

Godfrey Dreher's Statement.

(0/49)

A
Fair and candid Statement
of
Plain Matters of Fact
with accompanying Remarks
In Reference to Difficulties which have Existed
and still exist between
the Lutheran Synod of So. Ca
and
Godfrey Dreher

By Godfrey Dreher

Columbia S. C.

Printed by D. C. Morgan

1842.

2
Statement

Notwithstanding a sense of duty and self-respect may require it, it is still somewhat an unpleasant task for a man to give an account of matters in which he himself is deeply implicated; because in doing this he is often compelled to recall to mind the most unpleasant events and scenes which he would gladly have buried in the sea of oblivion, and to speak of others who would not willingly have their names thus used. These considerations, as well as the hope that the difficulties of which I shall treat, might be amicably and satisfactorily adjusted to all parties concerned; have induced me long to delay the performance of the task which I have now undertaken. No reasonable efforts, however, have as yet been made to adjust these difficulties, nor does it seem likely that any will in future be made.

3

I therefore now consider it my imperative duty to submit to an impartial and intelligent public, in order that it may judge for itself, a fair and candid statement of the difficulties which have existed and still exist between myself and the churches under my ministerial charge on the one part, and the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina and its friends on the other part. For me longer to delay this would be an act of flagrant injustice to myself, my friends and the publick and the cause of truth and justice. I will endeavor to deal plainly, but at the same time fairly, and in "nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice" I shall accompany this account with such remarks as I may consider necessary fairly to present the matters which it will embrace, and to vindicate my character and the course which I have pursued, against the assaults, aspersions and misrepresentations of my enemies.

It may not be amiss in the outset, nor will it be considered arrogance in me, to inform the reader, that I was the first of the now living Lutheran Ministers in this State.

I also made the first movements towards, and actively assisted in the formation of the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina, and adjacent States, and of the Ministers who assisted in its formation there is now but one in it.

I at all times, zealously labored to promote the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom in general, and of the Lutheran Church in particular, within the bounds of the South Carolina Synod; and I have reason to believe that my labors have not been in vain. Between the members of the Synod and myself, previous to the present misunderstanding, there always existed the most intimate, and, I have every reason to believe, sincere friendship. We annually assembled together in synod, and consulted to devise ~~means~~ the most judicious and efficient means to build up and extend the

Church in the South; and in the execution of these means we mutually cooperated. The estimation in which I was held by the members of the synod before these difficulties occurred may be seen by a reference to their minutes, the important trust which they confided in me, in having elected me ten years successively to the office of Treasurer, and many private letters now in my possession. But in what to us, with our limited conceptions of the dispensations of God's Providence may seem an unhappy day, a mighty change came over this delightful and harmonious state of things. The strong ties of attachment were rent asunder by the demon of discord, and the gentle stream of affection dried up by the fires of animosity. The connection between myself and the Synod has been dissolved; and parties are now arrayed in seeming hostility against each other. We are led to enquire, what has brought about all this?

The whole of the difficulties between me and the South Carolina Synod may be traced to a misunderstanding between the Rev. Jacob Moser and myself; it will therefore be necessary to advert briefly to this. I myself was one of the committee which examined this gentleman, and solemnly set him apart to the

important and responsible work of the Ministry. It would be injustice to my own feelings for me not to say that I long considered him sincerely engaged in the work of our Lord and Master. Until the year 1834, for any thing that I know to the contrary, the most perfect intimacy and friendship existed between him and me.

About that time (1834) in compliance with the request of the Elders and members of St. Jacobs Church which was then under the Pastoral charge of Mr. Moser, at such and by his consent I commenced preaching in that church, at such times as would not interfere with his appointments. For a short time matters went on in the congregation smoothly, and I believe to the entire satisfaction of all parties. But it was not long before, from some cause, of which we have no certain knowledge, but are left merely to conjecture, he seemed dissatisfied, and manifested coolness towards me. He attended the Church on the day of my appointment. I preached, and after I had closed my sermon, I invited him either to preach, or make some concluding remarks; but this he declined. He then rose, and in the most abrupt manner, without asking permission from the Elders, and read certain charges against me, of which I have now no certain recollection. It may easily be imagined what must have been my surprise and feelings at this, especially as I had had no previous intimation of it. I briefly replied to his

charges as well as I was prepared, and in as friendly a manner as could have been expected under such aggravating and mortifying circumstances. As might have been expected, this scene produced great excitement in the neighborhood, gave rise to various surmises, and set the congregation at variance. Had I even injured Mr. Moser, or in any wise treated him improperly, or preached unsound doctrines, I am willing that the reader should say whether this was the course which as a Christian and brother he should have pursued, for me it seemed the very reverse.

With a view to allay the excitement thus produced in the neighborhood, to heal the breach in the congregation, and if possible to effect a reconciliation between Mr. Moser and me, a meeting was called at his own house at which the Elders of two congregations attended, but this proved abortive. He seemed cool and obstinate, and treated me particularly with the greatest contempt. Although nothing can justify such conduct in Mr. Moser, some apology may be found for him on this occasion, as well as at the subsequent meetings held in the church for the same purpose. We have every reason to believe that he was under the influence of a certain designing malicious individual, who generally attended the meetings held in the church for the purpose of adjusting these unhappy difficulties. All this attempts to settle this dispute were met by alleging that it could not be settled without being carried before synod.

Accordingly, at the next session of the Synod, which was held at Ebenezer, Georgia, November, 1834, Mr. Moser

charged me with preaching certain heretical and dangerous doctrines. The expectation that such a charge would be preferred against me, as well as the conviction on my mind that Mr. Moser had acted impudently and contrary to the precepts and Spirit of the Gospel, induced me to charge him with improper conduct. All the letters and papers touching this painful subject were now laid before synod, and a committee of four ^{appointed} to report on them. The following is their report:

"That they would recommend that both the ministers who have recently officiated in St. Jacobs Church be required to discontinue their ministerial labors ~~in~~ in said Church, in order that harmony be restored.

2. That this Synod enjoin it on the members of said congregation not to employ either of said ministers

3- That we recommend that the church be placed under the care of Rev. Dr. Hozebins, and who is required, in case of his being unable to attend, to supply his place from the Theological Seminary.

4. That it be recommended to the congregation of St. Jacobs' Church to appoint a day of humiliation and prayer, in special reference to the unhappy difficulties which have so long existed among them." Min., 1834, p. 9.

