

The Lutheran Visitor.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

Wednesday, November 10, 1869.

EDITORS: REV. A. R. RUDE, COLUMBIA, S. C. REV. J. I. MILLER, STAUNTON, VA.

"In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity."

TERMS: \$2.50 for one year... 1.50 for six months... 1.00 for three months.

All communications must be written correctly and legibly, and accompanied with the names of the writers, which, however, may be withheld from the public.

We request our subscribers to make remittances to us only in registered letters, or in the form of post office money orders or bank checks.

Formerly there may have been some ground for the remark that "the only effect of registration is to make the letter more liable to be stolen."

Notwithstanding, Postmasters throughout the country will have trouble by obeying the laws in regard to newspapers, etc.

Premiums.

We will give to any one who sends us two Subscribers and \$5, one copy of "Distinctive Doctrines."

We will give for four Subscribers and \$10, a copy of "Life and Deeds of Luther."

We will give for five Subscribers and \$12.50, a copy of "Luther's Sermons, Vol. 1; or if preferred, a copy of "Dr. Stier's Ecclesia Sacra" or "Luther's Church Postil," in 18 numbers.

We will give for ten Subscribers and \$25, a copy of "The Book of Concord."

The names and the money must accompany each order.

As regards premiums due for Vol. I, the former publishers are responsible. For the premiums for Vol. II, we are.

A. R. RUDE, J. I. MILLER.

Mysteries.

We received the other day, through the post office, the bundle of Lutheran Visitors, that are mailed to Wardensville, West Virginia.

Our New Contributor.

Permit us to introduce him, respected readers. He belongs to the old North State, and his contributions will greatly enhance the value of our paper.

"HOHEN"

has lingered by the wayside, or else he would not have arrived past time. We suppose his sprightliness caused him to roam, and the kind entertainers that took him in charge.

New Publications.

Davidson's School History of South Carolina. Columbia, S. C.: Duffie & Chapman. New York: E. J. Hale & Son.

A little book—but a good book, an excellent book, which we hope will be introduced in every school in the State.

Lehr und Wehr. October, 1869. St. Louis, Mo. Contents: Materials to Pastoral Theology. The Four Empires of Daniel. Popery. Church-Intelligencer.

Minutes of the 28th Session of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Southwestern Virginia.

Blackwood. October, 1869. Leonard Scott, New York. Contents: A Year and a Day. The Old Monk in the Belfry. Juvenis Mundi. The War in Paraguay.

Cornelius O'Dowd. A Great Whig Journalist. Charles Reader's Novels. The Rural Carolinian. November, 1869. Walker, Evans & Cogswell, Charleston, S. C.

An excellent number, with profitable reading, both original and selected, and good illustrations. Among

the articles we notice an essay on the application of manures; another on Deep Ploughing; also, Result of High Culture. This is a real eye-opener.

D. Wyatt Alken tells also about his Clover Experiment, in which he made one mistake: he should not have put his stock on the clover, but left the growth to protect the roots during the hot season.

The article proves satisfactorily that South Carolina farmers should sow clover. The more plow, the better clover—and apply plaster of Paris.

The American Agriculturist, for November. Judd & Co., New York. An excellent number. This is a good time for subscribing. Read, and you will know.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth, that formerly stood out, like the grand pictures of the old masters, seemingly separate from the canvases, have become blurred, and blended, and daubed over with modern, and especially American varnish, until they lie flat upon the background.

For the Lutheran Visitor. On Different Subjects.

Dear Visitor: Visitors are not always the most desirable persons; but when out of our heart of hearts we can say of any one, "dear visitor," it must be that he is agreeable. And now, if these visits but enhance the interest we feel in that friend, it is still greater tribute to his worth. Hence, we can without compunction of conscience address you thusly, as we see your weekly visits in your fine, new garb. And so much the better, for new clothes are always preferable to old ones "done up."

And "Washington" can not further charge you with being a "turn-coat." Said a friend on seeing W's charge and your reply, "It may do to turn a good linen coat wrong side outward, but it does not mend the matter to turn an improper one. What would the man who had on no wedding garment at the marriage feast have gained by turning the one which he had? So Editor Rude did a wise thing to throw away his old theological coat." At any rate, the Visitor's visits are becoming everywhere more acceptable as his personal is the elegance of new type, and "his countenance is lifted upon us" beaming with true Lutheranism.

A certain D.D. said that he "saw Lutheranism here as he never saw it before." Drawn from the very spirit of the word of God, and preserved in its purity by the sainted Mhlenberg, Mayer and Deumme and the living faithful. We have it in that form in which God blessed it to the unshackling of religious thought, and the inspiration of vital piety. And it is not now the tortoise concern which German repugnance to English began in earlier days, but it is the activity of Luther, who was instant in season, and out of season to urge on the work of the Lord. Missions have been established in various parts of the city within the last five years which have now grown to congregations, and already

NEW CHURCHES

are being erected by them. Christ's church congregation began Sept. 7th to build; St. Andrew's just previously to that. The Messiah began on Tuesday last, and will erect a large brown stone building, 64 by 102 feet, with lecture room below. These are English. The German Zion congregation has nearly completed a very large brown stone church, costing about \$150,000. Enough this, to be doing at one time. The subject of

ORPHANS' HOMES

is, under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Passavant, assuming quite a practical shape. In the West and East various church eleemosynary institutions have sprung up, and are, under skillful and faithful direction, doing a noble work. Here, where the population is already dense, many children are thrown upon the public charity, and if that charity be not fostering, it rears them only to fill houses of correction. In these the orphans are brought up amid domestic duties and educational facilities, and for positions of usefulness. They thus become of great service to the church, whereas they would otherwise be outcasts—driftwood upon the surface of the great ocean of life, impeding the progress of others, and impairing its beauty.

