

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1967

The Theology of Paul Henkel in Relation to his Environment

Stanley Padgett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Padgett, Stanley, "The Theology of Paul Henkel in Relation to his Environment" (1967). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 373.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/373>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL HENKEL

Padgett, S. T. M.

May 1967

THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL HENKEL
IN RELATION TO HIS ENVIRONMENT

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Stanley D. Padgett
May 1967

49287

Approved by:

John W. Constable
Advisor

Harry A. Lomer
Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1967
no.17

49287

TABLE OF CONTENTS
C.2

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	iv
Chapter	
I. THE EARLY YEARS.	1
Heritage and Home Life of Paul Henkel.	1
Training for the Ministry.	6
II. THE RELIGIOUS ENVIRONMENT OF PAUL HENKEL	15
III. THE EARLIER PERIOD (1790-1800)	20
Paul Henkel's Relation to His Environment	20
Henkel's Reaction Against His Environment	23
Characteristic Features of Henkel's Theology	27
IV. THE MIDDLE PERIOD (1800-1810).	33
Revivalism Confronts Paul Henkel's Theology	33
Return to Virginia and Mission to Ohio	48
Back to North Carolina with the Augsburg Confession	55
Another Mission to Ohio.	59
Henkel's Theology Goes to Press.	65
V. THE LATER PERIOD (1811-1820)	96
The English Catechism.	96
Various Mission Journeys 1811-1814	109
The Church Hymn-Book of 1815-1816.	115
Events in North Carolina	123
The Book Called <u>Luther</u>	129
Items from the North Carolina Convention of 1817.	134
Developments in Ohio--1818	136
Schober's Letter to David Henkel of 1818	139

	Page
VI. THE PERIOD OF CONTEST 1819-1820.	146
The Theology of Paul Henkel Meets with Dissent in the "Untimely Synod" of 1819	146
Paul Henkel's Theology Gains Ground in Ohio, 1819	163
The Theology of Paul Henkel is Rejected at the Synod of Strife, 1820.	166
The Restoration of the Augsburg Confession to the American Lutheran Church. . .	181
VII. CLOSING YEARS AND SUMMARY STATEMENTS . . .	190
The Closing Years 1820-1825.	190
Summary Evaluation of the Theology of Paul Henkel.	195
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	202

INTRODUCTION

Ludwig Ernst Fuerbringer Hall, the new home of the Concordia Seminary Library, has provided a lasting memorial to the Henkel churchmen of the Valley of Virginia by inscribing their name, "The Henkels," on the memorial rail surrounding the central lobby of the library. In a brochure printed for the dedication of this modern library in September 1962, it states the purpose which the memorial rail is to serve:

On the interior of the building we find names on the rail of the open well of the second floor. These are representative scholars and printers of four different periods in the history of the Lutheran Church.¹

Along with the great names of Luther, Chemnitz, and others, for the Reformation; Bengel and Spener for the period of Orthodoxy and Pietism; Loehe and others representing modern world Lutheranism; are recorded such notables as C. F. W. Walther and Muhlenberg for the American period, and among them the Henkels. The names just mentioned, with the possible exception of the Henkels, and Lochner, are known throughout world Lutheranism. The purpose of this study is to make the main member of the Henkel family better known,

¹Concordia Seminary Library--Ludwig Ernst Fuerbringer Hall (St. Louis, Mo.: Color-Art Printing and Stationary Co., 1962). p. 13.

especially in the area of his theology. The man upon whom this study will concentrate, therefore, is Paul Henkel, the father of a family of Lutheran ministers.

Paul Henkel made a significant contribution to the theological understanding of Lutheranism on the American frontier, and for this reason deserves to have his theology enjoy a broader awareness among students of American Lutheranism. There are a number of articles and monographs which treat of his life and work, but few which have explored his theology, if any.

That Paul Henkel's theological motifs are worthy of recognition is evidenced by the inclusion of the Henkel churchman, of whom he was the head, among the representatives of notable American Lutherans. The reason why the Henkels are cited in the library of one of the world's largest Lutheran seminaries is summarized in the brochure.

This family of Lutheran missionaries, pastors, educators, authors, editors, and printers was descended from Anthony Jacob Henkel (1663-1728), a great-grandfather of Paul Henkel (1754-1825). Paul was the greatest home missionary in the early part of the nineteenth century. He established a printery in New Market, Va., later known as the Henkel Press. Paul, his six sons and several grandsons wrote and published many Lutheran pamphlets and books in English and German. Largely through the Henkels the Book of Concord was translated into English and published by the Henkel Press in 1851.²

²Ibid., 18. The 1851 edition was the first English translation of the Book of Concord to be printed, see "Paul Henkel," in Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), VIII, 529.

This study will deal, chiefly, with the content of Paul Henkel's writings and publications in the attempt to ascertain their relationship to his environment. Attention will be directed toward discovering what impact his theology made upon his religious milieu, as well as the interaction of the environment upon his theology. The historical setting will be examined briefly in order to see his theology within its own context.

The present writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Professor Harry Gordon Coiner, a ninth generation descendent of Anthony Jacob Henkel, "who introduced him to the Henkels of the Valley of Virginia," to Professor John W. Constable, "who tried to keep him from going off on the proverbial tangents," to the staffs of the Fuerbringer Memorial Library, and the Concordia Historical Institute, for their patience and kind assistance.

A word of grateful appreciation is also to be expressed to Norma and the children, and the congregation of St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Sullivan, Missouri, for their understanding and encouragement.

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY YEARS

Heritage and Home Life of Paul Henkel

The Rev. Paul Henkel (1754-1825) was descended from a long and notable line of ancestors, who trace their lineage back to Dr. Johann Henkel of the Reformation period. Dr. Johann Henkel was Chaplain to Queen Marie of Hungary. One of the interesting historical items is the fact that he probably was privileged to hear the first public reading of the Augsburg Confession, when he attended the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 with his Queen.¹ Johann Henkel sympathized with the Reformation and was on friendly terms with Erasmus, Melanchthon, and Spalatin,² and gained his Queen to the side of the Reformation.³

Another prominent Henkel after the Reformation period was Count Erdman Henkel, who lived in the days of Pietism. Count Henkel was on "intimate terms"⁴ with Dr. August

¹A. Stapleton, ed., The Henkel Memorial: Historical, Genealogical, and Biographical (York, Penn.: A. Stapleton, 1910-1919), First Series, Number One, pp. 18-23.

²Socrates Henkel, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel & Co., 1890), p. 67. Information taken from the Obituary of Paul Henkel.

³Stapleton, p. 20.

⁴Elon O. Henkel, ed., The Henkel Family Records (New Market, Va.: The Henkel Press, Inc., 1926; Second printing, 1960).

Hermann Francke. He "heavily supported the Missionary Institute of Dr. Francke (Gotthilf August Francke, the Elder Francke's son) at Halle, and aided in the preparation of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg for his great work in America."⁵ Muhlenberg was "said to have been a kinsman"⁶ of the Count.

American interest with the Henkel ancestral tradition begins with Anthony Jacob Henkel (1668-1728), the great-grandfather of Paul. It is known that Anthony Jacob "belonged to the pietistic group of Erfurt and Halle,"⁷ although he had matriculated at the University of Giessen.⁸

Anthony Jacob was part of the great wave of immigration which came to America from the Palatinate in the early eighteenth century. They came in response to William Penn's moving appeal for settlers to come to Pennsylvania to find a haven from religious persecution. Anthony Jacob was one of the first German Lutheran missionaries to arrive in America.⁹ He and his family settled around New Hanover, Pennsylvania, commonly called "Falckner's Swamp." When he died in 1728,^x from injuries sustained in a fall from his horse, Anthony Jacob had behind him eleven years of pastoral service in which he had served many Lutheran congregations, and had

⁵Stapleton, Second Series, Number Two, p. 233.

⁶Ibid., p. 172.

⁷Ibid., p. 173.

⁸Elon O. Henkel, pp. 12-14.

⁹Ibid., p. 115.

organized, or was instrumental in organizing, the three Lutheran Congregations of Germantown, Philadelphia, and Tulpehocken.¹⁰

A number of the children of Anthony Jacob moved south, and after a brief period in North Carolina they settled in what is now Pendelton County, Virginia (Hinkle's Fort).¹¹ There the family prospered in the midst of a settlement of German and Scotch-Irish immigrants.¹² The children of Anthony Jacob "were early dedicated to God . . . and held to the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession."¹³ It is noted, however, that "the baptism of the first child of Yost Henkel (John Justus 1706-1778, Paul's grandfather) was performed on August 22, 1731, by Rev. John Peter Miller at the Goshenhoppen Reformed Church."¹⁴ This perhaps reflects the early intimacy of the Lutheran and Reformed people in early Pennsylvania.

Jacob Henkel (1733-1779), Paul's father, in keeping with the Henkel tradition, raised his family in the spirit of Lutheran pietism. Paul speaks of his father as a man, "anxious to secure useful books and that he read them diligently;

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 275-279. See also Stapleton, Second Series, Number One, p. 175.

¹¹Elon O. Henkel, p. 131.

¹²Ibid., p. 584.

¹³Ibid., p. 243.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 366.

I know too that he read them with profit and often spoke of what he had read."¹⁵ This was the atmosphere and tradition in which the young Paul Henkel was nurtured. A pious home life and the desire for the education of their children were the gifts which Jacob Henkel and his wife, Mary (nee Dieter), were anxious to bestow upon their offspring.

Paul Henkel (1754-1825), in his early years had the benefit of what could be described in those frontier conditions as a good formal elementary education. "Schools were established in the fortifications and Paul and his brother Moses were sent on every occasion that it was possible for them to attend."¹⁶ Nor was he isolated from the influence and piety of other members of the Henkel clan, which formed the German community in and around Hinkle's Fort.¹⁷ Among Paul's teachers was a woman who taught him the German language, an educated doctor of medicine, and an English Episcopalian who had studied at Oxford. The Englishman taught Paul Latin, the English Church Service and Catechism, mathematics, and the English branches.¹⁸ From

¹⁵Quoted in, Elon O. Henkel, p. 648.

¹⁶W. J. Finck, "Paul Henkel, The Lutheran Pioneer," The Lutheran Quarterly, LVI (July 1926), 309.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 309-310.

¹⁸Elon O. Henkel, p. 189, gives the names of the teachers. See also, p. 650. Additional information is given in Finck, p. 309.

his father's small but excellent library, Paul had access to the Nuremberg Bible with notes and commentary, Arndt's True Christianity, and Starck's Prayer-book. In addition to these molding influences, he was deeply impressed with the visits of Pastor Schwarbach of Hebron Church. Pastor Schwarbach would visit their settlement once a month, hold services for the Lutheran community, and instruct the children in Luther's Catechism.¹⁹ Paul "was influenced not only by the services and the catechetical instructions, but especially by the conversations he heard in his home between his father and the visiting pastor."²⁰ Pastor Schwarbach later confirmed Paul in his fourteenth year.²¹ One can see from the various elements that have been traced out in Paul's background, that all the component parts of ancestry, home life, and early training, place him within the influence of a strong Lutheran pietism. Another influence must, however, be noted; namely, that he lived among the Scotch-Irish, presumably of Presbyterian orientation.²² These influences, were to have a later effect upon his relation to and interaction upon his environment.

¹⁹The information regarding Paul's home-reading is found in Finck, p. 309. See also, B. H. Pershing, "Paul Henkel, Frontier Missionary, Organizer, and Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, VII (January 1935), 100.

²⁰Finck, p. 309.

²¹Ibid., p. 309.

²²William Warren Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier: 1783-1840: The Presbyterians (Chicago: The

Training for the Ministry

The early American frontier was in desperate need of men trained for the ministry, but there were few schools, and fewer colleges. The pastors in all denominations, as was customary, took promising young men under their wing, trained them academically in their own homes, and gave them practical pastoral experience by having them accompany them as they performed pastoral duties. Paul Henkel, like many others, was prepared for the ministry in this way. Before he had received this training from Johann Andreas Krug of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Fredericktown, Maryland, Paul had served the churches of Virginia as "lay" preacher for two or three years, at the request of his brethren in the faith.²³ He preached his first sermon on the text Phil. 2:5 in German in 1781.²⁴ Significantly enough, Paul followed this German sermon with one in English on Eccl. 12:13 for the benefit of the people in attendance who could only understand English. This was to remain his general practice throughout his ministry, since he usually preached to a mixed congregation on his missionary tours.

University of Chicago Press, 1936), II, 3. See the descriptive map facing the page reference.

²³Stapelton, Second Series, Number Two, pp. 226-228, for a full description of the years before Krug.

²⁴Finck, pp. 210-211. And the Obituary in *SpC. Henkel*, p. 69.

Not being content to preach without a proper call,²⁵ and believing a definite call from the Church to be indispensable to preach the Word of God,²⁶ Paul was finally able to place himself under the tutelage of Krug in the year 1782.*

Under the guidance of Pastor Krug, he further studied German and Latin, acquired knowledge of Greek, and learned the other branches necessary for the ministerial office.²⁷ It is evident that Krug further deepened this young man in the writings and doctrine of Lutheran pietism, for before being sent to America by the father of Halle to Philadelphia in 1764, Krug had been Preceptor in the Halle Orphan House.²⁸ He was an intimate colleague of Muhlenberg.²⁹ He continued in America the pious practices advocated by Spener and Francke. It was said of him, "As a true 'Hallensis' he held private devotions with . . . [his members] in addition to the usual public service."³⁰ Krug's influence

²⁵Finck, p. 310.

²⁶Pershing, p. 101.

²⁷William Buell Sprague, Annals of the American Lutheran Pulpit (New York: R. Carter, 1857--), IX, 92. See also the Obituary in S. Henkel, p. 67.

²⁸J. C. Jensson, American Lutheran Biographies (Milwaukee, Wis.: Press of A. Houtkamp and Son, 1890) p. 434.

²⁹Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1958), III, Index, p. 774, where upwards of 115 references are made to Pastor Krug.

³⁰William J. Mann, Life and Times of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg (Second edition; Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1911), p. 410.

must also be taken into account as a molding factor in the course of Paul Henkel's theological training.

In 1783, the Convention of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania granted a "catechist's" license to Henkel.

He was ordered

1. To preach the Word of God in its purity, according to Law and Gospel, as it is explained in its chief points in the Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books.
2. Diligently to instruct children, visit the sick, care for souls and administer Holy Baptism according to the command of Christ.
3. Diligently to exercise himself in knowledge.
4. To adorn his office with a Christian life.
5. Not to leave or go beyond the congregations which were entrusted to him in the license.
6. To record the most noteworthy occurrences of his ministry in a journal and annually present this to the Synodical Meeting, also to appear personally as often as asked.
7. To renew the license annually.³¹

As a catechist Paul Henkel was put under the supervision of Pastor Krug of Fredericktown, and later under Pastor Jung of Hagerstown. In 1787 he was licensed as a "candidate" for the Ministry.³² The Ministerium authorized Paul to serve as regular preacher in all the congregations in his own vicinity not having a minister. Among these

³¹ Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748-1821 (Philadelphia: Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1898).