The Ministerium also acted upon the letters and papers referring to the mutual charges above adverted to. The following is their report:

1. That both of the Rev. Brethren, by leading too

9

ready an ear to the vague and unfounded reports circulated against them, and giving way to feelings of unkindness and suspicion towards each other, have, in the opinion of this Ministerium, trespassed against that Spirit of love which should ever obtain among brethren, and which beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeith all things, and endureth all things;" In accordance with this decision, it was resolved:

- 1- That the Rev. Dreher and Moses, in obedience to earnest and affectionate request of this Ministerium, and in the spirit of mutual forbearance, do make such acknowledgments as shall be mutually deemed satisfactory, and that forgetting all past differences, they will be more united for the future.
- 2- As certain doctrinal errors had been alleged against Rev. S. Dreher, he consented at the request (on threat of excommunication, provided he did not) of his ministerial brethren, to submit to an examination of his religious sentiments and views. And as the result of this examination this Ministerium take pleasure in stating, that from Mr Dreher's confession, they found him sound in the faith and deem it a duty they owe to their brother, to express their unanimous conviction, that there existed no sufficient grounds for the accusation of heterodoxy.
- 3- As certain charges were made against Rev. J. Moses, the Ministerium examined the papers and documents relating to them; and as the result of this examination, this Ministerium take pleasure in stating that the evidence is insufficient, and deem it a duty they owe their brother, to express their conviction that there existed no sufficient grounds

1 8
for the accusation Min. 1834, p. 19, 20,

This seemed to me a strange mode of procedure in a matter of such great importance, especially for a body of men who pass for men of talents, of erudition and business tact. I was then dissatisfied with it, am still dissatisfied with it, and expect to remain so. My reasons for this, I will briefly assign, and let the impartial and intelligent reader judge for himself.

This procedure was unreasonable and simple in every sense of the word, and what is still worse, without any constitutional authority to justify it. Mr. Moser had charged me with preaching heretical and dangerous doctrines. Now in the Synod of South Carolina, like all other Lutheran Synods, the Augsburg Confession of Faith is the acknowledged standard of orthodoxy and point of union. (See Constitution, Chap. 5 sect 6; also Preamble to Can. sec 2.) Consequently each Minister of this Synod at the time of his ordination, and every Candidate at the time of his receiving license, is required to subscribe to this venerable Confession of Faith of our forefathers and first Reformers; and according to this Confession, are they all, by the Constitution and their ordination vows bound to teach. When a minister deviates from any of its fundamental doctrines, he is liable to suspension or excommunication. According to the Constitution, all charges of heterodoxy, or in other words, of a deviation from the fundamental doctrines of

771
one supposing confession must be preferred either by the Church Council of the accused Minister, or three ordained ministers of the Synod; and no minister can be suspended or expelled without having been convicted, by clear and satisfactory proof, of having deviated from the doctrines of this Confession, or of criminal or immoral conduct before the Ministerium or a court of justice. (Can. chap. 5, sec. 5, 6)

From the above, it appears evident that the Synod, or Ministerium, had no right to try me for heterodoxy, because the Constitution expressly requires that the charge must be made, either by the Church Council of the accused minister, or three ordained ministers of Synod; but the charge against me was made by but one minister; therefore my trial was unconstitutional. The fact that the Constitution was only finally adopted and ratified by the Synod in 1834, at which I was tried can not material-ly affect the argument; because the committee by whom it was draughted had, in obedience to the resolution of Synod, three months previous to the session of 1834, placed a copy of it in the hands of every minister in connection with the Synod for examination. They had all examined and approved it; intended to, and actually did subscribe it in 1834. It was therefore the law of the Synod.

I will now notice the manner in which my trial was conducted. There is a proper order to be observed in the transaction of business of any kind. According to my knowledge of the manner of proceeding in all similar cases, the first thing which the Synod should have done, after both parties were ready to enter into the trial, would have been to

ask me. Are you guilty or not guilty of the charge? Guilty or not guilty, if I intended to stand a trial I would, of course have answered, not guilty. The next thing to be done, would have been to call on my accuser for the evidence by which he thought to sustain the charge. If the evidence had been sufficient to establish the charge, it would have then been the manifest duty of the Ministerium, either to have expelled or suspended me.

But instead of this, strange as it may appear, I was not asked are you guilty or not guilty of the charge against you? Nor was my accuser called upon to adduce the evidence by which he thought to sustain his charge. No; but although it has since been denied, and does not appear in the minutes, I was peremptorily required, on threat of suspension or excommunication, provided I refused, to submit, like a candidate for license or ordination, to an examination of my religious sentiments. When I called upon the Ministerium for its authority thus to proceed, I received no satisfactory answer. Thus the only alternative left me, was suspension or excommunication, or submission to an examination. Being some what perplexed, and at a loss to know what to do, I reluctantly submitted to the examination. My examination proving satisfactory, the Ministerium expressed it as their unanimous conviction, that there existed no sufficient ground for the charge of heterodoxy against me, but that I was sound in the faith, and free

from heterodoxy: Thus was I acquitted of the charge.

Now, had I actually been guilty of the charge, could the Ministerium possibly have supposed that I would have acknowledged it? Or did they indeed think that I was so notoriously ignorant of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, and the views of the Synod, that I would entangle and convict myself of the charge by my own answers? They certainly must have thought so, or else they would have pursued a different course; or else, they intended to acquit me, guilty or not guilty. This indeed seems to me, more like the work of ignorant and illiterate men, than the work of men of talents, education and business tact. And, then, to cap the climax of absurdity, they publish to the world that on my own confession there existed no sufficient ground for the charge of heterodoxy etc. Who ever heard of the accused being cleared on his own Confession?

It is without a precedent. Adopt this rule, and it will be difficult, nay impossible, to convict any man.

Another source of dissatisfaction was the manner in which my accuser, whom I had charged with improper conduct, was acquitted. As I entertain no unkind feelings towards Mr. Moser, and have now no ecclesiastical connection with him, I would willingly decline making any remarks on this subject, did not a sense of justice to myself require it. The Ministerium expressed it as their unanimous conviction, that on examination of the papers and documents relating to this subject, there

existed no sufficient ground for the charge. - Be it so; I must, however, acknowledge that I differ widely with these gentlemen, The charge of improper conduct I have adverted to in another place, I would now ask, in all candor, whether the abrupt manner in which he assailed me in St. Jacobs' Church, and disturbed the devotions of the people, - the cold and contemptuous manner in which he received and treated me, as well as the Elders, who had undertaken to effect a reconciliation between us, and the charge against me of preaching heretical and dangerous doctrines, without clear and satisfactory proof - I ask, was not all this improper conduct? Is this the manner in which our Christian Minister and brother is bound, by the precepts and spirit of the Gospel, to treat another? If so, I must ^{indeed} confess that I am utterly lost to a sense of justice, honor, and propriety as well as the higher principles of the Gospel. The reader may judge for himself. The Synod acquitted him without one word of censure or reproof.