The Warburg, near New York city, will soon be rebuilt in the style thro' the liberality of the Moller Brothers, who foot the bill themselves as a testimonial to departed relatives.

The Germantown Orphan's Home is to be freed of \$25,000 debt by a fair, to be held the 18th inst. The fair will continue more than a week, and like all arrangements of its character, will be attended to by the fair.

A musical jubilee of three hundred voices will be given in the Academy of Music, at the same time for the same object. The friend of the friendless must rejoice when he sees the homeless being provided for by the availing help of the church, and not left to questionable secret orders to help one or another, as they may have been benefited by their ancestors, to the exclusion of all others. It is the duty of the church to attend to these matters, and she is attending nobly to that duty. HOHEN.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth, that formerly stood out, like the grand pictures of the old masters, seemingly separate from the canvases, have become blurred, and blended, and daubed over with modern, and especially American varnish, until they lie flat upon the background.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth, that formerly stood out, like the grand pictures of the old masters, seemingly separate from the canvases, have become blurred, and blended, and daubed over with modern, and especially American varnish, until they lie flat upon the background.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth, that formerly stood out, like the grand pictures of the old masters, seemingly separate from the canvases, have become blurred, and blended, and daubed over with modern, and especially American varnish, until they lie flat upon the background.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth, that formerly stood out, like the grand pictures of the old masters, seemingly separate from the canvases, have become blurred, and blended, and daubed over with modern, and especially American varnish, until they lie flat upon the background.

For the Lutheran Visitor. Destructive Liberty.

NUMBER ONE.

Messrs Editors: One of the famous four points presented by the Missouri Synod to the General Council, for adoption by that body, as a condition upon which they (the Missourians) would be willing to identify themselves with the General Council, was the exclusion from the pulpit, and from any participation in the ministerial services pertaining thereto, of all who were not Lutherans, in their use of that term.

Judging from your editorials, one would infer that you regarded this rigid exclusiveness as extreme and untenable. I cheerfully agree with you in this respect.

But let us view the matter calmly, and see if we do not also agree to admit the principle, and oppose only the extreme of the Missourians.

The Lutheran Church is so fearful of the charge of bigotry, and so much in love with charity towards all men, that I fear, in their liberality, they have erred on the other side.

They advocate the "give and take" principle for the sake of harmony and conciliation, but unfortunately it has been all "give" and no "take."

The Lutheran Church has given away some of the most time-honored usages, and contented itself with the adoption of those of other denominations, for the sake of harmony, until some of those usages are coming back to them through the channel of sister churches, in which they have been preserved.

This is the true reason why there is such a want of uniformity in our Church. The very order of worship, stereotyped in all other denominations, is so different in different localities of our church that we frequently find a placard posted up in the pulpit to direct a stranger, though a Lutheran, who may chance to preach there, how to proceed.

Thus usages have been abandoned, one after the other, until we find in some Lutheran (?) churches, the whole congregation stand in singing and kneel in prayer a la Methodist.

In others, the congregation sit in Holy Communion, a la Presbyterian. In others, again, the services are opened by an invocation instead of the simple and time-honored "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In short the church has become so chameleonized, that it changes color every time it comes in contact with other denominations. These other denominations pat the Lutherans on the back and say, "see how you value your liberality," and then—well, simply laugh in their sleeves.

They have never yet exhibited any return of the liberality by yielding aught of their own peculiar usages. A Methodist in a Lutheran church, feels like a fish out of water. He longs to stand, facing the minister, and sing the hymn, until he arrives at the last two lines, then wheel about and sing those two lines out of the front door, preparatory to kneeling; the sound of the last word has not ceased to reverberate through the house, when the whole congregation, simultaneously drop upon their knees, and the minister raises his hands and says, "let us pray," over a kneeling congregation. Thus he is brought up, and he loves the usage. I do not draw this picture in caricature, nor with a wrong motive, but merely to show how tenaciously other denominations hold to their own peculiar usages. Two Methodist, or two Presbyterian churches may be located antipodally, and there exists no difference in their mode of worship. A simple river, or it may be a State or County line, may separate between two Lutheran Churches, and a placard in the pulpit will be found necessary to indicate the mode of worship observed by each.

This then is the result of Lutheran liberality, giving up their own usages and adopting those of any contiguous house of worship, for the sake of harmony, conciliation and union. If such pastors knew how their liberality was appreciated by those other denominations, they would not be so eager to un-Lutheranize themselves to avoid the charge of bigotry. How absurd this appears in the face of the fact that Lutherans do not fall out with other denominations for observing usages different from their own, and yet apprehend the charge of bigotry for maintaining their peculiar usages.

But yielding time-honored usages is not the worst consequence of this false liberality. Lutherans in their great zeal for peace and harmony, and union, have relinquished doctrine as well as practices. The outlines of Lutheranism, rendered so sharp and definite by the authors of her symbols, have been somewhat obscured. Their sharpness is gone; their definiteness is effaced; and the beautiful exhibitions of truth,