³²

Finck, p. 315.

congregations, he served faithfully for five years, until his ordination extended his labors into the frontier areas as a traveling missionary.

During his time as a catechist and a candidate Paul Henkel, along with William Carpenter [later a pastor in Virginia], went to the home of Pastor Christian Streit for further theological training. Streit's education was possibly the "highest that could be gotten at that time."³³ He studied at the Academy and College of Pennsylvania, which later became the University of Pennsylvania, and from which he graduated in 1768. Three years later he received the Master of Arts degree there.³⁴ While in Philadelphia, Streit studied theology under Muhlenberg and the Rev. Dr. Carl Magnus Wrangle, the Swedish-Lutheran dean of all Swedish-Lutheran parishes in America.³⁵ Dr. Wrangel had studied at Uppsala, Strasbourg, Griefswald, and Goettingen Universities.³⁶ Under Streit, Paul Henkel continued his study of

³³ C. W. Cassell, W. J. Finck, and Elon O. Henkel, eds., History of the Lutheran Church in Virginia and East Tennessee (Strasburg, Virginia, Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., 1930), p. 57.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

³⁵ Erwin L. Lueker, ed., "Streit, Christian," Lutheran Cyclopedia (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954), p. 1013. See also Mann, p. 383.

³⁶ "Wrangel, Carl Magnus," The Encyclopedia of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, edited by Julius Bodensieck for the Lutheran World Federation (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), III, 2530.

Latin, Greek, and Theology.³⁷ With Christian Streit, Paul Henkel was under the influence of a man of the broadest attainments. He was educated only in America. After taking his classical course he was instructed by the highly learned, and widely travelled, Dr. Wrangel in theology. Johann Andreas Krug had known only Halle and was ordained before coming to America, as was Muhlenberg. In Streit, Paul Henkel encountered more than the Halle type pietism. What this could have meant as a contribution to the theology of Paul Henkel can only be conjectured.³⁸ This influence must be considered, however, especially in view of Paul's later relation to his environment. His later objective stance in theology in contradistinction to the subjectivism of Halle pietism, may have had some of its roots in Streit's broader orientation.

Mention should be made of another possible molding influence upon Paul Henkel's theological growth. In the year 1783, "One of his hearers [in the neighborhood of New Hanover] . . . gave him a book of sermons that had belonged to his great-grandfather Anthony Jacob Henkel."³⁹

³⁷"Henkel, Paul," Dictionary of American Biography, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932). VIII, 538.

³⁸This writer is not aware of any sources which would indicate Paul Henkel's personal judgment upon his theological training, nor has his research disclosed any personal reflection on Paul Henkel's part analyzing the forces that molded him. One is therefore thrown back on an interpretation of documents, and facts.

³⁹Finck, p. 314.

This book has quite probably been identified as a double volume of the works of the religious-philosopher, Dr. Spanheim (1629-1710) of Geneva, dated 1639, and printed in Geneva. Testimony of Paul Henkel's granddaughter, a Mrs. Stirewalt, maintains that he "prized the book for some reason very highly."⁴⁰

Another item of interest, which the biographical sketches of Paul Henkel all seem to note, is the fact that he was proud of his ministerial gown and wore it whenever he conducted the official services of the Church. An account is given of the first day he donned the dress of the holy office

It was two days before Christmas (1782). Pastor Krug at once arranged to have Paul Henkel assist him in his many services. The weary, dust-stained traveler was refreshed and encouraged, and on Christmas afternoon was invested in a regular Lutheran gown and given the English sermon to preach. Oh, what a happy day for the young candidate.⁴¹

The gown which he wore throughout most of his ministerial life was made of the richest black silk, the only luxury that this frugal man allowed himself. Traditionally, it is thought to have been the gown of General Peter Muhlenberg,

⁴⁰ Stapelton, Second Series, Number Two, pp. 252-253, see also p. 230.

⁴¹ Finck, p. 312. It should be noted that this work is based upon an original Journal of Paul Henkel's covering his earlier life, which the writer has not been able to investigate. See also, Pershing, pp. 101, 103.

who gave it to Paul Henkel out of respect for the Henkel family from which his father had descended.⁴²

That Paul Henkel had a high respect for what the ministerial robe signified is witnessed by the fact that he always wore it in his official capacity "in performing the services of the sanctuary,"⁴³ and "in the smallest log-cabin churches and when conducting services in private homes."⁴⁴ Early then in his ministry Paul Henkel manifested a high regard for the order of the church.

In 1792, after many years of exceptionally devoted service to the church, and innumerable recommendations from congregations, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania "Unanimously resolved, that Mr. Paul Hinkle [this spelling occurs often in the Minutes of the Ministerium] be ordained this evening [June 6] at public service."⁴⁵ Paul was ordained by Johann Friedrich Schmidt, the President; Rev. F. H. Christian Helmuth, Secretary; and the Rev. Heinrich Muhlenberg, pastor loci.

⁴²Stapelton, First Series, Number Three, pp. 83-84.

⁴³Sprague, p. 94. Further confirmation is in John G. Morris, Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry (Baltimore: James Young, 1878), p. 351. Note Morris' whole discussion of the wearing of the gown in early American Lutheranism. See also his remarks on Paul Henkel, pp. 43-46.

⁴⁴Theodore Graebner, "Paul Henkel, an American Lutheran Pioneer in Missions, Organization, and Publicity," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, V (July 1932), 63.

⁴⁵Documentary History, pp. 246-247.

Two significant events occurred at this meeting of the Ministerium, though little regarded at the time; one was the ordination of Paul Henkel, and the other the adopting of a new constitution.

In view of the subsequent career of Henkel it is of interest to note that the Ministerium at the same session adopted a new constitution in which no doctrinal basis was contained.⁴⁶

The only reference in the new constitution which comes close to any kind of confessional subscription is contained in Article II, listing the duties of Licensed Candidates, where in point three, it says, "He is to preach the Word of God in its purity according to the law and the gospel. . . ." ⁴⁷

The subsequent life of Paul Henkel, however, is to show that he did not forget that confessional base to which he had earlier been pledged as a catechist.

Paul Henkel's boyhood prayer to be "a true representative of his illustrious forefather (Anthony Jacob)," ⁴⁸ had now been confirmed by his ordination into the ministry. He was to continue the work with the full responsibility of the pastoral office, which had already engaged him for a

⁴⁶Pershing, pp. 102-103.

⁴⁷Documentary History, p. 251.

⁴⁸Stapelton, Second Series, Number Two, p. 227. See the complete article which is a presentation of Paul Henkel's Journal (First Series) ending with the year 1799. This Journal contains biographical material of his early years (Ibid., pp. 226-232).

dozen years. He knew the country, the people, and their religious needs. As a young man he

was deeply impressed by the futility of many efforts made by travelling revivalists, (and) . . . saddened by the neglected conditions of the people in spiritual matters. . . .⁴⁹

He was, therefore, to go forth equipped by experience, education, and now with the full authority of the church "to preach the Word of God."⁵⁰ His early years had combined in him, the spiritual fervor of Lutheran pietism with what appears to have been a characteristic of his own self-understanding, an emphasis upon objective authority. These two qualities were to be the characteristic features of the theological impact he was to make upon his environment.

⁴⁹Finck, p. 310. Finck probably based his judgment on the Journal mentioned above, n. 48. See also, supra, p. 11, n. 41.

⁵⁰Finck, p. 310.

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGIOUS ENVIRONMENT OF PAUL HENKEL

The religious environment in which Paul Henkel conducted his missionary and ministerial labors was one of a complex society. The people to whom he ministered were of various classes and descriptions. Although one of his main purposes was gathering up the remnants of scattered German Lutherans on the western frontier, his audiences were composed of Germans of all religious persuasions. They also consisted of a large number of English people representing the varied types of Christianity existing in America.

This social structure of eighteenth century America had its roots both racially and spiritually in Europe. A large immigration from Europe took place with the beginning of the eighteenth century. The Enlightenment, which spawned a pluralism in religion, was one of the forces that gave rise to this immigration. There was a spirit of freedom from the old strictures of European Christian tradition in the air, "as of a youth now come of age."¹ This spirit was later to have its effect upon the

¹Horst Weigelt, Pietismus--Studien, Der Spener-hallische Pietismus, I. Teil (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1965), p. 119. This is the sense of Kant's descriptive explanation of the Enlightenment as humanity's awakening out of his "selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit."

religious environment in which Paul Henkel lived and worked. This enlightened spirit of the age was also a source of the indifferent attitude toward the church which distinguished a great number of the immigrants.

Many of the immigrants, however, were Christians who had transplanted the piety and practice of their homeland to the new world. The Palatinate, which was composed of Lutheran as well as radical and Reformed pietists, was characterized by many people of this type.² The common bond which united the adherents of these various shades of persuasion was their search for a haven of refuge from religious persecution.³ Pennsylvania, because it provided liberty for the practice of various forms of Christian expression, became a haven for the German sectarians, as well as the Lutheran and Reformed who emigrated for similar reasons.⁴ Pennsylvania became the abode of these Germans, who together with "large sprinklings of Scotch Irish, Welsh and English" made up the great bulk of her inhabitants.⁵ All the shades of

²Theodore E. Schmauk, A History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania (1638-1820) (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1903), I, 1, n. 1.

³Ibid., p. 2 n. 2.

⁴Clifford E. Olmstead, History of Religion in the United States (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 136.

⁵Schmauk, p. 27.

religious opinion that was to characterize the American colonies were found here in Pennsylvania:

the Province was swarming with Quakers and Mennonites, Seventh Day Baptists, Inspirationists, Hermits, Newborn and other side by side with the most intense spiritual activity, there was the grossest religious indifference it had become proverbial to say of a man who did not care for God or His Word, that he had the Pennsylvania religion⁶

From Pennsylvania the people of the Palatinate migrated largely southwestward inhabiting the western frontier. There were Germans, now, from New York to Georgia.⁷ They settled in the midst of Scotch Irish and other English immigrants, who were of Calvinistic background.⁸

Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio was the field of labor for the forty-five years of Paul Henkel's ministry. This section of the country was settled by the Palatinates, Presbyterian Scotch Irish, and the English. Jost Hite had settled in the Shenandoah Valley.⁹ Earlier under

⁶Ibid., p. 222.

⁷William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York: Harpers & Bros., Publishers, 1950), p. 22.

⁸William Warren Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier 1783-1840: The Presbyterians (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1936), II, see Chapter II, p. 22., and the map opposite page 34.

⁹C. W. Cassell, W. J. Finck, and Elon O. Henkel, History of the Lutheran Church in Virginia and East Tennessee (Strasburg, Virginia: Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., 1930), p. 4.

Adam Müller more Germans had come from Pennsylvania, mostly of the Mennonite connection.¹⁰ Presbyterians followed their lead into the Valley.¹¹

Twenty years before Paul Henkel moved to New Market there had been a Baptist-meeting house established there.¹² Among the prominent families of the Valley were the Neffs, the Kageys, and the Henkels, all of them originally from Pennsylvania. John Kagey, an exemplary man of whom a proverb had risen that said, "almost as good as John Kagey," was a Dunker preacher.¹³ The Baptists were so numerous in Virginia alone at this time that a substantial history of four hundred and forty-six pages could be written about their rise and progress.¹⁴ The Methodists numbered fifteen thousand in Virginia in 1784.¹⁵

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 2-3.

¹¹Olmstead, p. 151.

¹²Elon O. Henkel, ed., The Henkel Family Records (New Market, Va.: The Henkel Press, Inc., 1926; Second printing, 1960), p. 629.

¹³Albert Bernhardt Faust, The German Element in the United States (New York: The Steuben Society of America, 1927), I, 194-195.

¹⁴Robert B. Semple, A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia (Richmond: John O. Lynch, Printer, 1810). This work has many valuable tables and statistics.

¹⁵Kenneth Scott Latourette, Christianity in A Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (New York: Harper & Bros, 1958), I, 107.

The polyglot make up of Virginia's religious milieu was true also of North Carolina and Ohio, since the same religious bodies migrated throughout the western frontier. Ohio was more German and more conservative due to the westward movement of the Pennsylvanians to that State.¹⁶

Slight attention should be called to the Moravians to complete the picture of this overview. They were strongly concentrated in Pennsylvania and North Carolina through the work of Zinzendorf on the one hand, and the Southern Moravians on the other.¹⁷ Moravians were also located in Ohio through the efforts of David Zeisberger.¹⁸

What was the relationship of Paul Henkel to this environment and how did he react upon it? He has much in answer to this question in the detailed diary which he kept conscientiously both for the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, as a traveling missionary, and for his own purposes.¹⁹

¹⁶Roy H. Johnson, "The Lutheran Church and the Western Frontier, 1789 to 1830," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (July 1930), 232.

¹⁷Olmstead, pp. 135-136.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 136.

¹⁹Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748-1821 (Philadelphia: Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1898), p. 188, resolution (6) in "revers" of a licensed catechist.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLIER PERIOD (1790-1800)

Paul Henkel's Relation to His Environment

The Chronological Life of Paul Henkel which runs from 1789 to 1825 is the primary source for ascertaining the relationship of Paul Henkel to his environment.¹

This diary begins with a descriptive note that was to characterize the work of this man throughout his ministry:

I ended the year 1789 and began 1790 in Powell's Fort, where I preached and administered the Lord's Supper. I had a devout, beautiful assembly of Germans and English. I had the help in preaching of a young English preacher, who left the Methodists at the time when they began to introduce their new mode of shouting and tumult.²

In this ten-year period, he records many instances of preaching in the homes or churches of other denominations. In Rockbridge County, Paul preached "in the inn of Jacob Ruf both for the Germans and English There were

¹ A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel: From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, Etc., selected and trans. by William J. Finck, D. D. (New Market, Virginia: n.p., 1935-1937). Typewritten Volume of 488 pp. with an appendix, in the personal library of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis. For reference to this work see, Elon O. Henkel, ed., The Henkel Family Records (New Market, Va.: The Henkel Press, Inc., 1926; Second printing, 1960), pp. 610-611.

² Wesley M. Gewehr, The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790 (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1930), pp. 168-170 for a description of this period.

a number of young Presbyterians among my hearers, preachers and others, who declared themselves well satisfied and marveled at the possibility of my preaching in English."³ In the next year (1791) he preached again at Lexington, Rockbridge County, in the same church "at the request of Mr. Greyham [the pastor] and of his church council, to satisfy their curiosity, which was aroused in the preacher and his members the year before by my preaching."⁴ Near Fincastle (1793) Paul Henkel preached an English sermon "in a home which Englishmen had built for a church."⁵ Evidently it was in a Baptist settlement for he had difficulties with the Baptists over infant baptism at this service. At Hot Springs, Virginia (1794), he relates,

I . . . remained a few days . . . and preached to the Germans and the English under the shade trees. The visitors and patients made a large assemblage, but it was difficult to make an impression upon the English speaking people as the most of them were there seeking pleasure and were not interested in the Gospel. They had come from Old Virginia.⁶

In Madison County (1796) he preached in a Reformed Church.⁷

³A Chronological Life, p. 7.