But what seems, if possible, still stranger and more unreasonable, was that the Ministerium recommended that we should both make such acknowledgements as should be mutually deemed satisfactory. I made no acknowledgment, for I knew of nothing which I had done that required it.

13-

Mr. Moser made none, had he at that time acknowledged that he was mistaken, and had lent too willing an ear to vague and unfounded reports, it would have been my duty, according to the principles of our holy religion, and I should, from the bottom of my heart, have forgiven him. Had he done this, the matter would have forever ended.

I then discovered that there was something improper and unjust in the proceedings of the Ministerium, and felt dissatisfied with them. Accordingly, I repeatedly called for a re-consideration of the matter, or some satisfactory explanation. To my remonstrances against its proceedings and demand for a new trial, the Ministerium paid but little attention. To my call for some satisfactory explanation of mysteries, which I supposed were connected with the settlement of the difficulties, some attempts were made to clear them up, but none which satisfied me.

Thus ends this unpleasant matter; but before dismissing it finally, I must say a few words in reference to a visit which the President of the Synod, Rev. Mr. Mealy, paid me, as was said, for the purpose of restoring that reciprocity of friendship between the Synod and myself which had measureably ceased. He afterwards reported to the Synod that I had not treated him with that respect and hospitality due the first of-

from of the Synod, and that I had circulated reports injurious to his official character. Rev. Mr. Ring, who accompanied Mr. Mealy on that occasion, was called in to testify that I had not treated him with due respect and hospitality, and also that he saw nothing improper or censurable in Mr. Mealy's conduct. Be it so, in their judgment. I must however confess that I differ widely with these gentlemen in their views of courtesy and hospitality, and as to that which is proper and ~~not~~ irreprehensible. But should I give a statement of the whole matter, it would be but my word and opinion in opposition to these two gentlemen. Some might believe and justify me; others might believe them and justify Mr. Mealy. That I ever circulated any reports injurious to Mr. Mealy's official character standing, I do positively deny. As I am but a plain man, and not very conversant with the rules of etiquette, I may not, in my republican simplicity, have treated his reverence with that respect which he thought due his standing and official character.

I now saw clearly that I had nothing like justice to expect from the Synod. I also discovered that they were departing farther and farther from the doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church; and were introducing in the churches

17

the various new measures which so eminently characterize the present fanatical age, and which are so well calculated to distract and divide the Church. This I could not sanction; for I was bound by the Constitution and my ordination vow, as well as my honest convictions of all that was sound in doctrine and pure practice, to oppose it. Thus it was that the Ministers of the Synod complained that I had ceased to cooperate with them.

Some time early in the year, 1837 business of a private nature called me to North Carolina, where I had the pleasure of forming an acquaintance with several of the Ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod, and particularly Rev. Messrs. A. Miller and A. J. Brown. After a free interchange of views with these gentlemen on the doctrines and discipline of the Church, I was fully convinced that that much persecuted, abused, and misrepresented body of Ministers still retained and taught in their primitive purity, the doctrines of our Church, and adhered to her usages, in her purest and best ages. Accordingly I extended a friendly invitation to the above named Ministers ~~and~~ to visit me and preach in my Churches. In compliance with my invitation, in the month of May 1837 Mr. Miller visited me, ^{and} preached in my Churches, and was ~~soon~~ followed soon after by Mr. Brown,

(17)

The introduction of these brethren into my churches gave rise to fresh difficulties, and seemed greatly to alarm and inflame the Ministers of the S. C. Synod in this section of country. Instead of meeting and treating these men with that respect and affection due Ministers of the Gospel, the Ministers of Synod met and treated them with coolness and indifference. They followed them to various places of worship, but refused participating in their religious exercises, and took notes of their sermons. They industriously circulated among the people misrepresentations of their sermons and of the doctrines of the Synod of which they were members. - They assailed them publicly in their pulpit exercises, and, we have reason to believe, published a Circular over a fictitious signature, addressed to the Lutherans within the bounds of the S. C. Synod, containing a statement, and an attempted refutation of certain absurd and dangerous doctrines, which they said the Tennessee Synod held.

All this had an effect altogether different from what it was designed and desired it should have. The public mind was excited; a spirit of inquiry was raised among the people; they flocked together to hear these ~~people~~ men preach; they were convinced that they had been greatly abused, and misrepresented; and that the principal, if not the only ground of opposition to them by their enemies.

was that they were the advocates of the people's rights, and the primitive doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church.

This course having proved ineffectual, the Ministers of the Synod now fell on another plan. Some of the nearest of them held a meeting of consultation, at which the following statements were made, and resolution, among others, passed:-

"Rev. Mr. Hope stated that he had heard Mr. Miller preach and the substance of his sermon amounted to this, viz; that being baptiz'd, partaking of the Lord's Supper and giving assent to the truths revealed in the Bible, were all that was necessary to prepare a soul for the enjoyment of Heaven."

Several other Ministers made statements substantially the same as those made by Mr. Hope. In view of these statements it was.

"Resolved, That a Committee of four be appointed to inquire of Mr. Dreher whether he sanctions the doctrines and sentiments set forth by Mr. Miller."

The Committee, in obedience to the injunction imposed upon them, addressed a letter to me, in order to obtain the desired information; but to their request, for reasons satisfactory to my mind, I did not feel either disposed or bound to comply. For 1- I had once before submitted to an examination of my religious sentiments, when the Synod had no right to make such a demand of me; and I was determined never again to be thus imposed upon. 2- In my judgement, they had greatly misrepresented

Mr Miller's sentiments, or at least expressed them in very ambiguous language, so that I could not say whether I did or did not sanction them, as expressed by the Committee. 3- I did not consider myself responsible for Mr. Miller's sentiments any more than the members of the Synod do for the doctrines advanced by all the different men they invite to preach in their churches. And finally, the Committee had no right to make any such demand of me. These reasons satisfied my own mind in refusing to comply with the Committee's request, and I feel will satisfy the reader.