⁴Ibid., p. 10.

⁵Ibid., p. 18.

⁶Ibid., p. 23. See Gewehr, pp. 19-25, for the class distinctions between the Tidewater and the backcountry of Virginia.

⁷A Chronological Life, p. 29.

While on a preaching tour in Old Virginia (1797), he reports one of his experiences among the English:

The English people were mostly of the Anabaptist persuasion. I preached in one of their churches, at which time the pastor was also in the audience.⁸

On a trip to Philadelphia (1800) Paul preached in an African Methodist Church "for which the poor Negroes both pastor and people showed themselves most thankful."⁹ In the span of ten years these few instances show that Paul Henkel preached for most of the denominations represented in the religious complex of that day.

He also shared the pulpit with the pastors and preachers of the churches in which he preached and was on intimate terms with many of them.¹⁰ At the Presbyterian Church in Lexington, Mr. Greyham spoke after him.¹¹ When Solomon's Church, Shenandoah County, was dedicated in 1795, "the Reverend Jacob Hoffman of the Reformed Church also preached at the dedication."¹² At the meeting of the Ministerium

⁸Ibid., p. 31.

⁹Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 46.

¹¹Ibid., p. 10.

¹²Ibid., p. 28.

of Pennsylvania (1798), Paul became good friends with Rev. Schlagel of the Moravian Church, who was present. They carried on an "extensive correspondence" during Henkel's service in North Carolina (1800-1805).¹³ In 1800 he attended the Ministerium in Philadelphia, visiting Pastor Schlagel at Graceham. He preached there "Saturday evening and Sunday afternoon in the hall" [evidently not in the church].¹⁴ Paul also records this incident:

An Englishman by the name of Stephen Chapee, who in 1786 attended my communion with other Englishmen, had separated himself from the crowd of unbelievers because a better light had dawned on his way, at times read a sermon and gave exhortations.¹⁵

The context indicates that Stephen Chapee did this reading for congregations which Paul Henkel was serving.

Henkel's Reaction Against His Environment

Although, he apparently did not draw a hard and fast line on sharing the pulpit and other joint tasks of the preaching ministry, Paul Henkel manifests definite reactions

¹³Ibid., p. 36. See also Roy A. Johnson, "The Lutheran Church on the Western Frontier, 1789 to 1830," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (July 1930), p. 227 for a discussion of the doctrinal looseness and union practices of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in this period.

¹⁴A Chronological Life, p. 45.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 18.

against the current theological climate so general in Virginia.

He speaks disparagingly of the revivalistic phenomena produced by the Methodists, finding that "the English people had been very much disturbed by the preaching of the Methodists among them."¹⁶ "The Methodists had searched out those who had been influenced by my former sermons and found them more ready for their ministrations."¹⁷ The year 1793 was filled with "much opposition on the part of many leaders of different religious sects, that grew up alongside of my congregations. They acted in a hostile manner towards me."¹⁸

The second year that Paul preached with Mr. Greyham in the Presbyterian Church, he noted that "there was some that afterwards passed an unfavorable judgment upon me and my effort."¹⁹

After he had preached in an Englishmen's church, where he baptized four children of a German woman, he portrays the reaction of the congregation:

¹⁶Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 19-20.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 10.

This ministerial act showed by their gestures, acts and waiting, who many of my hearers were; the immersionists murmured, and others showed their approval.²⁰

Deism was widespread throughout the States,²¹ and Paul Henkel strove to combat it. He preached in one of the Reformed churches,

The service was in English. It was just at that time that Deism was widely accepted by the English people, and the friends of the Bible were strongly opposed and attacked by the believers in this old cult of unbelief. For this reason I made it known that my sermon would be delivered for the defence of the Christian Religion, consequently the attendance was larger than usual There was not a strong expression of sentiment in regard to the sermon; only the friends of the Bible showed that they were glad and thankful.²²

In the preaching of Paul Henkel a certain desire for an emotional response is present. On two occasions the result of his preaching caused a woman to weep,²³ and the hearers to receive "a deep impression."²⁴

²⁰Ibid., p. 19. See also where he was vehemently attacked by a Baptist woman for baptizing two children, pp. 31-32.

²¹Lyman Beecher, describing Yale (1790's), wrote: "That was the day of the infidelity of the Tom Paine school. . . ." "That statement might have applied equally to classes from Dartmouth to the University of Georgia." quoted in Clifton E. Olmstead, History of Religion in the United States (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 219.

²²A Chronological Life, pp. 29-30. Even on the frontier of Kentucky, according to a pioneer at the turn of the century, half of the state's inhabitants subscribed to Deism, see Olmstead, p. 221.

²³Ibid., p. 7.

²⁴Ibid., p. 10.

Another feature of his early preaching was its note on faith and trust in the unseen reality of Christ and his kingdom.

They (Christ's disciples) were to be a testimony to the world of things which he himself taught and acted. But as all men by Nature are blind to the things that are of Divine Nature, so were the disciples of our Lord to the grand end of Coming into the world. Flesh and blood is naturally attached to that which consisteth of the Kingdom of this world, under which circumstances the disciples of Christ existed at the time when first called. They willingly followed him, but in a mistaken view. And whereas they suggested matters in a sense different to what they were in Reality, they after sometime began to grow uneasy seeing that our Lord declined from putting his power or force into Execution.²⁵

Henkel continues in this sermon to make the application to his own day by saying to his hearers that they too desire only what is tangible and earthly. Their great danger is to run the risk of judging Christ's blessings in a material way, and thus to make the mistake of distrusting his promises because they cannot be proven by experience. The essence of the kingdom Christ brought is spiritual and eternal,

²⁵ Paul Henkel, Pocket Diary of 1794 (brown-covered pocket diary with Paul Henkel's signature clearly legible, in the Archives of Concordia Historical Institute, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.). The present writer compared the handwriting and signatures with an ink stained pocket-diary of the year 1820, see infra, Chapter V n. 81, and Paul Henkel's Latin-English copy of Erasmus' Colloquia Selecta, (London, Pater-Noster-Row, Messrs. Hitch and Hawes, trans. by Mr. Clarke, n.d.), the handwriting and signatures correspond. The above sermon is titled, "Seek Ye First the Kingdom of God," and it is similar in nature to another one contained in this diary, "The Due Preparation of the Heart for The Kingdom of God," Isaiah 40:3. Henkel said in this sermon: "Every sin abounding in the mind of the unconverted man, and unlawful deed, may with propriety be considered as hills, mountains and inconvenient places to obstruct the progress and operation of the Blessed Spirit of God and hinders the acceptance of Divine grace."²⁵

therefore, Henkel admonishes his hearers to beware of judging by appearances.²⁶

Characteristic Features of Henkel's Theology

The Holy Communion was central in the official acts of Paul Henkel, and he demonstrates the importance of this means of grace in his pastoral work. As a general rule when he made the rounds of congregations and preaching stations he "preached and administered the Lord's Supper."²⁷ The dying were given the comfort of the Sacrament. At the deathbed of Pastor Volz's mother, he prepared her "With words of admonition and warning and comfort . . . for communion and her departure . . .

[administering] the Holy Communion to the family in which she also participated."²⁸ The administration of communion and its use reflected Paul's pietism.

After instructing a class of young people for confirmation, (1789), he noted the external evidences that attended the succeeding Communion:

²⁶Paul Henkel, Pocket Diary of 1794. This diary contains notations of hymns that Henkel composed, medical prescriptions, baptismal and marriage acts, as does the diary for 1820.

²⁷A Chronological Life, p. 2.

²⁸Ibid., p. 8., see also p. 42, for a similar instance.

I devoted all my strength of body and soul to this administration of the Lord's Supper, and there was external evidence that we had the Lord's blessing in our service.²⁹

That Sunday evening in the home of John Philipi where Henkel was invited to preach and give the Communion, "the daughter of the host regained her speech after sitting silent in a rocking chair for eleven and a half years."³⁰

The consideration of this case gave me many difficulties, but on the whole it gave me great pleasure to learn that the dear Lord had used me as an instrument in his hand to bring even bodily and temporal relief to a fellow being, as was surely the case with Barbara the daughter of the oft-mentioned John Philipi.³¹

Although Paul Henkel highly regarding the Lord's Supper as the normal means of grace, he records one instance in these years when he dispensed with its use in the case of a young dying girl, Margaret Koppenhafer. Since insights into his theology can be gained from this instance of pastoral care, it is necessary to present the matter in full:

²⁹Ibid., p. 37.

³⁰Ibid., p. 38.

³¹Ibid., p. 38. The contrast between Paul Henkel's meaning of external evidences, and their conservative nature within the context of word and sacrament, can be appreciated when one compares Henkel's thought with the teaching of the Baptists who stressed "strong faith in the immediate teachings of the spirit . . . [and who] believed that to those who sought him earnestly, God often gave evident tokens of his will." Quoted from Robert B. Semple, A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia (Richmond: Robert B. Semple, 1810), p. 2.

She was afraid . . . that she must pass away without knowing whether she was going to her Savior or to the place of torment. She said, she attended for several days four years ago the catechetical instruction class with her brother, but as according to the judgment of her honorable stepmother she was too young for confirmation, she let it pass by. But she was deeply impressed at the time as she saw the class confirmed and admitted to the Lord's Table, and said to herself, if I only could be among the others in the class! I am sure it would help me to come to repentance. Now I am living in the fear of punishment for my sins and I am afraid I shall be lost. Oh, my Lord, what shall I do?³²

With this troubled person, living under the law, Paul comforted with the gospel promises:

I read to her the hymn, Jesu, Meine Suversicht, [Jesus Christ, my sure Defence], and we sang several stanzas of it together. The house was full of people After this was done she declared herself fully assured of her salvation. I then asked her, if it still disturbed her mind that she must depart without receiving the Lord's Supper according to the words of institution? She answered, Not at all, for I have the Savior and so I have everything that I need; do you not think so? Yes, thank the Lord that He has given you the faith. You now have far more than the Lord's Supper. She answered, This night I shall come to my Savior; how happy I am!³³

Paul Henkel indicates another mark of his theology which was characteristic of his point of view. He divides his audience into children of God and children of this world, or believers and unbelievers. He showed his pleasure that evening with Margaret because "even the

³²A Chronological Life, p. 4.

³³Ibid., pp. 4-5.

blind children of the world that were present showed that they were glad because she could depart in assurance and trust."³⁴

The way of salvation³⁵ was a constant emphasis of Paul Henkel's in preaching, instruction, and private conversation. The contexts in which the expression occurs implies that it was the explanation of the contents of the gospel to those under the burden of the law. On one of his preaching tours to Madison County (1798), his wife aided him in teaching this truth to a number of women.

There were many women there who were eager to learn the way of salvation, some of whom had doubts to remove; all of these conversed with her on the subjects agitating their hearts and found much relief and comfort. We were there four or five days and I preached every day.³⁶

In this earlier period, Henkel's accent on order and objectivity also expresses itself significantly. The Augsburg Confession, always dear to the Henkel ancestry,

³⁴Ibid., p. 5.

³⁵The way of salvation (ordo salutis) presents a problem within Lutheranism. It is a product of Orthodoxy, although under Pietism it underwent a change. Rather than the objective values it held under Luther and Orthodoxy, Pietism understood the way of salvation as an "interpretation of the believing life as a psychological process that lost sight of Luther's central concern." When evaluating Paul Henkel's use of it, his application in context should be considered. Quotation from, Julius Bodensieck, ed., "Order of Salvation," The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), III, 1811-1812.

³⁶A Chronological Life, p. 37.

was to be a living expression of the church's faith and practice. At the Special Conference in Woodstock (1797) Paul Henkel offered a resolution toward its circulation among the churches:

At this convention I offered the resolution, and I had never before made this motion, that the Augsburg Confession be printed in small books in order that all members of the Church might have and own one. All were in favor of the project, but no conclusion could be reached in the matter until 1805³⁷

This resolution reveals that the Augsburg Confession played a large and singular role in Henkel's theological position.

The above motifs provide representative features of Paul Henkel's theology. His material principle revolves around the personal faith of the individual, while his formal principle can be seen to center in the means of grace applied to the heart. This theological circle witnesses to the molding influence of his background in Lutheran pietism, which was characterized by its pre-occupation with Christology and soteriology.³⁸ At the same time Henkel's theology, with its direction toward the means

³⁷Ibid., p. 32. During these years "the spirit of union continued unabated in the east and southeast," Quoted from Johnson, p. 228. The confessional base had gone from the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1792.

³⁸Julius Bodensieck, ed., "Pietism" in The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), III, 1905, column one.

of grace and the church's confessional foundation, shows that his theology is not just personalistic.

The age of the revivals, which was about to dawn, will reveal which of these two themes are to gain the ascendancy.

CHAPTER IV

THE MIDDLE PERIOD 1800-1810

Revivalism Confronts Paul Henkel's Theology

This year 1800 marks the beginning of Paul Henkel's ministry in North Carolina, which he describes as five years "in a real labyrinth, as well as in a devastated vineyard" ¹ He complains of a pastor from Germany who served in the field and "that he cared for nothing more than to instruct others in true Christianity--which he himself did not practice." ² Some of the people "had been awakened to the true faith and had made a good beginning in the Christian life, [but] had made shipwreck of their faith and others had fallen into grievous sins." ³ Paul Henkel sums up these years as a perpetual battle for the truth "on all sides; for some of the leaders

¹A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel: From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, Etc., selected and trans. by William J. Finck, D. D. (New Market, Virginia: n.p., 1935-1937), p. 48. Typewritten Volume of 488 pp. with an appendix, in the personal library of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis. The year 1800 marked also the beginning of the Second Great Awakening, see Clifton E. Olmstead, History of Religion in the United States (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), pp. 256-263.

²A Chronological Life, p. 49.

³Ibid., p. 50.

walked in a very disorderly manner"4

As he was carrying on the normal routines of his office in the first year and second year after his arrival, "daily . . . reports of the work of two young Presbyterian preachers . . . who were preaching here and there," were brought to him.⁵ The revival instituted by these men continued until 1803 in North Carolina, at which time it began to cool down.⁶

The doctrine of the Millennium was the trigger that started and gave impetus to the revival in Paul Henkel's area.⁷ Henkel gives a vivid picture of the revival phenomenon that brought scores of people into the woods where they "remained in common from Fridays to Mondays."⁸

⁴Ibid., p. 50. Henkel indicates that these are summary statements written later, and are to be understood as general highlighted by a few examples. The reference to trouble with the leaders is important, since the official minutes of the North Carolina Synod do not present such to be the case. See F. W. E. Peschau, Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina From 1803-1826, Twenty-Three Conventions. Translated from the German Protocol (Newberry, S. C.: Aull and Houseal, Printers, 1894). See the Minutes of the first conference. The translator says in his Preface that this work is "a translation only of the Protocol in "Synod's Record Book," and not of the published Minutes" This fact will prove important later in the study.

⁵A Chronological Life, p. 61.

⁶Ibid., pp. 96-97. Revivals continued sporadically till after 1811.

⁷Ibid., p. 62.

⁸Ibid., p. 62. "common" means together.

The ordained ministers would begin the service in an orderly manner, and

After their sermons came the exhortations in which no order was observed, but every one said what came in his mind, and many intentionally uttered the severest things about death, the devil, judgment, and hell as a consequence some of the hearers were stunned, others were driven into fear, while others fell to the earth in unconsciousness, and became as pale as death when they regained their consciousness some declared that they full realized their sinfulness and depravity and had received full assurance of their reconciliation with God; others received peace for their souls only some time afterwards and everything was done to aid them to come through, and experience the grace of God.⁹

When Paul Henkel was summoned by the Presbyterian ministers of his own neighborhood to come and join in the work, as these men entertained the hope that the day of reunion of all Christendom had come, he could not attend because of illness at home. He remarked, however, "that it would have been agreeable to me to attend in order that I might see and learn what views the old doctors held of this matter."¹⁰ Shortly thereafter, he did attend

⁹Ibid., p. 63. See also "Colonel Robert Patterson Reports," in H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960), I, 566-570, for a comparison account of the phenomenon of these revivals.

¹⁰A Chronological Life, p. 64. This attitude was characteristic of Paul Henkel while in North Carolina. As Henkel records in numerous instances, that he preached in all denominations where he could get a hearing, and was on friendly terms with all preachers. As a general statement, only when the Gospel was at stake, did he refuse to counsel or work with other religious bodies in the preaching and teaching ministry.

his first camp meetings. Some of the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian ministers, tried to move the people emotionally and eventually succeeded. Paul Henkel, who was standing about five feet from the platform with Mr. Kramach, a Moravian minister who "deplored and regretted the work as a tragedy,"¹¹ and later succeeded in advising Paul not to take part in the preaching, saying "This spiritual fanaticism is too great"¹² To a woman, who after much agitation and trembling, was ready to faint, Paul "told her of the true evangelical way of salvation."¹³

Paul Henkel's reaction to the revival phenomenon was pointed and firm in the defense of the true Gospel. In the midst of the revival flare, he preached to a mixed audience representing the various "religious parties,"¹⁴ both ministers and people. Many of them had spent six to eight weeks in prayer trying to break through to assurance. One girl in particular "had been laid on the floor by the revival storm sermons."¹⁵ One of the men argued

¹¹Ibid., p. 68.

¹²Ibid., p. 68. The reason Henkel gives for wanting to preach in this situation was "being . . . zealous for the preaching of the true Gospel"

¹³Ibid., p. 68. Note the context of applying the way of salvation. The way of salvation was the gospel applied to a law situation in Paul Henkel's usage.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 72.

with Paul against infant baptism, saying, "it had been shown him by means of immediate revelation that it was not right."¹⁶ Later he had his children baptized. To this audience Paul proclaimed the gospel:

I read several stanzas of the hymn found in the Reformed hymnbook "Ich habe nun den Grund gefunded;" [Now I Have Found the Firm Foundation...] This text was sufficient for my purposes as it gave me the opportunity to show rightly the nature of the Gospel of Christ; likewise the directions of the preachers who were present, who advised the poor people to pray constantly, and had not a word to say of faith in Christ the blessed Redeemer, yea, scarcely referred to Him.¹⁷

Henkel describes the effect this counsel had upon the hearers who for sometime had been under the strain of a type of preaching that confused law and gospel:

The sermon instantly impressed the hearers, especially the poor troubled and tempted seekers after righteousness. I was moved in my spirit, partly with zeal for the evangelical truth and partly for pity for the wretched ignorance.¹⁸

Then follows the essence of his criticism of the revival preaching:

I reminded them that great effort is being made to bring people to tears and cries through the law and sermons pronouncing punishment; but that I found reason to preach evangelical sermons, but also to reprove sharply; that it is common to forget the dear Redeemer and to reach his merit so slightly, from which alone we can draw the truth, like water from a well.¹⁹

¹⁶Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 73.

There was weeping and lamenting following this sermon,²⁰ however, "what on this occasion testified to the beauty and value of the evangelical doctrine was this, that the young girl . . . during the time of the service did not experience the least fear; on the other hand . . . she had comfort and assurance in the belief that she had for the sake of Jesus a merciful God"²¹ On one occasion Paul Henkel did preach at a camp meeting. It was at the insistence of Pastor Storch, who was warmly attracted to them, and publicly defended their value.²² Henkel, however, used the opportunity to preach the "true order of salvation,"²³ and to "openly oppose" and refute

²⁰Ibid., p. 73. Perhaps this emotional response must be understood as part of the conditioning of the people through the revivals? See also A Chronological Life, pp. 85-86 for Henkel's evaluation of a feigned response.

²¹Ibid., p. 74. Although Paul Henkel does not use the term Justification by faith, the theological meaning of the right application of law and gospel here demonstrated witnesses to it in this context.

²²Ibid., p. 76. For a biographical sketch of Storch, see, G. D. Bernheim, History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book Store, 1872), pp. 312-316.

²³A Chronological Life, pp. 78-79. Present also with Storch and Henkel was Pastor R. J. Miller, an Episcopal Clergyman ordained by the Lutheran Ministerium in North Carolina (1794), who served Lutheran congregations for twenty-seven years, see the account of his ordination in Bernheim, pp. 337-340. Paul Henkel remarks on this occasion that he met Miller for the first time, and that Miller "was in full harmony and agreement with me" regarding the revivals, see A Chronological Life, pp. 78-79.

the theology of the revivals.²⁴ His position made him feel quite alone in his "sentiments,"²⁵ which must have been an evident fact, as Pastor Storch reprimanded him for his singular stance:

he [Storch] maintained that I was the only preacher in the state who did not yield to the revival movement, but held to the regular order of the Church.²⁶

Paul Henkel's position against the revivals, and his fellow pastors approval of them brought about "disputations" that "became very warm at times . . . [but] . . . they parted in peace and love."²⁷ Storch was not without criticism of them, although he was favorably disposed. He commented:

By the side of this pestilence [infidelity], there prevails now, for over a year, a something, I know not what to name it, and I should not like to say Fanaticism. . . . Opinions are various in regard to it; many, even ministers, denominate it the work of the devil; others again would explain it in a natural way, or in accordance with some physical law; whilst others look upon it as the work of God.²⁸

Henkel was not so charitable. He criticized the revival sermons as the preaching of the law devoid of the concomitant proclamation of the gospel. He saw to the root of the revival error, and later wrote that it taught the Germans

²⁴Ibid., p. 79.

²⁵Ibid., p. 84.

²⁶Ibid., p. 90.

²⁷Ibid., p. 90.

²⁸Bernheim, pp. 350-354, contains Storch's and Henkel's accounts in full.

the true worth of the gospel.²⁹ His description is analytical and judgmental:

it appeared exceedingly strange to those, who were well acquainted with the order of salvation, that true conversion would consist in such a way as declared by these people; that true faith should originate in such sermons. . . . as many declared, that by means of such workings they had received the true and reliable witness of the pardon of their sins and of the new birth still we thought them to be contrary to the doctrines of the gospel the important question arose among the Germans 'Must we not also experience the same things in order to be saved?' The people became anxious and concerned³⁰

A divisive note was struck among the German ministers on account of the revivals. There was much hesitancy and indecision registered as to the manner of dealing with, and counselling the people. The only one among them, however, that appeared to critically assess the doctrinal errors of these awakenings was Paul Henkel. Henkel, although critical and leary of them, did not stand altogether aloof from some adaptation of these methods, at least in the beginning of their manifestation.

Pastor Storch had initiated the practice of protracted meetings in his German congregations. Paul Henkel, Pastor Miller, and Pastor Christman of the Reformed Church participated in the services, which were conducted over a three-day period.³¹ There is evidence that Paul

²⁹Ibid., p. 352.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 352-353.

³¹A Chronological Life, p. 90.

Henkel conducted this type of service in his congregations, although not for the three-day extended period of time,³² and he soon reached the decision that "it was enough."³³ Thereafter, he returned to the regular services of the church, stating,

I decided that I could well allow myself to be satisfied with what I had seen and heard I decided also that neither in my public nor private utterances would I offer any opposition. I gave myself wholly to my service in my congregations.³⁴

That summer (1802) Paul Henkel had large audiences at his services conducted throughout Guilford and Orange Counties because the people knew that Storch felt favorably about the revivals, and Henkel was opposed to them.³⁵ "The folks were at all times eager to try my doctrine and to find out if it agreed with the doctrine of the revival of religion."³⁶ That Paul Henkel's doctrine was far removed from the theological content and methodology of the revivals is witnessed to by an experience which he records as he closes out his diary for the year 1802. He became "a true evangelist" to a troubled soul, which he describes in detail:

³²Ibid., p. 89. Henkel notes in his services, "our sermons aroused much interest and moved the hearts of the hearers, but there were no bodily agitations."

³³Ibid., p. 89.

³⁴Ibid., p. 89. This remark seems to be related to both the revivals in general, and the protracted meetings conducted by the Lutheran ministers.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 89-91, passim.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 90-91.

She had experienced what I could wish for every sinner, the miserable condition of their souls, the horror of sin, the multiplicity of actual sins man in his heart commits; all these in a moment became real to her and filled her with fear in her conscience. She could find rest nowhere.³⁷

Paul Henkel led her to the means of grace in word and sacrament.³⁸

she became very attentive to my sermons. The following Sunday she attended with others The Lord's Supper She assured me that . . . she had full confidence and certain assurance that she had experienced the saving grace of the Lord.³⁹

As though in conscious thought of the harsh and loud sermons, the physical methods calculated to engender the

³⁷Ibid., p. 92. This was the same experience that the revivals were calculated to secure, as a Dr. Baxter 1801 indicated when he justified them on the basis that "Something extraordinary seemed necessary to arrest the attention of giddy people who were ready to conclude that Christianity was a fable and futurity a delusion. This revival has done it. It has confounded infidelity and brought numbers beyond calculation under serious impressions." Quoted in Olmstead, p. 262, see Olmstead's rationale in defense of the revivals, pp. 261-263.

³⁸Although Paul Henkel desired the same effect as the revivals, namely, a true repentance and faith, note where he centers the hoped for results--in the conscience of man, in the inner man, who commits actual sin in thought and not only in word and deed. Furthermore, he did not fail to apply the gospel, and direct the troubled soul to the means of grace.

³⁹A Chronological Life, p. 92. Although Paul Henkel uses the terminology of Pietism, and his thoughts center on the inner man, the assurance of grace is directly connected to the objectivity of the word and sacrament. This fact taken together with his rather definitive concern for the true gospel, the true faith, and his implied negative answer to the question of "experiencing the same thing" as the revivalists "in order to be saved," throw much light on the direction of his thought.

right response, and the developed manipulations that "would make an impression, or create an outburst of interest,"⁴⁰ Paul Henkel makes a remark, after his experience with this despondent woman, that shows the divergence between his theology and that of the revival "machine:"⁴¹

So great is the difference between what we preach with words and what the Lord himself does. We cannot attract a man by breaking into his house and treating him with death and life; when the Lord through the Holy Spirit teaches, the question becomes so important that a person is willing to do a great deal to find peace.⁴²

Henkel Organizes the North Carolina Synod

The year 1803 saw his desire materialize in the beginning of the North Carolina Synod. Henkel was the initiator of the organization, and in his mind it was to be a Lutheran synod.⁴³ His diary states:

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 97.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 96-97. Henkel mentions that the revivals had cooled off, and when the English Baptists tried to relight the fires, "no machine would work right."

⁴²Ibid., p. 93. The thoughts expressed here reflect the idea of law and gospel death and life. The immediate working of the Holy Spirit is not meant, for the context in which the statement occurs in the diary, as well as mentioning the act of preaching, bears the thought that the Holy Spirit uses the imperfect instrumentality of human words in preaching to effect repentance and faith.

⁴³The fact that Paul Henkel conceived of this Synod as being a Lutheran one from the outset is borne out by the Minutes of the Special Conference, May 2, 1803, which state: "Rev. Paul Henkel declared himself in favor of the adoption of a proposed Constitution, according to which the

March 20th I went to Pastor Storch and made this proposition to him; That we arrange a kind of Conference for the union of our (Lutheran) ministers in the State, in order that we might further the education of the young men that have the ministry in view. Pastor Storch agreed to the plan.⁴⁴

After the Special Conference of May second, the first regular session of the Synod met in October.⁴⁵ Henkel

Lutheran Church should be governed." At the first meeting of the North Carolina Synod, October 17, 1803, it was convened, however, as "the Synod of the Lutheran and Protestant Episcopal Church." There was no confessional base adopted for the Synod at this first meeting. The Constitution shows only one definite confessional characteristic [Art. IX] and that was the requirement to determine whether a member's baptism was valid. This was possibly directed toward the sects which opposed infant baptism. Quotations taken from Peschau, pp. 3-6.

^{44A} Chronological Life, pp. 94-95. Doctrinal reasons are not specifically mentioned by Henkel, although one must consider that he may be taking a step at a time. He commented later upon the May second meeting, "The foundations of the constitution was laid to which up to the present time the parts of a building have been added." In a very recent and voluminous history of the Lutheran Church in the areas served by Paul Henkel, the author credits Paul Henkel with initiating and providing the impetus toward the organization of the North Carolina Synod. He says, "Lutheranism in North Carolina was in danger of losing its essential character and becoming mongrelized. To combat this situation Paul Henkel threw himself into the thick of the fray. Rallying the few pastors on the scene, he banded them together in 1803 in a synodical organization." Quoted from, William Edward Eisenberg, The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962. Including An Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee (Lynchburg, Virginia: J. P. Bell Company, Inc., 1967), p. 106. This history contains 731 pages, heavily documented, with a good index, and an excellent bibliography. It has much material on the Henkels. The present writer had access to it only briefly before the completion of this study.

⁴⁵ Article I of the constitution called for the third Monday in October as the convening of Synod. Already in 1804 Paul Henkel was compelled to hold Synod to that date [it had been called a week earlier]. The failure

remarks that "the official routine of a regular Synod was somewhat strange to priest and people. The beginning of all things is hard."⁴⁶ Doctrinally, the significant things that took place was by way of omission; no confessional subscription was adopted by the Synod. The next year (1804), however, some additional resolutions were added to the Constitution, and among them it was, "Resolved, That the Twenty-one Articles of the Augsburg Confession be published for the benefit of the Church."⁴⁷ For the first time, the long hoped for resolution became a reality.⁴⁸ The Augsburg Confession was again to find a place in an official constitution of a Lutheran synod

to hold to the prescribed meeting date of Synod occasioned no little trouble later on. For constitution, see Peschau, pp. 4-6.

⁴⁶A Chronological Life, p. 99.

⁴⁷Peschau, p. 7. Further restrictions were placed upon preaching engagements, funerals, sponsorships, and attendance at the Communion in the other resolutions added to the Constitution. This is perhaps in the interest of "order" and the "furtherance of godliness."