The Committee having thus been foiled, passed a resolution to refer the whole matter to the President Mr Mealy, requesting him to apply such a remedy as in his opinion the Constitution of the Synod might provide. In compliance with this request, the President appointed Rev. Messrs. Hazelius, Rauch, Hope, Hultwauser, Barnhardt, Clay, Sull, ^{and} Biedenbaugh a Special Committee, to meet at Lexington village on the 26th of July, 1837, to communicate with me on the subjects of complaints alleged against me. He also forwarded certain interrogatories to Dr. Hazelius, Chairman of said Committee, to be proposed to me; and also a letter to me, informing me of the time, place, and object of the meeting, and urging upon me to attend and answer for myself. Dr. Hazelius also addressed me a long letter, inviting me to attend the meeting. In this letter he says: In the same spirit of candor I will state facts to you, which, in the opinion

21

of your Synodical brethren, make a separation between you and us necessary, until you return to a sound mind." After a long detail of matters he continues: "Under these circumstances a separation must take place, and we wish it to be mutual on your own account, because it will keep the door open for a return on your part, if you should return from your errors. For we trust the time will come when stubborn facts will convince you that the Synod has been your friend, and that Hentzelites and their consorts are your enemies, you have introduced them to injure us, but that injury will fall upon yourself."

Thus it appears that the President of the Synod had empowered that Committee to investigate the charges against me, and that without an investigation of the subject, they declared a separation must take place. And also that it was principally because I had introduced some of the ministers of the Tennessee Synod, whom they style Hentzelites, into my churches. I was not then apprised of the fact, but have since learned that neither the President nor the Committee possessed any constitutional right thus to call me to ~~an~~ account, and suspend or expel me. The 6th sec. of the 5th chap. of the Constitution, to which I have already referred in another place, expressly says, that this cannot be done unless an accusation is regularly brought against a minister, either by his Church Council or three ordained ministers of Synod, of having deviated from the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession. But I was not charged with this, but was to be tried and suspended, or expelled for another man's sentiments: consequently they acted illegally + unjustly + unwisely

tional authority. But why notice this? What is a constitution to such arbitrary men? They seem to claim and exercise the power to make and violate laws, at their option, as circumstances may require, or it may suit their convenience.

I met the Committee according to appointment. To the questions which they proposed to me I did not feel a willingness to respond, except upon conditions to which they would not accede. They then informed me that they would feel constrained to recommend my suspension from the ministerial office, unless at the suggestion of the Chairman, I should think proper to voluntarily to dissolve my connexion with the Synod, and separate from them on terms of peace. I chose the latter alternative, and in conjunction with the Chairman of the Committee, signed the following agreement.

The Chairman of the Committee, after stating that for several years repeated attempts had been made to settle the difficulties existing between it and the Rev. Mr. Dreher, but all proving ineffectual, called upon the Rev. Mr. Dreher to agree to a friendly separation, on the ground that we cannot agree in our views of doctrine and church affairs, to which the said gentleman consented

(Signed) "Godfrey Dreher"

"Ernest L. Hozeius, Chm. of said Com."
Dated, "Lexington, C.H., July 26th, 1837"

Thus was my connexion with the Synod of South Carolina dissolved. The immediate cause of it seems

to have been the introduction of Rev. Messrs Brown and Miller into my churches. In view of this, and the fact that the Synod of which these brethren are members, has recently been assailed and denounced by the Synod of South Carolina, I will offer a few remarks in vindication of my conduct, in introducing them into my churches. In a report of a Committee of the Synod in 1837, which was unanimously adopted, it is said the Tennessee Synod "has been denounced by every Lutheran Synod in the Country, as holding heretical and dangerous doctrines." At the same session of the Synod Dr. Bachman preached a sermon, in which he states and attempts to refute what he calls the errors of this Synod; but has been so clearly and satisfactorily answered and refuted by Messrs. Brown and Miller, that he has not even attempted a reply. My object at present is simply to notice the charges of the Synod to see how nearly they harmonize with the truth, and correspond with its former course.

1- Is the Tennessee Synod an Evangelical Lutheran Body? Almost every Christian denomination of Christians has either framed or adopted some creed which they profess to believe, according to which, with more or less strictness, they are bound to teach, and from which their doctrines are learnt. So has the Lutheran Church; and the Augsburg Confession is the acknowledged standard of faith and bond of union in all genuine Lutheran Synods and churches. The Tennessee Synod has adopted this Confession, and are by their

have made a deviation from it an excommunicable offense. Therefore they are, at least, theoretically a good Lutheran Synod, they have also practically adhered to this Confession. For proof of this, the testimony of Dr. Hazelius will be considered sufficient by the South Carolina Synod. He says in a Communication to Rev. A. Miller, published in the Lutheran Observer, "we, therefore, cheerfully say again, what we have never denied, that the Tennessee Synod, so called, has never departed from the Augsburg Confession and its apology."

"2- But has the Tennessee Synod, as has been asserted, been denounced by every Lutheran Synod in the country, as holding heretical and dangerous doctrines? From all the information which I have been able to obtain on this subject, but few Synods have ever taken any action at all on the subject. So far from being denounced by every Lutheran Synod in the country, they have been acknowledged by at least several Synods, and individual members of Synods, as an Evangelical Lutheran Synod. And although the General Synod has denounced it on several occasions, it has also, in consistent as it may seem, acknowledged it, by including it in the published reports of its proceedings, among other Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the country. At its last session, I am informed a "systematic effort" was made by some members of the General Synod to have the Tennessee Synod recognized as an Evangelical Lutheran body. A desire has also been expressed by some of its members to have the Tennessee Synod brought into connection and cooperation with the General Synod. The names of its ministers too were vol-

25-

university published in the Lutheran Observer, by its able editor, Dr. Kurtz, in the Clerical Catalogue of Evangelical Lutheran Ministers in the United States, and not a word of complaint was heard from any source except the North and S. Carolina Synods. So too, together with the statistics of the Tennessee Synod in the Lutheran Almanack for 1842. Dr. Kurtz in speaking of "Essays in illustration and defense of some of the distinctive doctrines of the Tennessee Synod" published in his paper, says, that although he cannot agree with their author in all his views, he considers the difference unimportant, and says that he could not refuse to fellowship him. But what ^{must} appear still more astoundingly strange is that the South Carolina Synod itself in its Minutes of 1833, and 1835 included the Tennessee Synod, its officers and statistics among the other Lutheran Synods of the country, their officers and statistics, thereby acknowledging it as an Evangelical Lutheran Synod. But things have changed. Why so? In the language of Dr. Bachman, had this unenlightened and declining sect remained in the abodes of obscurity, and not been recently introduced into the very bosom of our churches;— forsooth, for aught we know to the contrary it might still be acknowledged by the South Carolina Synod as an Evangelical Lutheran body. But in view of all these plain and stubborn facts the redoubtable Lutheran Synod of South Carolina has now the effrontery to assert that the Tennessee Synod "has been denounced by every Lutheran Synod in the country as holding heretical and dangerous doctrines." O! shame, where is thy blush? O! consistency, thou art a jewel!