⁴⁸Paul Henkel had first made the resolution to the Special Conference of Virginia (1797). The year following N. C.'s resolution, the Special Conference of Virginia (1805) appended the first Twenty-one Articles to its Minutes at the suggestion and expense of Dr. Solomon Henkel [Paul's son]. Paul's good wife stood the expense of publishing the Augsburg Confession for the North Carolina Synod by using twenty dollars of inheritance money she had received from her mother, see A Chronological Life, pp. 138-142, for the whole discussion. These factors indicate the seriousness with which Paul Henkel viewed the Augsburg Confession, and adds more weight to the implication that his reason for desiring Synodical organization was motivated by doctrinal concerns.

in America, after a twelve year absence from the books.⁴⁹ Paul Henkel was largely, if not totally, responsible for this development.⁵⁰ The "true worth of the gospel," which the revivals had enabled the Germans to appreciate, was now tending toward an official synodical sanction for the strengthening of the true faith among the people of North Carolina.⁵¹

During Paul Henkel's remaining service in this state, the patterns of his ministry followed along similar lines as those of the first ten years recorded in his diary.

⁴⁹The North Carolina Synod was the third Lutheran synodical structure in America. It was preceded by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania 1748, and the New York Ministerium in 1786. See Harry J. Kreider, History of the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954), I, 23. Kreider says, "all references to the church's confessions were omitted." Although North Carolina simply published them for the benefit of the church, the articles of the Augustana are once again being printed synodically.

⁵⁰Paul Henkel wrote the "introduction" to the Articles appended to the Virginia minutes, see C. W. Cassell, W. J. Finck, and Elon O. Henkel, History of the Lutheran Church in Virginia and East Tennessee (Strasburg, Virginia, Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., 1930), p. 86. He saw both appendixes for the two Conferences through the press at Hagerstown, Maryland, see A Chronological Life, pp. 141-142. He had Rev. J. G. Schmucker, his former student, and the father of Samuel S. Schmucker, write a preface for "our edition of the Augsburg Confession, as I had neither the time nor the health to write it." Ibid., p. 142. For J. G. Schmucker's associations with Paul Henkel, see Ibid., pp. 2 - 8, and P. Anstadt, Life and Times of Rev. S. S. Schmucker (York, Pa.: P. Anstadt & Sons, 1896), pp. 10-12.

⁵¹See Paul Henkel's "Report on the Condition of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina," in Bernheim, pp. 366-371.

He continued to work jointly with ministers of other denominations.⁵² His main conflicts with others, theologically, revolved around the themes of regeneration, faith, and the means of grace.⁵³ His main opposition was from the sectarians, although, over infant baptism and the way of salvation many German Lutherans and Reformed caused him grief through their worldliness in life and thought.⁵⁴ Henkel's preaching services manifested

⁵²The names most commonly occurring in A Chronological Life are Jacob Laros (pp. 109-111), Diefenbach (p. 123), and Jacob Christman (p. 90). These men were Reformed pastors. Paul Henkel himself served three joint [Lutheran and Reformed congregations] and one Lutheran on the Sandhills, in Rowan County, Bernheim, pp. 366-367. He had the most favorable remarks to make of the Moravian ministers, saying on one occasion, "As long as I live I shall remember their kindness and friendly spirit," A Chronological Life, p. 91. He also shared in joint preaching work with them.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 130-133. These pages tell the story of conditions in Wilkes County where there was "a medley of various religious denominations. . . ." Paul Henkel was concerned about true regeneration and true faith over against a falsification of them. In this same context he grieves because a German family did not exhibit what to him "resembled the true experimental Christianity." Sanctification follows justification, and this is what he was contending for in this environment which had the true order. He makes this explicit in his Report 1806 :-- attached to the Minutes of the Virginia Special Conference for that year. "many having neglected to embrace their opportunity, are still strangers to that work of grace [which are produced by word and sacrament as the context shows], which they should experience in their hearts; there are others again to be found, who are enlightened by something better than their own blind reason, who seek the salvation of their souls not in works, but in the merits of their Savior, and who strive with all their hearts to become the followers of Jesus." Quoted in Bernheim, p. 370.

⁵⁴A Chronological Life, pp. 116-117. Paul Henkel

similar outward characteristics as before.⁵⁵ His theological evaluation, however, was becoming more precise. The North Carolina experience had taught him to look more at the objects of faith than the evidences of faith.⁵⁶

Return to Virginia and Mission to Ohio

In the year 1805, Paul Henkel and his family returned to New Market, Virginia for health reasons. After

laments about the people on "Dutchman's Creek," "to think that I had preached so often among these people, who had pretended indeed that they were believers, and confessed that they had the witness that they possessed saving grace and were acquainted with experimental Christianity, and yet acted in such an un-Christian and heathenish manner." [There had been a drunken brawl, which was not a one-time occurrence].

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 70-127, passim. He preached on regeneration as opposed to the revivalists; rebuked vices and superstition so that the tears flowed; preached a catechetical sermon with emphasis so that the "whole audience fell upon their knees" in prayer; gave the Deists a good "over-hauling;" Through Henkel's disapproval dancing soon became unpopular at weddings.

⁵⁶His criticism of the people of North Carolina was against their "foolish pride," and their wisdom; they "know of nothing so little as of the true way of salvation, and who in their own opinions are wiser than the Bible itself." The disposition which he praises, is that which seeks salvation "not in works, but in the merits of their Savior. . . ." Quoted in Bernheim, pp. 369-370. Henkel sees as opposites, faith as trust in the merits of Christ, from which flows the works of the regenerate man, as opposed to pride of human reason, and confidence in one's own wisdom. His treatment of the doubting indicates that Henkel did not direct people to trust in the evidences of their faith, but in the object of their faith: On one occasion a man showed him "several texts that frightened him away from the Table of the Lord. For instance Romans 14:1 and 23. . . . I explained these verses to him The next day with a joyful spirit he communed with the English members," A Chronological Life, p. 119.

staying a year, he began his first missionary tour to the State of Ohio. During this year he found that the news of the revivals had "filled the whole Valley," and he complains that "neither Germans or English were eager to hear the word of truth; the repute and praise of the revival sermons were in every man's mouth"57

Henkel busied himself in Virginia with publication work, and this year saw the first book come off the Henkel press, as well as another significant publication; the first twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession in German.⁵⁸

Another noteworthy event of this year was the joint dedication of the new Rader's Church [Lutheran and Reformed] for which Paul Henkel preached the English sermon.⁵⁹

⁵⁷A Chronological Life, p. 143.

⁵⁸Albert Sydney Edmonds, "The Henkels, Early Printers in New Market, Virginia, with a Bibliography," William and Mary Quarterly, XVIII, second series (April 1938), pp. 176-177. Shows the first publication as 1806--Augsburg Confession. Die ersten ein und zwanzig artikel der ungeanderten Augsburgischen Confession, nebst einem kurzen vorgericht von Paulus Henkel. 1806; and the second as 1806--Verrichtung der Special-Conferenz der Evang. Luth. Prediger und Abgeordneten im Staat Virginien etc. The author states: "This was the first book printed on the old hand press of Ambrose Henkel, and was the first book printed in German in the South." The fact that the Augsburg Confession was printed in the first year that the Henkel Press became really functional indicates the importance with which it was regarded. The text of the Augsburg Confession was reprinted "from the Nuremberg Bible, which was about the only place where the people could find a copy of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession," quoted from C. W. Cassell and others, p. 86.

⁵⁹A Chronological Life, p. 185. See also p. 145, where Henkel and the Reformed Pastor Braun dedicated another church in Augusta County. The close union with the

Then, it was on to Ohio.⁶⁰

Ohio was different from North Carolina and Virginia only in degree, not in kind. Through the influx of northern people from Pennsylvania, primarily of German nationality,⁶¹ this western frontier tended to be more conservative. The impact of the Second Great Awakening, joined with the exigencies of the frontier, however, soon erased the near likeness of the people who inhabited the wilderness with their relatives living under the influence of

Reformed characterized the Lutheran Church throughout the eastern states and the frontier [as will be seen in Ohio]. This close relationship was in the matrix of things, and can be traced back to the cementing ties formed through the mutual "assistance from the Halle pietists." Quoted from Olmstead, p. 141.

⁶⁰"In 1798 and 1799 vast numbers emigrated to the territory of Ohio, which was at that time nearly an impenetrable forest Among the first settlers in . . . Ohio were many pious Germans from beyond the waters and eastern states. A large number of them were baptized and confirmed to membership in the Lutheran communion. But through the neglect of the use of the means of grace some had fallen into rationalism and all manner of sin." Quoted from the Diary of Rev. Johannes Strauch, one of the earliest Lutheran frontier missionaries, in C. V. Sheatsley, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States (Century Memorial Edition; Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1919), pp. 23-24.

⁶¹Roy A. Johnson, "The Lutheran Church and the Western Frontier, 1789 to 1830," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (July 1930), 232, offers the information that of the nearly two million people inhabiting Ohio in 1850, Pennsylvania "had furnished over two hundred thousand, more than twice as many as any other state." For Lutherans on the frontier given in very brief compass, see, J. L. Neve, History of the Lutheran Church in America (Burlington, Iowa: Lutheran Literary Board, 1934), pp. 44-45. Bernheim describes the movement west into Ohio and other states from the German families of North Carolina, stating

eastern social refinements.⁶² The colonial period of the nation's life was now over a hundred and fifty years old.⁶³

There seems to be a different tone sounding forth from the diary in the accounts recorded of Paul Henkel's first missionary trip to Ohio.⁶⁴ It may be due to the purpose for which he is making the trip under the orders of a Reiseprediger [traveling preacher]. At any rate, the records exhibit a strong polemical note over against his religious environment.⁶⁵ One of the first large audiences he had was composed mostly of "backslidden Baptists," with some from the Methodist communion.⁶⁶

"they were . . . absorbed by other denominations, and lost to the Lutheran Church." See Bernheim, pp. 392-394.

⁶²Sheatsley, p. 15, for a description of a woodsman couple.

⁶³Winthrop S. Hudson, Religion in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), see the table of contents for the neat chronological dating of America's history.

⁶⁴A Chronological Life, p. 146. This section in Finck's work is an acknowledged abridgement of F. E. Cooper's translation of Henkel's report to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania pages 146-182 in A Chronological Life. See F. E. Cooper and C. L. Martzoff, "Paul Henkel's Journal," Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society Publications, XXIII (n.d.), 162-218.

⁶⁵Roy A. Johnson, p. 236. Johnson describes Henkel as one who "cruised through Ohio seeking out the Germans, going from cabin to cabin, and listing them carefully, letting the news of others farther on shape his itinerary." One should not lose sight of the fact, also, that Henkel has been through five years of revivals.

⁶⁶A Chronological Life, pp. 150-151. For a concise account of the settlements, churches, and revival movements

Another large attendance, fathered in a barn and composed of German and English, brought forth this lament,

Oh perverse people! If you are invited you will not come, and now we are overrun with you! Nevertheless I must preach to you too, so as to get room to continue my instruction of the young.⁶⁷

Throughout this tour Henkel made similar laments; there was "much high-mindedness . . . among the people," others he described as "light-minded."⁶⁸ Germans of Lutheran background [and only of background], Henkel characterized "By birth and education a Christian; by disposition and habit a heathen."⁶⁹ He regretted the prejudice that many Germans had against German pastors, and summarized them as being possessed of stupid pride. The old state of Virginia comes in for rebuke because it transferred the vices along with the people, "Oh, what an ungodly people has the old State of Virginia already delivered into this newly settled State!"⁷⁰ Toward the attitudes of these people, and in this type of religious climate, Paul Henkel preached the law and gospel.

in Ohio during this period, see Willard D. Allbeck, A Century of Lutherans in Ohio (Yellos Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1966), pp. 6-16.

⁶⁷A Chronological Life, pp. 153-154.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 151, 156.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 174.

⁷⁰Quoted in B. H. Pershing, "Frontier Missionary," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, VII (Jan. 1935), p. 106.

In the forest he preached to a mixed audience, many of whom were drunk, and to them he emphasized the law,

But what shall I say to this assembly? Some of them are even drunk, and the others look very dissolute. What more could I wish than that the sermon would fall as heavily upon them as it was for me to preach.⁷¹

On the other hand, to a would-be suicide, troubled by doubt and perplexity, Henkel gave prominence to the gospel,

But today's sermon, he confessed, had been a guide to him, to reveal the way and means by which to be saved. To him I preached, who knows how long, in an altogether evangelical manner.⁷²

He finds a dearth of knowledge about the true plan of salvation, remarking that "many were unaccustomed to hear the plan of salvation explained in this [Henkel's] way."⁷³ Much of his trip is spent, therefore, in catechizing the children, home discussions, the explanation and administration of baptism,⁷⁴ and the exposition of the holy communion.⁷⁵

⁷¹A Chronological Life, p. 167.

⁷²Ibid., pp. 165-166.

⁷³Ibid., p. 157. This remark was made of an audience of Germans and English, from whom threats had come "to attack" Henkel "because of infant baptism."

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 158-160. Once he baptized five children, some of which were old enough for instruction, but due to circumstances [the family was poor] and "very ignorant," and since the parents and the children "express their desire to be baptized," Henkel baptized them after the "simplest instruction." This shows how highly he regarded this means of grace. He also marveled that so many English "approve of infant baptism . . ."

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 161.

Henkel's thoughts polarize around the true way of salvation. When a person has been prepared to understand and receive it, he is described as "a man who knew his soul's need,"⁷⁶ or as one who has been "brought to take thought" of himself,⁷⁷ or as a person "concerned about the salvation of [his]. . . soul."⁷⁸ Then the application of salvation is made to them. The following example illustrates Henkel's manner of applying grace to the sinner.

. . . we had the company of a woman . . . who
 Twenty years ago, by the grace of God . . . had
 been properly brought to take thought for herself.
 But as she could get to hear no preachers than
 Methodists, Baptists, etc. by such her progress
 had to be furthered. But this was bound up with
 so much imagination, that she was unable to grasp
 any right exposition of the order of salvation.
 . . . I contend with much in making the matter
 clear to her; but in vain But the Lord
 doeth all things well. I commit her to his grace.⁷⁹

At the same time, Henkel is still concerned about "living Christianity,"⁸⁰ and his audience "experiencing

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 165.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 176.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 155.

⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 176-177. In contradistinction to the revival theology Paul Henkel's reliance is upon the Spirit's work through the implanted word. Peter Cartwright, the great Methodist frontier missionary traveled in Ohio in 1806, and commented "there was a great work of God going on," and "many were getting religion," quoted in Allbeck, p. 9. Henkel, meanwhile, preached on the frailty of man! A Chronological Life, p. 180.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 162.

the truth," while he is preaching.⁸¹ He makes a distinction between "believing Christians,"⁸² and those only outwardly such. His relationship with the Reformed pastors is very cordial and cooperative, although his relationship to the revivalist and sectarian preachers seems to be more officially negative than in North Carolina.⁸³

Back to North Carolina with the Augsburg Confession

Paul Henkel returned to Virginia after seventy-one days service in Ohio. It was September 15, 1806. On the eighth of October, he is on his way again to North Carolina with five hundred copies of the newly

⁸¹Ibid., p. 171.