3- But I have in introducing and permitting the

(25)

ministers of the Tennessee Synod to preach in my churches done more than ministers of other Lutheran Synods and Christian denominations in the country have done? I have it from good authority that they have frequently been permitted to preach not only in Lutheran churches of other Synods, but also in Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian churches, in different sections of the country. The Rev. Mr. Brown, particularly, informs me that he has preached in Lutheran churches, where they had no societies in Kentucky, Ohio and Virginia, and also that he has often preached in the Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian churches, in different sections of the country; and that in one place where the Tennessee Synod had no organized congregation, nor house of worship he was permitted to hold Catechetical Lectures, Confirmation, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, to ordain Elders, and thus organize a congregation in a Presbyterian Church. Is it possible then that the ministers of the S. C. Synod, are so much wiser and holier and more orthodox than their brethren in other sections of the country, and other Christian denominations? They seem to say to all, "stand by, for we are holier than thou," No doubt they are almost ready with the ancient Pharisees to "thank God they are not as other men are."

Reader you have now the facts on this point before you; judge for yourself. I cannot however, forbear expressing it, as my deliberate and honest

27

opinion, that had not the synod of South Carolina manifested such great coolness and hostility to the members of the Tennessee Synod, who preached in my churches, but treated them as brethren and fellow laborers in the moral vineyard of our common Lord and Master, many, at least, of the present difficulties might have been entirely avoided. They would then have come, and preached, and gone as other visiting ministers had done. But the Synod treated them with coolness, refused to fellowship them, and drew plainly the line of demarcation. They now had a right, and felt in duty bound, to defend their Synod, its doctrines and measures, against the assaults, misrepresentations, and aspersions of its enemies. The violent opposition with which they met, and the discussion which it elicited, served to convince the people, that the South Carolina was averse to the doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church; for if not, why thus oppose a Synod which is confessedly one of Old School Lutherans? Before dismissing this subject, I would simply remark, that the Tennessee Synod does not only adhere to the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church, but also holds all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian system; such as the doctrines of the Trinity, Original Sin, Vicarious Atonement, Justification by Faith, etc, etc.

Having then given an account of the difficulties between myself and the South Carolina Synod, to the time of our separation, and also some remarks in vindication of the course which I pursued amid them all, I will now give an account of matters which

27

have since transpired. Unreasonable and uncharitable as was their conduct previous to that period, their subsequent conduct exhibits but little evidence of reformation and improvement.

No sooner had the separation taken place between the Synod and myself, than the members of the Synod informed my Churches that I was no longer a member of the Synod; they must make arrangements to get a Minister belonging to the Synod to preach for them. As many of the Lutheran Churches in this country have been incorporated by the Legislature, and as they contended, and still contend, connected with and under the control of the Synod, they doubtless flattered themselves, that as the connection between us had been dissolved, the simple announcement of this fact would be sufficient to induce my Churches to forsake me and employ them. But in this they were, to a great extent, sadly disappointed.

The people of my charge, with few exceptions, still adhered to me. At one of my Churches, where there was a faction opposed to me, they succeed in intruding themselves; at others they made powerful efforts, but were frustrated.

Having thus failed in their attempt, it was necessary that the Synod should fall upon some other plan, which would more surely accomplish their desired end. Accordingly, at the ^{session} of the Synod held in Charleston in 1837, a committee which had

29

been appointed in reference to this subject, recommended that "the Synod should declare me no longer a minister of the Lutheran Church— that I was beyond the control of the Synod, and that the Synod was not responsible for my faith and conduct." The report was unanimously adopted. In a recent correspondence with some of the members of St. Peter's Church, Dr. Bachman, who was at that time President of the Synod, confirms this statement. He says: "It became my duty, according to the 5th Article, Sec. 5 of the constitution of our Synod, to notify you, that on the 15th of November 1837, at the meeting of the Synod of our Church held in Charleston, the Rev. Godfrey Dreher was expelled from our Synod and declared no longer a minister of the Lutheran Church." Persons connected with the Synod have since, repeatedly asserted that all my ministerial acts are invalid. It therefore became necessary that I should notice this bull of excommunication.

1st. Let it be distinctly understood and borne in mind, that the President of the Synod, Mr. Mealy, had appointed a special Committee to meet at Lexington Court House to communicate with me on the subjects of complaint alleged against me. Before that Committee I appeared. They did not recommend to the President my suspension or excommunication; but requested me to separate from them, — or in other words withdraw my membership from the Synod. This may be seen by a reference to the paper which in conjunction with the chairman of the Committee, I signed. Now if there was a friendly separation, I was entirely free from the jurisdiction of the Synod, — it had no further control over me

The Synod then had a right, and it was by the Constitution, their duty to ratify the act of the Presidents Committee, by which the separation was made, and to say that I was no longer a member of their Synod*, and consequently that they were not responsible for my faith and conduct; but I am utterly at a loss to conceive how they could expel me, when I was already out of the Synod, and free from their jurisdiction, and more especially what authority they had to declare that I was no longer a Minister of the Lutheran Church.

2nd The Constitution of the Synod grants it no power, either to suspend or expel any of its Ministers, and much less to declare that a man is not a Minister of the Lutheran Church unless a charge is regularly gotten up, and clearly proven, either by his Church Council or three ordained Ministers, belonging to the Synod, that he has departed from the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession; or that he has been convicted of criminal or immoral conduct, such as either before a Court of justice or the Ministerium. But in this case, I am not charged with departing from the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession; nor has it been proven, either before a Court of justice or the Ministerium, that I have been guilty of criminal or immoral conduct, - such as lying, theft, drunkenness, adultery etc. Nor had I been cited to appear before Synod and answer for myself. What authority then, I ask again, had

* That I ^{actually} was at this time out of connexion with the Synod, and that the Synod viewed the subject in this light, is evident from the Minutes of the very same Synod at which they pretended to expel me. They say: "and (Mr. Dreher) still, even whilst out of our connexion, exercises towards us a temper incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel, he be declared no longer a minister of our Church," etc. - Min. 1837 p 23. They might just as well talk to me about killing dead men, as expelling men from the Synod who are already out of it,

they, even if I had been under their jurisdiction, to expel me, and declare that I was no longer a Minister of the Lutheran Church?

3rd. If the Synod had the power to expel me from the Ministry of the Lutheran Church, then indeed it must be a little popedom in the Church. It must be the supreme representative of, and tribunal in, the Lutheran Church, which alone possesses the power to declare who shall, and who shall not be considered Ministers of the Lutheran Church. All men in the Country, who wish to be considered Lutheran Ministers, would therefore do well to make immediate application to this high ecclesiastical tribunal for their recognition, or they may incur its holy indignation, and be expelled from ^{the Ministry of} the Lutheran Church! But happily, such is not the case. When was such power delegated to this Synod by the Lutheran Church? When, I repeat? Echo answers When? The response is never. Whence did the Synod derive its authority to say that I was no longer a Lutheran Minister? It possesses no such power. All its parade on this subject is only designed to blind the ignorant and unsuspecting. Such proceedings are unworthy the name of a Protestant, and a disgrace to the great Reformer.

In the conclusion of my remarks on this branch of my subject, I would barely remark, that it is a matter of but little importance to me, whether the Synod of South Carolina recognize me as a Minister of the Lutheran Church or not. I did not derive my authority from that body, to preach and administer the ordinances of the Church, and it cannot, by any of its acts, affect that authority. I was ordained a minister of the gospel long before that Synod was in existence, and I, myself, assisted in the ordination of several of its leading ministers, and particularly Mr. Mealy, who was then President of the Synod. I have higher authority under which to act. I hold my Commission under the Great Head of the Church; I am an

ambassador for Christ." And as long as I have the unspeakable satisfaction to feel assured that my doctrines and conduct harmonize with the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, they may declare me no longer a Minister of the Lutheran Church and put me out of the Churches if they can, I will still fearlessly proclaim the great truths of the Gospel. My persecutions and trials may be great, but what are they compared to the persecutions and trials of the first heralds of the cross? "None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the Ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God."

But I am not yet done, I will next notice the treatment which I have received from the present Treasurers of the Synod, and the Synod itself, in reference to my office as Treasurer of Synod. In my opinion, they have not only acted unreasonably and ungratefully towards me, but have made an attempt to involve me in difficulties, if not to impeach my character. But I will submit the facts, and let the reader draw his own conclusions.

By a reference to the Minutes of the Synod which was formed in 1824 it will be seen that from that time, down to the year 1835, I had been elected every term in succession Treasurer of Synod. By the adoption of the new Constitution in 1834, which requires that the Treasurer should be a Layman, I was no longer eligible to that office. I was bound by a heavy bond for the faithful performance of my duties; and at the annual meetings of every

Synod, my reports were examined by a Committee appointed for that purpose, they were always pronounced correct, and received by the Synod. When I went out of office, I returned my thanks to Synod for the confidence which they had reposed in me in having elected me Treasurer so many years in succession, and my gratitude for now being exempt from that heavy ~~burthen~~.burthen. It was also unanimously "Resolved, That the thanks of this Synod be returned to the Rev. Godfrey Dreher, for the faithful performance of his duties, for many years, as Treasurer of the Synod."

On the 22nd day of December, 1835, I made a full settlement with West Baughman, Esq, the present Treasurer of Synod. I delivered up to him all the monies, notes and documents in my hands, to which he was entitled, and took his receipt. The heavy bond into which I had entered for the faithful performance of my duties, was given up to me. All were fully satisfied - not a word of complaint was heard.

But judge of my surprise, when soon after my separation from the Synod, in July 1837, Mr. Baughman came to my house, and demanded of me the papers still in my hands, touching my office as Treasurer of Synod. I refused giving them up, believing, as I still do, that I was the proper owner. I was still more surprised when the following appeared in the Minutes of 1837.

"It has also been ascertained by a report of the present Treasurer of Synod, that although Mr. Dreher, when his office as Treasurer expired, thanked the Synod for the confidence which they had placed in him, in electing him successively to that office, and received in return a vote of thanks; yet it appears that he retains in his hands valuable documents, the property of the Synod, which on application, he has refused to surrender to the proper officers."

Now is it not a matter of profound astonishment that the long period of nearly two years, from the time I went out of office, had expired, before it was discovered that I retained in my hands "valuable documents, the property of the Synod," or at least before any thing was said about it? But no sooner does the separation take place than new light is received - the important discovery made, and what can possibly be these "valuable documents"? I have in my hands documents which are valuable to me, but none that are the property of the Synod. It is well known to men of business, that as Treasurer of Synod, I had no right to pay out any money without an order from Synod, or its legal officers; and that unless I wished to account for it out of my own pocket I had no right to pay any order for money without taking a receipt from the person or persons to whom paid, showing that I had actually paid it. These orders and receipts, together with my band are all the documents in my possession. Now, suppose I had surrendered them to the present Treasurer of Synod, and he had destroyed them, might not the Synod come upon me, and demand, what right had you to pay such and such monies? Others, who made draws upon the Treasury, might demand where are your receipts, that you have paid me such and such monies. What would now be my condition? That such was the object of the Treasurer of Synod. I will not positively assert. But it is a trite, but nevertheless a true saying, "it is no harm to watch an honest man." Reader, you have now the facts before you. Judge whether I have in my hands valuable documents, the property of the Synod; and also their object in demanding them of me. My own opinion is, that the object of the Treasurer in making this demand of me at the time and the circumstances under

which it was made, was any thing else than a good object.

35-

There is one more subject, which in justice to myself and my friends, I must notice before I come to a conclusion. I allude to the difficulties which have existed, and still continue to exist, in St. Peter's Church, growing out of my separation from the Synod, and the litigation to which they have given rise.

The history of this Church will first demand attention, as it will throw light on the subject before us. The persons by whom this church was first established, were formerly members of St. Johns Church near the present north-eastern corner of Lexington District. Living at an inconvenient distance from that Church, they determined to erect a new one for their accommodation and convenience. Accordingly, a survey was made by Peter Shumpert and Uriah Mayer, dec'd, on Feb 15th 1794, of a tract of land containing 112 acres, on which St. Peter's Church is situated, and a grant obtained for this land on the 5th of May following, for the use of a Lutheran Church. A congregation was organized, and incorporated by an act of the Legislature on the 17th December, 1794. The clause of the act incorporating this congregation declares,—"that all those who have signed the petition for incorporating the Lutheran Congregation of St. Peter, - who are now, and shall be hereafter duly admitted, or become members of that society, according to the rules, orders and constitution of the same to be formed, be a body corporate and politic, by the name and style of the Lutheran Congregation of St. Peter's"

Of course, according to the established laws of all corporate bodies, the majority of the members of this corporation had the right to make its own rules, regulations, and constitution, to use the church and church property as they might

(35)

see proper, without violating the principles of the incorporation, and to call its own minister. Down to the year 1833 this Church had been under the charge of several different ministers; but I was then chosen its pastor by the congregation, and it remained under my charge until the separation took place between the Synod and myself. I believe the whole congregation was satisfied with me and my preaching, and was united and prosperous.