⁸²Ibid., p. 164.

⁸³Ibid., p. 179, and passim. Henkel observed the phenomenon of "the so-called "Jerks" (as the English call it)," and concludes, although he was always of the opinion that the people could prevent these things themselves, in this particular case [a fifteen-year old girl], it "was contrary to her will." He traveled a number of times through Quaker country, but could do nothing among them. He is prevented by the duties of his office to take leave and observe the Shaking Quakers, which he terms a "quite lately established sect." In the complete text of Henkel's Journal of this trip it is recorded that "he called Baptist and Methodist preachers fanatics and once arranged for a formal debate with a Baptist," quoted from Johnson, p. 236. Johnson cites Cooper's and Martzolff's translation of "Paul Henkel's Journal," pp. 196, 199. The proselyting activity of the sects among the Lutheran and Reformed explains the cause of some of their mutual animosity toward the sects, as well as it serves to explain the strong bond of union between the Lutheran, Reformed, and Moravian ministers on the western frontier. A Lutheran missionary, Rev. Scherer, says of Ohio in 1813, "Proselyting is carried on extensively here, and some of the Germans have united themselves with the Baptists and Methodists, but very few heathens have become Christians." Quoted in Bernheim, p. 389.

printed Augsburg Confession beside him in the chaise.⁸⁴

Henkel remained in North Carolina this time until the end of the year. His main activities were devoted to the distribution of the Augsburg Confession, and correcting false views regarding the true way of salvation.

Paul Henkel planned to attend the convention of the North Carolina Synod on this trip, but they had changed the place of the meeting, without informing him.⁸⁵ This thoughtlessness on the part of the brethren grieved him, although he happily arrived in time to attend most of the synod.⁸⁶ Thereafter, he spent his time strengthening the people in their faith.

He mentions about one of his former churches, that although the people loved to hear his sermons some years ago, now after the revival they listen "with even more pleasure than formerly."⁸⁷ One man in particular gives him great joy because he and his family "loved the Bible and our conversation on all Bible subjects." This same family, of John Beck, is further described as one that

⁸⁴A Chronological Life, pp. 187-188.

⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 188-189. The loose practice regarding the punctuality [and this time, place of meeting] of synod points to a certain arbitrariness in the leaders.

⁸⁶Ibid. Henkel remarks, "I had gone to so much trouble to have a kind of conference established in this State, which did not exist before, and now that I should be so completely disregarded by the other preachers!"

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 195.

"loves the truth and for truth's sake they appreciate all teachers of the truth." Among them, Henkel records that he gave "an explanation of Article XIII of the Augsburg Confession."⁸⁸ On another occasion, as Henkel continues visiting the congregations, one of his former members thanks him for having shaken her out of her "nest of self-righteousness."⁸⁹ While traveling home to Virginia, he preaches at the courthouse in New London, Pittsylvania County. The Presbyterian minister there had announced previously for the people to come "if you want to hear a regular minister of the old Protestant order, who knows how to tell you the truth in regard to salvation."⁹⁰

⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 193-194 for these related quotations. Article XIII of the Augsburg Confession treats of "The Use of the Sacraments." The Sacraments are rightly used according to the Augustana when they are recognized as "signs and testimonies of God's will toward us for the purpose of awakening and strengthening our faith." Quoted from the translation of the German text in Theodore G. Tappert, trans. and ed., The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 35. See the translation of the Latin text, bottom half of the pagination, p. 35.

⁸⁹A Chronological Life, p. 198. This remark is made in a context which also witnesses this person could remember the "time and place, when [she] experienced the first convictions of the divine truth" which came to her from the sermons of Paul Henkel. He pointed out however the nature of "true Christianity" over against its perversion through the revivals, see A Chronological Life, pp. 197-199.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 206. Henkel says "The people were frightened away by this announcement, for the people are afraid of such sermons." The people probably identified this salvation sermon with the revival sermons designed to save them.

Although Henkel's stress upon the right understanding of the way of salvation, and the use of the means of grace, forms the larger part of his theological concerns, his pietistic strain is still present. As he prepares to administer the holy communion in one congregation, he rejoices that "there is evidence of the fruit of his former work [among them]."91 This gives him "reason to believe that there are souls here who are desirous of salvation and seek to glorify God in their life."92 With the woman who confessed that Henkel has shaken her out of her nest of self-righteousness, he is glad to note she "lived in harmony with [her] . . . confession in walk and conversation."93 The same search for the evidence of faith is found when Henkel counselled a young man waiting for the gallows.94 The objective grounds of faith are, however, the source of faith, and Henkel does not speak of the evidences of faith apart from the means of grace and their use. The man facing the gallows

91Ibid., p. 196.

92Ibid., p. 196. The idea that salvation was futuristic; failing to emphasize the present completeness of justification, was a characteristic of pietism.

93Ibid., p. 198. Pietism stressed the living faith of a person which revealed itself in walk and conversation godly living .

94Ibid., p. 190. This young man had been reading books by Tom Paine. Henkel says, "he asked me to pray for him and with him, but I saw no evidence of repentance and trust in the promises of God." Finck shows omissions at this point. The omissions are probably the work of the compiler.

was directed in the final analysis to trust in the promises of God.

Another Mission to Ohio

During the years 1807 through 1810, Paul Henkel's ministry followed its normal pattern, and was conducted in the areas that he had traversed before. The year 1808 was the most noteworthy, theologically, for he journeyed to Ohio for the second time and met Rev. Johannes Stauch.

The Methodists had been making their inroads in the state, and the "American spirit"⁹⁵ was manifesting itself among the Germans leading them to give up their German [and Lutheran] ways.⁹⁶ Paul Henkel contended for the evangelical truth in this environment.

My English auditors were not altogether satisfied with my evangelical sermon, so I could perceive from their conduct. My host asked one of their leaders, "How did you like the sermon?" To which he answered, "I can easily see that if I were accustomed to such sermons, I would like them very much." No one said anything to me.⁹⁷

He also had to meet the appeal that the "New Reformed

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 238.

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 238-239. Sweet remarks that in these years "an evergrowing body of circuit-riders were striving to bring the gospel into every nook and corner of these new states and territories. No other church was so well equipped for this particular task as the church of John Wesley and Francis Asbury." Quoted from William Warren Sweet, Circuit-Rider Days Along the Ohio (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923), p. 26.

⁹⁷A Chronological Life, p. 239.

party" exercised upon the German constituency, both Lutheran and Reformed.⁹⁸ Added to these factors was the ever present popularity of the Dunkers [German Baptists].⁹⁹

Wherever Paul Henkel met a "lover of the evangelical truth" [and a] "sincere friend of all preachers of the truth," he rejoiced.¹⁰⁰ He had cause for rejoicing from these singular experiences for his style of preaching attracted a great deal of attention from the people because it was "somewhat strange" . . . [to them].¹⁰¹ Henkel's evangelical tone and manner was not the current bill of fare served up for the sermonic palate of Ohio in those days. The revivals were still going strong on the western frontier, and the fanning of the flames was done chiefly by Methodist camp meetings.¹⁰² Among the Lutherans, Pastor Stauch was noted for introducing

⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 240-243. One German "railed vehemently against the sermons of the New Reformed preachers Guting, Strickler, etc.," For the origin of this new denomination and its close association with Methodism, see Olmstead, pp. 236-237.

⁹⁹A Chronological Life, p. 243, passim. Henkel hints that the mixed-marriages of Lutheran and Dunker German couples occasioned no little difficulty for him, as it resulted in some of them being, "no friend of a Lutheran minister."

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 246.

¹⁰¹Ibid., pp. 247-248.

¹⁰²"To such leaders as Bishop Asbury the camp meeting became Methodism's harvest time." Quoted from Olmstead, p. 260. Olmstead says further that the revival "spread like wildfire" through the western frontier between 1800 and 1804, and that by 1811 there were 400 to 500 held

revivalistic practices into the congregations, and many of the people submitted because they thought it was demanded of them.¹⁰³ A Rev. Pfreimer, who worked in associating with Stauch, supported the new methods among the Reformed.¹⁰⁴ In opposition to this type of theology and practice, Paul Henkel devoted the measure of his energies while on this tour.

Henkel "found traces of revivalism . . . in all congregations served by these two men."¹⁰⁵ After preaching in one of them on Matthew 21:2, Loose them and bring them unto me! One of his hearers said,

Had you come two years ago, you would not have received my approval in your teachings; it would have been too evangelical for him. But now that I have learned from experience how to deal with the works of the law, your teaching is of great benefit to me.¹⁰⁶

Both publicly and in private conversation Paul Henkel continued to rebuild the foundation he had laid years

in the United States. "Long after other denominations gave them up, the Methodists continued to hold . . . [them]," p. 261.

¹⁰³A Chronological Life, pp. 248, 249, 249A.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., pp. 248, 260. Rev. Pfreimer was a New Reformed.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 248.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 249. This statement was made by a man who [as most of his hearers did] "belonged to those that spoke of experimental Christianity." In the terminology of Paul Henkel, this, and similar phrases, refers to what today would be termed professing Christians. It would mean then that the audience to whom Henkel was directing a right understanding of law and gospel was already

before,¹⁰⁷ and to strengthen the understanding of the true nature of faith upon it.

I learned that my [former] instructions had not been in vain; in the first place, they served to give them a knowledge of themselves. They learned to understand the condition in which they were and what they must become in order to be saved; they acknowledged that their understanding was of great benefit to them in the time of trial.¹⁰⁸

Then, he would direct them to put their trust in the Gospel, as is indicated by their questions:

I was frequently asked in regard to the matter, whether it was not sufficient for the poor sinner to be convicted by the preaching of the Gospel, with out coming in with the hammer of the law, or with threats of future punishment to frighten the sinner.¹⁰⁹

This confusion of law and gospel is what Henkel saw at work whenever he commented upon the revival phenomenon. He saw in revival theology the very opposite of the application of the true way of salvation, namely, that the law works contrition, and the gospel creates faith in the forgiveness of sins obtained by Christ. Where this mixture of law and gospel was pinpointed in revival

concerned about the Christian life, and Paul was teaching them to put their trust in the gospel, and not in the works of the law.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., pp. 249-249A. Many of these people were former members of Räder's Church in Virginia.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 249A.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 249A. One can see in this description that the second use of the law was confused with its third use; consequently, justification by faith was actually nullified by an overriding doctrine of sanctification. Paul Henkel was sensitive to this error.

theology was in its concept of regeneration, or the new birth.¹¹⁰ Paul Henkel spent much time correcting the false views popularized on this subject.

My sermon was listened to with close attention, for they heard that discussed of which there had been so much talk in their neighborhood; namely, Regeneration, of The New Birth. I took the opportunity to deal very clearly of the subject as well as of the wrong teachings and ideas, that are held on this subject.¹¹¹

Many of the Germans knew the difference between the gospel declaration by which man is justified before God, and man's own attempts to justify himself. They were suspicious of "the excitement and movements that were common among the Presbyterians and Methodists."¹¹² The laymen often exhibited more theological discernment in these matters than their pastors. Paul Henkel, likewise, proved himself to be a good Paul to the Peter in

¹¹⁰The theological content of revival theology was adequately assessed by Dr. John W. Nevin in his critique of the "New Measures" [which were a direct outgrowth of the earlier revivals], when he said, "A low Pelagianizing theory of religion runs through it from beginning to end. The fact of sin is acknowledged but not in its true extent Hence all stress is laid upon the individual will, the self-will of the flesh, for the accomplishment of the great change in which regeneration is supposed to exist." Quoted in David H. Bauslin, "The Genesis of the "New Measure" Movement in the Lutheran Church in this Country," The Lutheran Quarterly, XL (July 1910), 375.

¹¹¹A Chronological Life, p. 252. In Lutheran theology, regeneration, "Like Justification . . . and new obedience are gifts of God's grace" mediated through word and sacrament, see Edmund Schlink, Theology of the Lutheran Confessions, trans. from the German by Paul F. Koehneke and Herbert J. A. Bouman (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), pp. 111-116.

¹¹²A Chronological Life, pp. 249, 249A.

Rev. Stauch and his wife, especially "in regard to Regeneration."¹¹³

Paul Henkel continues to manifest the strains of pietism in his theological outlook also in this period when he is again confronted with the radicalism of revivalists.¹¹⁴ The pace in which he is heading toward a more objective theological position, however, is gaining momentum. He is disturbed, for example, with the low appreciation that Stauch and Pfreimer attached to infant baptism. After baptizing five sons of a family that had come from Räder's Church in Virginia, and delivering a half-hour sermon for the occasion, he reflects:

I asked myself the question why did this father not have Pastor Stauch or Pastor Pfreimer baptize the children, as both of them preached in the congregation for several years.¹¹⁵

When he asked the father this question, the father informed him,

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 252-253. The biblical allusion is to Gal. 2:11-16. Paul Henkel comments on their stay in the home of Pastor Stauch, "we had serious word battles to fight with the wife, as she was not only very much inclined to the language and customs of the English speaking people but also to the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, which she endeavored to defend before me." It was all very hard for me to endure" Later, as Henkel said farewell to Stauch, Paul remarks, "I told him what I disapproved of in the teachings of the Presbyterians, Methodists, New Reformed, and others of like tendencies, especially in regard to Regeneration" He gave me his approval" Some years later Henkel and Stauch formed the conservative Special Conference in Ohio, and subsequently the Ohio Synod.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 255, and passim.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 260.

that he had deep suspicions of both of them because they were both so deeply involved in the revival excitement and movements of the time.¹¹⁶

If this were said of a traveling preacher, or of a pastor who was unknown to this member, one could draw the inference that it was the father who did not value baptism highly, but the remark was made of men who were their regular pastors. Shortly after the visit with Stauch, Paul Henkel and his wife returned to Virginia. Henkel set to work to answer the theological needs of the church on the frontier.

Henkel's Theology Goes to Press

The year 1809 brought forth two significant publications from the Henkel printery. Both were from the pastoral heart of Paul Henkel, and both were meant to be of service to the Church in combating the false views he had encountered primarily through his experiences with the revivals in religion.¹¹⁷ The one is a brief description of the religious teachings of the Shaking-Quakers together with a criticism of them. It bears the title: A Religious-Register: or A Brief Description of the Doctrine and Worship of the Shaking-Quakers in the

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 260.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 283. Here he gives his own view of the place his books and publications have in the Church. They serve the same purpose as his public sermons, and they "are especially valuable for the Church." The judgment that they were to serve the interests of the truth over against error is sustained by the polemics they contain, as well as the audience they have in mind.

State of Ohio, With a Few Remarks to the Reader.¹¹⁸

The other is an exposition of Baptism and the Lord's Supper for the common man. Its full title is: A Short Exposition of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper: For the Instruction of the Common Man, Written by One Who is Both a Friend of Man and the Kingdom of Christ.¹¹⁹

The book on the Shaking-Quakers is in the form of a popular symbolics. After describing their doctrinal views and manner of worship, interspersed with his own corrections and testimonies to the truth, the author concludes with an admonition to the reader to remain in the true faith, and then directs him as to how this steadfastness can be achieved.