But before the Synod met to take any action on the subject, some of the Ministers, without the solicitation of the Elders and members of the Church, and before the congregation took any action on the subject, made attempts to have me excluded from the Church and intrude themselves into it. The very evening on which the separation took place, two of them Rev. Messrs. Hope and Aull, rode a distance of between fifteen and twenty miles, and roused one of my elders from his bed, and told him that I was no longer a member of the Synod they must dismiss me and make arrangements to get a minister to preach for them in connexion with the Synod. They received but little satisfaction. The congregation was still united; but by the efforts and misrepresentations of my enemies, a party was got up in opposition to me. But still, it is a fact well known, that of about eighty four (84) male members, who were at that time attached to the Church, about seventy (70) were in favor of continuing me as their minister.

Shortly after the separation between me and the Synod, Mr Hope, perhaps by the invitation of the faction opposed to me made an appointment to preach

37

in the Church. After some hesitation and consultation among the Elders and members, he was allowed to preach on that occasion, and occasionally afterwards upon certain conditions. It was not long however he soon violated these and was locked out. After having preached a few sermons in an adjoining grove, he was again admitted to preach in the Church upon certain conditions. It was not long, however, before he violated these conditions and was again locked out. One of their party then said that he had preached long enough in the woods. He intended to enter the Church, and enter it honorably.

Now, let it be distinctly understood that during all this time, the congregation of St. Peter's Church was as much as ever in connection with the Synod of South Carolina, a

Foot note. By being in connexion with the Synod, I do not mean that the congregation, by sending delegates to the Synod, and contributing to its Treasury, merged its Corporation into the Synod Corporation, placed itself under its control, and made a transfer of its corporate property to the Synod; for the Synod has never established this as a law. But I mean by being in connexion with the Synod, that as the Synod only claims advisory power, the congregation by sending delegates to it, and contributing to its Treasury, only intended to consult with the Synod as to the best means to be employed in spreading the Gospel, and aid in the execution of these means, thus still reserving to itself the right of making its own regulations, and retaining the right to its corporate property.

They had not withdrawn their membership from it, nor had the Synod dismissed them, nor had they violated any law of the Synod. I had been duly elected the Pastor of the Church, and my election had been ratified.

And let it be further understood, that Mr. Hoopes' just interference was not by appointment of Synod, but voluntary and arbitrary.

And in reference to this, it should further be observed, that even after the Synod had assembled, it had no authority whatever, to appoint a Preacher for St. Peters Church without the petition and concurrence of a majority of the male members of the congregation. The constitution of the S. C. Synod, on this point, says: "Though it has hitherto been the custom of the Ministerium to point out to the different Ministers their field of usefulness and labor, yet do we ~~desire~~ ^{desire} to have it understood by our people, that the Ministerium has no right to act in such cases; but that the Churches alone, and more particularly their Elders, and male communicant members, are the only authority which can give call to Ministers, by a plurality of votes of the Church or Churches;" (Cons. Chap 11th, sec 3.) Nor does this article require that the Minister Chosen should be a member of the Synod. The Church certainly has the right to employ any Minister (and particularly Lutheran Ministers,) it may see proper. To say that a small faction petitioned the Synod for a Minister, will not remove this objection; because it would be contrary to all laws of corporate bodies to say, that a small minority should govern. If therefore the Synod even did appoint some man to preach for the minority, and the majority being opposed to it, had debarred him, they would neither have violated the constitution of Synod nor the laws of corporate bodies.

The minority of the Congregation having thus

39
failed to carry their point, next had recourse to the strong
arm of the civil law. On the 28 April, 1839. they commencing
a suit in the Court of Equity, praying for the right of
the Church and church property of St. Peters, and if this could
not be granted they might still have an interest in it.
A heavy law suit now ensued. Although it might be inter-
esting to the reader, my limits will not permit me, even
were I capable, to notice the grounds assumed by the respective
parties, the facts established in the investigation, and the points
of law upon which it was determined. Suffice it to say,
that Chancellor Johnson, who presided at the trial, after hav-
ing long delayed his decree, dismissed the bill, each party pay-
ing their own costs of the suit. Thus the parties were left just where
they commenced. So the matter still stands. It has been re-
mored that the plaintiffs intend to have the suit carried to
the Court of Appeals, but whether this will ~~be~~ or will not be
done, is unknown. It has also been said that the plain-
tiffs will enter a new suit; but this is uncertain. Thus,
my friends and myself are still in a state of suspense.
How the matter will finally be determined I know not. But
of one thing I am certain, that is, that I know of no law
by which the majority can be deprived of the Church and
church property, and certain I am, that according to
justice, they never can be.

In order, if possible, to adjust these unhappy dif-
ficulties and put an end to further litigation, in reference
to St. Peters Church, the majority of the members who
were taken in the suit, addressed a friendly letter to the
minority, inviting them to meet them for that purpose.
With this invitation the minority complied, and they met on
4th of February, 1842, As the majority had called the

meeting, it devolved upon them to submit their proposition. It was in substance as follows:

"That the present majority of St. Peters Church should have the free and undisturbed use of the house one half the time, for religious exercises, with permission to employ either E. Dreher, or any other regularly ordained minister, to preach for them, that they might see proper; and further, that they should have the right to organize a society in the said church, with such rules and regulations as they might see proper to adopt, all the members of which society, thus formed, to be considered as forming a part of the body corporate and politic of the Lutheran Congregation of St. Peters. The minority were to have the use of the church, the other half ^{of} the time for the same purpose, to enjoy the same rights and privileges."

This proposition I consider quite a reasonable one, and the members of the corporation most unquestionably had a right to enter into such an agreement. Either party, in securing a minister of their own faith to preach for them, could not possibly, in the judgment of the other, pollute the church, because the house is not susceptible of moral impressions - Neither party would have been compelled to attend the others' preaching; it would have been entirely discretionary with themselves. It would not have deprived either party of the privilege of attending church as often as would have been desirable; for neither party would have been able to procure, nor would they have desired, preaching, more than half the time. It would not, in

the least have impaired the house; it would have stood 41
just as long as it will without being used at all. And
in this way both parties would have got the good of the
labor they performed, and the money they expended, in the
erection of the church. But for reasons best known to
themselves (for they were not assigned) the minority re-
fused to accede to this proposition.