Henkel goes immediately to the heart of their error, which he sees as their attempt to completely spiritualize the Kingdom of Christ. "The true believer," in their view, "is one who holds his Savior in his heart, and not in his

¹¹⁸German Title: [Paul Henkel], Religions=Register, oder Kurze Beschreibung der Glaubens=Lehre und Gottesdienstliche Verrichtungen der sogenannten Schaking=Quäkers, in dem Staat Ohio; aus dem Englischen Übersetz!-- Nebst eine kurze Erinnerung an den Leser (Newmarket [Virg.]) Gedruckt und zu haben bei Ambrosius Henkel, 1809). That this is a work of Paul Henkel, or one of his older sons is discerned from content and style.

¹¹⁹German Title: [Paul Henkel], Eine Kruze Betrachtung der Heilige Taufe und Abendmahl, Zum Unterricht des gemeinen Mannes. Verfasst von einem Menschenfreund und verehrer des Reichs Christi (Neumarket : Schenandoah County [Virg.], 1809). Hereafter Betrachtung is cited as A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Paul Henkel identifies this work as his own. See A Chronological Life, p. 283.

hand [German=Tasche--'pocket']¹²⁰ Therefore, they reject as antichristian teachings such doctrines as water-baptism, the communion of the elements with the body and blood of Christ, and the sacramental union of the Christian with Christ's body and blood, which takes place in oral eating through faith.¹²¹ Paul affirms these doctrines on the basis of the written word of Scripture. He points out that their errors have risen because they despise the written word.¹²² They do this because of their erroneous view that the Spirit illuminates man directly, without means.¹²³ Thus they come to the Scripture with

¹²⁰[Paul Henkel], Religions=Register, p. 6. German: "Der Rechtgläubige trägt seinen Heiland im Herzen und nicht in der Tasche."

¹²¹Ibid., p. 10. German: "Welches alles widerchristlich angesehen wird: als dass man mit Wasser anstatt dem H. Geist tauft, dass ein Brodkuchen als den Leib Christi geben wird, anstatt der vereinigten Kirche und ein Glas Wein als das Blut des Lebens geben wird, anstatt dass man beweiset, dass das wahre Leben Jesu darin bestehet: dass man ein Leib und Blut (durch den Blauben) mit ihm werden müsse."

¹²²Ibid., pp. 19-28. These pages contain Paul Henkel's appeal to the reader. The important statement which points out their error is: "Dies aber macht es dennoch nicht nöthig, dass die schritliche Lehre von Christo, sie sei gedruckt oder geschrieben, uns verworfen werden." Their pre-conceived idea that the true believer knows everything already by experience, "es ist was ein Rechtgläubiger aus der Erfahrung weis . . .," renders Scripture useless.

¹²³Ibid., pp. 21-22. Henkel answers the Quaker's errors on the 'inner light', and direct illumination by asking, if this teaching is true then why did Moses instruct the people to teach their children; or St. Paul tell Timothy that the scriptures would make him wise for salvation; or why did Paul write letters to the various congregations; or the Lord Jesus instruct his

a superior attitude,¹²⁴ which only leads them into the future error of rejecting the reality of the Spirit who works through the Word that provides for faith.¹²⁵

Henkel closes by reminding his readers that such errors have overcome men because they failed to make use of the Word of God. He admonishes them, therefore, not to neglect the instruction of their children, and the use of the means of grace.¹²⁶ By faithful use of the

disciples with the command that they were then to teach others, and that they in turn were to teach and practice what the Lord had given through his disciples? German: "Wäre nun die Sache so wie diese meinen, dass keine Lehre als was der Geist unmittelbar lehret, nöthig sei, so hätte Timotheus den Unterricht aus der H. Schrift nicht nöthig gehabt, sonderlich nachdem er durch die Erleuchtung des H. Geistes war glaubig worden."

¹²⁴Ibid., p. 19. "In welchen Irrthum sie können verfuhr werden, von solchen die etwas Eigenes suchen, unter dem Vorgeben dass sie durch göttlichen Antrieb und hoher Offenbarung, die reine Lehre verkündigen, und den rechten Gottesdienst errichten wollen" Paul Henkel sees their root error as their own subjectivism.

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 29. Paul Henkel's affirmation of a true believer is one who holds his Savior in his hand as well as in his heart. "Der Rechtglaubige tragtauch gerne all Zeugnisse von sienem Heiland in seiner Tasche so wohl als in seinem Herzen"

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 26-28. The significant statement reads: "so kann man anders nicht denken, als dass solchen die rechte Erkänntniss der Schrift manglen muss; und zwar bei vielen, darum dass sie keinen gehörigen Unterricht aus dem Worte Gottes erhalten haben, nach dem Befehl des Herrn" Paul Henkel's concern for German schools, contained in this admonition, was not cultural, but religious. He saw in them the means of perserving the true faith. For his work in establishing schools in Virginia, and North Carolina, see Walter H. Beck, Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939), pp. 36-47.

means of grace, they and their children will be preserved in the faith.¹²⁷

The book on the Shaking-Quakers reveals, moreover, how cognizant Paul Henkel was of the religious trends of his day, that he was aware of the historical causes from which these trends derived, and knew the literature on the subject.¹²⁸

His Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper provides a clear insight into the motivation principle of his theology. The book was to be a contribution toward alleviating the "great distress and anxiety which many pious souls have on the subject" of baptism and the Lord's Supper, which has been brought about by the "quarreling and fighting" about them "especially in these days."¹²⁹ Henkel's concern is pastoral. He want to

¹²⁷[Paul Henkel] Religions-Register, p. 28. The positive implication is contained in his negative admonition with which he closes the book: "Wie solche Eltern. . . . sie selber die Predigt versäumen, und die Mittel der Gnaden nicht gebrauchen, damit die ihren Kinder genugsam zu verstehen geben, dass sie dieselbige gering schätzen, dass thut uns die gegenwärtige Zeit lehren." From his criticism of the Quakers, one can see the antithesis that Henkel saw between subjectivism and the Word of God. Henkel would say that the Word is to be known, and trusted against human feeling.

¹²⁸Ibid., pp. 14-17. Henkel says that the majority of the Shaking-Quakers came out of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Quaker Churches, through discontentment. He gives a brief historical summary of the origin and development of the Quaker movement from the time of Oliver Cromwell to the current writings of Robert Marshall and John Dunlavy.

¹²⁹ [Paul Henkel], A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's

show how the sacraments serve the gospel, and bring comfort and God's grace to people. This is his primary concern. His secondary concern is to show that the sacraments are the source of the Christian life.

Paul Henkel Begins his presentation by getting immediately to the soteriological meaning of baptism. He gives the chief objection that the immersionists have against infant baptism, namely, that children are not able to believe, and then states:

That, although, repentance and faith are required of adults before they would be baptized, still this does not prove that the same must be required of children before their baptism. Should children not be baptized because they do not believe, then one would be handing them over to damnation. For Christ says, "Whoever does not believe will be damned." If he would refuse baptism to the children because they cannot believe, he would also deny them the crown of glory because they cannot fight for it.¹³⁰

That children can believe is affirmed by the usual Lutheran arguments from the following Scripture passages, Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:24; Mark 10:13 to which is added Hebrews 8:11. Then, he goes into the substance of his scriptural proof, arguing from the premise that since the church is

Supper, Preface [Vorbericht], "Wir wissen dass redliche und recht heilsbegierige Seelen schon oft grosse Noth und schwere Anfechtungen wegen der Sache hatten" "Du weisst dass besonders in unsern Tagen gar vieles wegen der Taufe gestritten und gekämpft wird: einige wollen so, und andere die Taufe anders vereicket haben." "wegen dem H. Abendmahl nicht so viel als wegen der Taufe gezankt; doch finden wir dass einige so und andere ganz anders davon halten"

¹³⁰ [Paul Henkel], A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's

the kingdom of Christ, and children are included in the kingdom Mark 10:13, and baptism is the entrance into the church; it follows that children as well as all people are to be baptized.¹³¹ To deprive them of baptism is to deprive them of a share in the kingdom of grace.

so it appears very absurd that it should happen that children, because they do not believe [as the immersionists argue] should be thought unfit for a place in the kingdom of grace, which is present in the church, and which indeed prepares them for the kingdom of glory.¹³²

Supper, p. 6. German: "Dass Busse und Glauben von Erwachsenen vor ihrer Taufe gefordert werde, beweiset auch noch nicht, dass es von den Kindern vor ihrer Taufe erfordert werden müsse. Sollen die Kinder nicht getauft werden, weil sie nicht glauben, so müssen sie dann verdammt werden. Dann Christus' sagt, "Wer nicht glaubt der wird verdammt." Sollte den Kindern die Taufe versagt werden weil sie nicht glauben können, so möchten dann ihnen auch die Krone der Herrlichkeit versagt werden, weil sie nicht kämpfen können."

¹³¹Ibid., p. 7-31. The premise is given on page 7, and is supported by arguments from the O. T. and the N. T., interspersed with the treatment and objections to the proofs given by the immersionists, scattered throughout to page 31. Henkel's use of Scripture is a fascinating display of what present-day biblical theology would classify as the principle of "salvation history." He points out the failure of reading Scripture like a textbook, without the controlling theme of the gospel to guide one's use. If the textbook method were logically carried out, as the immersionists do, then one could prove that women are not to go to communion [auch sogar von denen die die Kindertauf verwerfen wollen, weil kein ausdrücklicher Befehl in der Bibel zu finden ist, und haben doch auch keinen Befehl dass ihre Weibspersonen zum H. Abendmahl gehen sollen?], page 9. Henkel approaches Scripture from the standpoint of sin and grace [or law and gospel], therefore, he is able to see the thread of God's saving purpose running through from the original promise given to Abraham to its fulfillment in Christ and on to its consummation in eternal life. How does one lay hold of the promise? He answers through baptism.

¹³²Ibid., p. 8. German: "so scheint es etwas sehr

The kingdom of grace is embodied in Christ. One needs to be incorporated into Christ in order to be in grace, and since baptism is the means of putting on Christ, all then need to be baptized, including children. Henkel summarizes this argument by saying,

Who can understand it in any other way than as the Apostle says, that since all Christians have put on Christ in baptism, and that all, likewise, are to be in Christ, therefore, all must be baptized, and since all are to be baptized, so children also are to be baptized.¹³³

In the final analysis Henkel returns, after his lengthy and involved corrections of false interpretations and applications of the Scripture and human experience, to the simple point from which he began: "Who would believe that children too are not to be blessed by Christ."¹³⁴ "Have they no right to be baptized, then they have no right to the church."¹³⁵ Consequently, the implication would be, they are outside the pale of salvation.

ungereimtes zu sein dass die Kinder weil sie nicht galuben untüchtig sein sollen in dem Reich der Gnaden, dass ist in der Kirche zu stehen, und dennoch geschickt für dass Reich der Herrlichkeit sein."

¹³³Ibid., p. 17. German: "Wer kann dass anders verstehen als so, wie der Apostel sagt, dass wie alle Christum angezogen hatten in der Taufe, dass alle zugleich in Christo seien, so müssen auch alle getauft worden sein, und waren sie alle getauft, so waren auch Kinder getauft."

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 29. German: "wer glaubt aber dass die Kinder dennoch nicht durch Christum selig werden."

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 31. German: "Haben sie kein recht zur Taufe, so haben sie auch kein Recht zur Kirche." Since no where can it be proven that they do not possess this right, he concludes: "Und weil wir es dann nirgends finden, so

The real reason Henkel assigns as the cause for man's objection to infant baptism is the influence of Satan, and their own love of sin. If one understands the reality of sin, and knows its remedy, then,

As surely as that person earnestly desires the blessedness of his children, he will not be long in rejecting the true comfort that comes to them through baptism, and the renunciation of the devil and all his works and ways.¹³⁶

After going into the justification of infant baptism by appealing to the history of the church from apostolic times through the Reformation,¹³⁷ Henkel discusses what baptism is, and what it is not.

In a series of negatives, he says that "baptism is not in itself salvation, nor the new birth."¹³⁸ "Nor is baptism in itself the forgiveness of sins, nor is forgiveness brought about through baptism" that is, forgiveness did not originate in baptism.¹³⁹ Baptism,

wollen wir den Kinder das Recht lassen, bis es dem Herrn gefällt es selber zu nehmen."

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 30. German: "Gewiss derjenige dem das Seligwerden ein rechten Ernst ist, wird sich nicht lange weigern bei der Taufe seiner Kinder getrost dem Teufel und allen seinen Werken und Wesen abzusagen."

¹³⁷Ibid., pp. 31-135. Ironically, Henkel comments that the very ones who oppose infant baptism, and have had themselves baptized by immersion, have grown to be such great leaders in the church because they were baptized as children and received all the concomitant blessings of baptism.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 36. "Sie baptism ist selber die Seeligkeit nicht, sie ist selber die Wiedergeburt nicht, die wir erfahren müssen, wan wir selig werden wollen."

¹³⁹Ibid., pp. 36-37. Commenting on Peter's Pentecost

rather, refers back to a past accomplished deed, which secured the forgiveness of sins, and baptism conveys that forgiveness to man. Henkel refers to the suffering and death of Christ as the cause of forgiveness.

The forgiveness of our sins has its origin in the suffering and death of Jesus; and now baptism is the means through which men have the assurance of the forgiveness of their sins, and further, that the right to and participation in eternal life has been transmitted to man through baptism.¹⁴⁰

Baptism is like a sales-slip [Kauf=Brief], which validates the treasure it represents, and hands over to the bearer the actual possession of that which it promises, when the bearer exhibits it for payment.¹⁴¹ Baptism never loses its validity. The neglect of its covenant obligations results in the loss of the baptismal treasure. The loss of the baptismal inheritance is due to sin and unbelief,

sermon, Henkel draws the conclusion, "Er sagt nicht dass die Taufe die Vergebung ihrer Sünden sei; auch nicht dass sie durch dieselbe bewürkt werde."

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 37. German: "Die Vergebung ihren Sünden hatten sie um des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu Willen; die Taufe aber sei das Mittel durch welches sie die Versicherung von der Vergebung ihrer Sünden hatten, und dass ihnen das Recht und Antheil des ewigen Lebens dadurch übergeben worden sei"

¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 37. German: "Gleich wie ein Kauf= Brief zu einem gewissen Landgut, dass von dem Landes= Fürsten mit seiner eigenen Hand unterschrieben ist, und seinen Siegel angedruckt hat, das Landgut selber noch nicht ist; aber dennoch von unschätzbarem Werth, weil dasselbe nicht nur die gewisse Versicherung giebt, dass man besagtes Landgut zu Eigenthum erlangen wird; sondern dass es schon allbereit zum Eigenthum durch denselben übergeben ist."

although the promise of the inheritance remains permanent, fixed, and eternal in itself. The baptized sinner can always return to it through repentance and faith.