The minority were then called upon to make their
proposition. It was in substance that the majority in
whose possession the Key now is, should surrender it to
the Elders of the minority, and relinquish all claim to the
church and church property and they would then see
what they could do for them, modest and reasonable
request indeed!

I will now show how the church was built,
in order that the reader may see that even if the minority
could deprive the majority of it (of which, however, we
have no fears) it would be entirely contrary to every prin-
ciple of justice. The survey and gift of the land on which
the present St. Peter's Church is situated, was made by
the ancestors of the present majority of the members.
The house was built conjointly by all the members,
the church and other liberal individuals. For its
erection there was about \$633 paid in actual cash,
besides a small collection of which no account was
kept; and in addition to this there was a good
deal of labor performed in hewing, hauling, etc;
by different individuals, for which no allowance
was made. Of the \$633 about \$300 was

money belonging to the treasury of the church. Of the balance of the money about \$220 was paid by the present majority; and about \$56 by the minority, and the balance was paid by different persons who were then members, but have since moved out of the bounds of the church, and other persons who were not members. At the time the separation took place, there were about 84 male members belonging to the church of which about 70 were with the ~~majority~~ majority. The proportionate part of the treasury money belonging to the majority would be about \$240 leaving a balance of \$60 to the minority. From this it appears that the majority paid about \$460 and the minority \$160, for the erection of St. Peter's church. Of the labor performed in building the church the principal part was done by the majority.

Now leaving human laws which are often imperfect out of the question, what do reason and justice, and the principles of our holy religion say should be done? Do they say, give the church and church property to the minority? - Men of the world often seek and take the advantage of the ignorance and necessity of their fellowmen when the laws of the land will not reach and punish them. But the Christian occupies a higher

ground. He at all times acts as in the all-seeing presence of God. Before His awful tribunal where the inequalities of the present administration will be rectified, and the defects of human enactments corrected he expects ere long, to stand, and render up an account for the deeds done in the body.

Under this he endeavors at all times to conform to the Golden Rule, "do unto others as you would they should do unto you." Under these views we leave the reader to say who has acted and proposed reasonable and fair in the present case. We have the satisfaction of enjoying the approbation of our own consciences, and of feeling assured that we enjoy the approving smiles of Him to Whom the secret motives of all men are fully known.

Before dismissing this subject finally. I feel it my duty to drop a few words in reference to incorporations and the connection of incorporated churches with the Synod. Many of the Lutheran churches in this section of country are incorporated, and the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina is also an incorporated Body. This synod at its session in 1840 recommended all the churches now in connexion with it, which are not already incorporated and such as shall hereafter be built and connected with it, to procure acts of incorporation,

Should this be done and the unincorporated congregations connected with and placed under the control of the Synod and their corporation merged into the Synod corporation, as every corporate body enjoys the right of making its own laws and regulations, if I am not greatly mistaken every thing done by the Synod would be binding upon all the members of the unincorporated congregations. It would then be no longer left discretionary with such congregations whether to obey or disobey the rules and resolutions of the Synod. Should there then be one hundred members in an incorporated congregation, and 99 of them ^{should} become dissatisfied with the doctrines and the proceedings of the Synod, and break off from it; the one still adhering to it, would be the legal owner of all the corporate property, yea I am not ~~so~~ sure but if the whole congregation should break off from the Synod, the Synod would be the lawful owner of the property. This in my opinion would be entirely unjust. It is necessary that the people should be apprized of these

facts that they may know what cause to pursue. 45-

I have now endeavored to lay before the reader a fair and candid statement of plain matters of facts in reference to difficulties which have existed and still exist between my friends and myself on the one part, and the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina and its friends on the other part. There are other important subjects in reference to the doctrines and discipline of the church on which we differ. To point out these subjects of difference would doubtless be gratifying to the reader, but for this at present I have neither time nor space. I may however hereafter notice them, and show wherein this Synod has departed from the doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church. Whether I shall, or not depend very much upon circumstances of which I now have no certain knowledge; but I hold myself in readiness to do so whenever it may be necessary.

In conclusion I would barely say that if in this exposé I unfortunately in anything erred, the reader may rest assured that it has been an error of the head and not of the heart, and I am at all times open to cor-

viction and correction. In taking a review of the subject, I have but one thing to regret, and that is that in the very commencement of these difficulties I did not dissolve my connection with the Synod. But knowing the unpleasant consequences resulting from such secessions in other sections of the country and other branches of the church and that such consequence would necessarily follow a reformation between the Synod and myself, I long and patiently bore with its aberrations and insults; but I bore with them until further endurance was intolerable. Past experience has now fully convinced me that in the view which I took, I was not mistaken. Neighbors and churches and relatives have been set at variance with each other, and in one instance litigation has ensued. But at these things we need not be surprised, for although the religion of Christ is a religion of "peace on earth and good will toward men"; such effects in some degree the preaching of our divine Master and his holy Apostles. Christ says, "think not

that I am come to send peace on earth; I
came not to send peace on earth, but a sword,
For I am come to set a man at variance ^{against} with
his father, and the daughter against her mother,
and the daughter-in-law, against her mother-in-law.
And a man's foes shall be they of his own house-
hold" Such we have reason to believe will
continue to be the case until the glorious Mil-
lennium shall burst in its meridian glory and full
splendor.

To us with our limited conceptions of the
dispensations of God this may seem an improp-
rious event; but it is certainly the work of
an over-ruling and an infinitely wise and
benevolent God. Joseph's brethren in selling
him into Egypt designed it for evil, but God
over ruled it for good. So in the present case
my enemies may have designed it for evil,
but God is able to over rule it for good. He is
able to bring light out of darkness and good out
of evil, and to make the wrath of man to praise
Him. Great good has already resulted from
it, what may hereafter result from it, time
alone will determine, It has aroused the

Church from that spirit of apathy which seemed to pervade her, produced a spirit of inquiry and elicited much important information, It has checked the spirit of fanaticism and innovation upon the ancient doctrines and usages of the Church, which were so rapidly gaining ground, in some places, and has restored to the Church in some places at least her primitive doctrines, usages and simplicity. And it will be the means of preserving from the sea of oblivion in this section of our Lutheran Zion the doctrines of the glorious reformation of the 16th century, We should therefore in this as well as all the trying circumstances of life, resign to the will of our Heavenly Father, and every dispensation of His providence, knowing that all things shall work together for good to them that love Him the Lord, to them who are the called according to His purpose."

The End.

(48)

49/49