Where a person neglects the covenant relationship, and would allow it to be wasted through neglect, he would then lose it, although he always had his sales-slip in his possession and can show it; thus it is the same thing with baptism.¹⁴²

As long as the baptized person remains true to the covenant of his baptism till death, he will receive the inheritance.¹⁴³

The counsel that Henkel offers to those who have broken their baptismal covenant, and face the possibility of dying in their sins is to "experience remorse and sorrow for their sins, and return again in repentance and faith to their baptism."¹⁴⁴ It is the same with adults as it is with children,

if they do not experience the effectual working of the Holy Spirit in their inner man, although water was applied on their outward physical person, it gains nothing for them.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 37. German: "wo er aber dasselbe versäumen, vernachlässigen und gar würde verwüsten lassen, so würde er es verlieren, ob er gleich seinen Kauf=brief immer noch im Besitz hätte und aufweisen könnte; also ist es mit der Taufe."

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 37. Paul Henkel stresses baptism as a covenant relationship. God's side is fixed and sealed and unbreakable, but man can break it and forfeit his claim upon the inheritance which has been procured for him. German: "so auch mit denen die in ihrer Kindheit getauft werden: bleiben sie ihrem Taufbund getreu bis in den Tod"

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 38. German: ". . . und so ohne Reue und Leid über ihre Sünden zu erfahren, und wieder durch Busse und Glauben umkehren"

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 38. German: "eben so ist es mit denen

Henkel holds both truths together in his exposition of Holy Baptism, namely justification and sanctification as an inner relationship that cannot be dissected rationally or demonstrably. He is against pride on the one hand that fails to believe that baptism is necessary to salvation, and folly on the other, that would build a false security on baptism as a pure ex opera operatum.¹⁴⁶ Although, the concepts and terminology which Henkel uses to describe the effectual power of baptism is that of Lutheran pietism, he does not follow through with the logical outcome of pietistic theology.¹⁴⁷ This is to say, Henkel does not

die als Erwachsene getauft werden, sie mögen im Wasser oder mit Waffer getauft worden sein, wann sie die Wirkung des H. Geistes an dem inwendigen Menschen nicht erfahren, so wohl als das Wasser an dem "ausserlichen Menschen, so gehen sie verloren." Note the pietistic term "inwendigen menschen." See Philip Jacob Spener, Pia Desideria, trans., edited, and with an introd., by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1964), (Seminar editions), p. 114; for Spener's use of the term 'inner man' see also Tappert's informative and analytical introduction to the thought of Spener and Pietism.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 62-64.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 38-42. These pages show that Paul Henkel is indebted to Lutheran pietism. After positing the certainty of baptism as a Kaufbrief, he goes on to describe, in detail, the kind of life the baptized should live, significantly, however, he does not belittle, or deny the place of returning to one's baptism in repentance and faith as the final proviso for the sinner. He returns to this thought again in his discussion of the Lord's Supper.

The religious environment must also be taken into consideration at this point. The immersionists were reiterating constantly the formality and lifelessness of the organized churches. They were saying for example, "The natives round about this little colony of Baptists, altho' brought up in the Christian religion, were grossly

end his discussion with the sanctified man, who on the basis of a holy life mediated through baptism, can stand before God trusting in his sanctity. He ends with the man, who is simul justis et peccator, and who always relies upon the forgiveness of sins for his righteousness before God. This is the direction of his thought in his exposition of the Lord's Supper. Henkel's Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the way it was written, must be taken as a unit, if he is to be understood correctly.

After a brief admonition to parents to see to the confirmation instruction of their children,¹⁴⁸ Henkel begins his explanation of the holy supper.

ignorant of its essential principles. Having the form of godliness, they knew nothing of its power . . . they could not comprehend how it should be necessary to feel conviction and conversion" "The Baptist preachers would often retort their own inconsistencies upon them . . . that even their clergy, learned as they were, had never learned the most essential doctrine of revelation, the indispensable necessity of the new birth, or being born again" Quoted from Robert B. Semple, pp. 3-4, 22, respectively.

The comparison between the sacramental theology of Paul Henkel, even with its emphasis upon the use of the sacraments for the progress of sanctification, is a far cry from the anthropocentric theology current in his environment. One also has to consider the polemical concern of Henkel's to safeguard the use of the sacraments in a situation where even the Lutheran constituency was swayed by the holiness theology of the sects.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 65-68. [Paul Henkel] Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Henkel's firm admonition on instruction can be understood in the light of the above discussion.

Also, with the Lord's Supper, Henkel goes immediately to its soteriological meaning. He sees the same objectives raised against this sacrament as were raised against baptism. People consider the Lord's Supper to be "an empty symbol in itself, which only signifies what man in a spiritual way must experience through faith, if he is to become blessed."¹⁴⁹ The popular view is "that one can be just as good a Christian without going to the Lord's Supper, as he can by going."¹⁵⁰ This only betrays, as with baptism, that man has no true conception of what sin is, and its remedy. Because people "see that others go to the sacrament, and do not become better in their manner of life," they conclude that it is not necessary.¹⁵¹ Speaking of this attitude, Henkel laments,

There would have been no need for the Lord's supper to have been instituted, if it made no difference whether one used it or not. One is indeed astonished that people can so pervert, and speak so foolishly concerning this holy institution and of his commandment, seeing that it has such significant meaning for us.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 68. German: "Bald sehen sie dasselbige an, als ein bloßer Schatten, von dem was es an sich selber ist, und erklären, dass es nur bedeute, dasjenige, was man geistlicher Weise durch den Glauben erfahren müsse, um selig zu werden."

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 69. German: "ja dass man ein so guter Christ sein könne, ohne zum H. Abendmahl zu gehen, als wann man auch gehe."

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 71. German: "Sie sehen auf andere die zum Abendmahl gehen, un nichts gebessert werden in ihrem Leben und Wandel."

¹⁵²Ibid., pp. 69-70. German: "Es wäre nicht nöthig

The real problem is that man looks to himself and his own feelings instead of to the Lord and His command.

But should it happen that a person has a genuine love for the Lord Jesus and would act accordingly, would he take his . . . commandments lightly just because he can . . . perceive in himself no impetus or inclination impelling him to receive the Lord's Supper? O, such shameful, sinful reasoning!¹⁵³

As man looks at himself, he is held fast in his sin, and doesn't recognize, nor seek the good of his soul. Let men, however, once really try to live godly lives, and they will find out "that their wills are bound fast to the lordship of sin."¹⁵⁴ When people realize this fact, "they will begin to earnestly seek help through all the means of grace."¹⁵⁵ The true meaning and value of the Lord's Supper would then come to them, and,

They would find out why, among other things, the Lord's supper was given and instituted by Christ: namely, that they might have the assurance that God has forgiven all their sins for the sake of

gewesen das H. Abendmahl einzusetzen, wann so wenig daran gelegen wäre, ob mans braucht oder nicht. Man hat sich zu erstaunen, dass Leute so verkehrt und unvernünftig von einer so heiligen Stiftung des Herrn und dessen Befehl sprechen mögen, da sie doch die Sache so deutlich vor Augen haben."

¹⁵³Ibid., p. 70. "Sollte es aber möglich sein das jemand den Herrn Jesum recht lieb hat, und sich vorstellen, er sei nicht schuldig seine Gebotten zu halten, weil er keinen Trieb oder Neigung dazu empfindet? O schändliche Sündliche Vorstellung!"

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 71. "sondern wohl wissen dass ihr geneigter Wille ist, in herrschenden Sünden fort zu leben"

¹⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 71-72. "Sie würden heilsbegierig nach allen Gndädmitteln forschen."

the voluntary suffering and death of Jesus.¹⁵⁶

When they have grasped this great fact, men would be less judgmental about their fellow-man's failures, and would use this sacrament in accordance with the purpose for which it was instituted. Henkel describes this usage under the simile of a doctor and his patient.

Some people would soon have a higher estimate of the Lord's Supper than that of a mere empty symbol or memorial. They would find out that the true use of it would be of great benefit and blessing to them. They would not always be looking to see whether the use of it tended toward betterment in others. They would see in it something like a sick man who yearns for the medical aid of a wise and understanding doctor, who could assure him that he had provided help for many with a similar illness. Thus he would not despise the medicine because others use it, but clearly according to the doctor's prescription.¹⁵⁷

If some people regard the sacrament too lightly, Henkel says, others are driven from it through fear.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 72. German: "Sie würden unter andern finden, warum das H. Abendmahl von Christo gestiftet und eingesetzt wurde: nemlich sie damit zu versichern dass ihnen Gott alle ihre Sünde um des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu Willen vergeben werde."

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 72. German: "Solche würden das H. Abendmahl bald weit höher schätzen als ein bloser Schatten, oder Bedeutung. Sie würden finden, dass der rechte Gebrauch desselben ihnen zu einem grossen Vortheil und Segen gereichen würde. Solche würden wenig darauf sehen ob andere durch den Gebrauch desselben gebessert wären oder nicht. Es würde ihnen damit gehen, wie einem Kranken, der die Arznei von einem weisen und verständigen Arzt erlangt hat, von dem er die Versicherung hätte, dass er manchen durch die Arznei von der nemlichen Krankheit geholfen hätte, der würde die Arznei nicht verwerfen, weil andere die sie missbrauchten nichts an ihrer Gesundheit sind gebessert worden. Er würde sie dennoch gebrauchen, aber genau nach der Verschrift des Arztes."

This fear has risen through a misunderstanding of the words of the Apostle, Corinthians 11:29. These people understand the word judgment as a judgment to external damnation. Consequently, "they explain the text in such a way, that every one who has not been truly born again, and who does not have the certain assurance of the forgiveness of their sins, would receive the eternal damnation of their souls, if they went to the Lord's supper."¹⁵⁸

That such is not the case, Paul Henkel proves through a solid piece of exegesis of the text. The Apostle means, not eternal damnation, but physical suffering, which in some cases has led to the death of the body. Instead of looking upon even these judgments as being signs of God's anger, Henkel sees in them the disciplinary acts of God's love.

The Lord visited them with bodily ailments, from which a good many of them died. In the following verses Paul shows, that such things were not sent to them in order to cause the damnation of their souls; but that they still might be saved It means for us that we should examine ourselves and use the Lord's supper in an orderly way, that these judgments of God would not come upon us.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 74. German: "So erklären solche, dass alle diejenige welche nicht vorher von neuem geboren wären, und die gewisse Versicherung von Vergebung ihrer Sunden hätten, wann sie zum H. Abendmahl gehen, dass sie sich das ewige Gericht; ja gar die Verdammtniss ihrer Seelen daran essen und trinken würden, welches gar nicht ist was der Apostel mit denselben Worten sagen will."

¹⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 75-76. German: "Der Herr zichtigte sie mit leiblichen Krankheiten, davon auch ein guter Theil mit dem Tode abgingen. In den folgenden Versen seigt Paulus, dass auch solches nicht geschehe, die

Henkel's pastoral concern for youth who are frightened away from the Lord's Supper as if it were a poison, and a snare to their souls, is what has led him to treat of this matter at length.¹⁶⁰ One can also gain a glimpse of the motivating spirit controlling his theology from his pastoral exegesis.¹⁶¹

The Lord's Supper is defined as the "communion of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ, and therefore it is his own body and blood."¹⁶² The communion

Verdammniss ihrer Seelen zu bewürken; sodnern dass sie dennoch selig werden sollten Dass ist so wir uns selber genau pruften und ordentlich das H. Abendmahls gebrauchten, so würden die Gerichte Gottes nicht über uns können."

¹⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 73-74. Paul Henkel's exegesis of I Corinthians 11:29 would throw some useful light on the prayer for the communicants found in The Lutheran Liturgy: Authorized by the Synods constituting the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.), p. 290, where the words of the prayer read, "that no one may partake of this holy Sacrament to his damnation."

¹⁶¹[Paul Henkel] A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, p. 76. Henkel ends this discussion acknowledging regretfully that even the best intention often errs in explaining this question of "judgment," and not only youth but many people are frightened away from the sacrament. In this concern Paul Henkel shows that he understands the Lord's Supper as the gospel, and in this sense is very close to Luther, who maintained that "This Sacrament is the Gospel," as quoted in Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), p.382.

¹⁶²[Paul Henkel] A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, p. 80. German: "Hat unser Brod und Wein Gemeinschaft mit dem Leib und Blut Christi, so muss es auch sein was es der liebe Heiland selber bei der Einsetzung nennt: sein Leib und sein Blut."

of the material elements with Christ's body and blood is unique to the institution itself. Before the institution of the holy supper this specific union was not spoken of, and the bread and wine "were not called"¹⁶³ Christ's body and blood. This fact rules out the interpretation that the unleavened bread and the cup of salvation of the Passover meal simply stand as a symbol or memorial of the body and blood of Christ himself, and therefore the communicant has actual "communion with His holy body, and with His true blood."¹⁶⁴

Paul Henkel does not go into an involved explanation of the mystery of the presence of Christ in the elements of the sacrament, declaring that that is not his purpose. His purpose is to explain why the sacrament was instituted.

In explaining why it was given, he first draws upon the typology of the Passover festival. As the children of Israel were reminded of their great physical deliverance from Egypt and their inheritance of the land of Canaan through the presentation of the Passover lamb, similarly through the presentation of Christ as the lamb of God, Christians are reminded that Christ effected an eternal

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 80. German: "wir finden aber nirgends, dass das ungesäuerte Brod die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi, oder der Leib Christi vorher genannt wurde."

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 83. German: ". . . die Gemeinschaft mit seinem heiligen Leibe, und mit seinem theuren Blut."

deliverance for mankind. Each celebration of the Lord's Supper is a call for great thanksgiving because Christians are reminded of the great miracle of redemption accomplished by Christ for them.¹⁶⁵

The Lord's Supper, however, is more than a symbolical presentation which calls to remembrance the past redemptive act which won salvation for the world. The sacrament is the place where a person is incorporated into Christ, and shares concretely in salvation itself. Henkel describes this first as union with Christ.

We do not have merely an empty deed portrayed in our Lord's supper; we do not use it only to proclaim His death and think of it in love and thanksgiving, dear children of men! We have this indeed in the beloved Lord's supper, but surely we have much more; we have also, as the Apostle teaches: communion with His holy body, and with His true blood.¹⁶⁶

Then, he describes what one actually receives through this union.

Since we, therefore, have communion with His body and blood, so the power of His suffering, death, and the pouring out of His blood which occurs in the Lord's supper, must also be present for us; the forgiveness of our sins will not only have been given to us through the Lord's supper; but also, on the basis of other statements of the Savior

¹⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 81-86. Paul Henkel makes use of biblical typology in order to illustrate the meaning of God's deeds in the O. T. and the N. T. His exegetical methodology is both dynamic and propositional. In this biblical method one can see the material principle of Lutheranism at work in the way he approaches the contents of the Bible. His use of typology is not only illustrative, but integral, viz., one can learn the meaning of God's acts in Christ through their prototypes in God's deeds performed in the O. T. period.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., p. 83. German: "Wir haben die Sache nicht

and His Apostles, we believe that the power to live a better life will also have been given to us through it.¹⁶⁷

The reception of these gifts bestowed upon the person through the Lord's Supper brings definite blessings to the participant. Henkel enumerates them as,

Our faith will be strengthened, our souls comforted, and our hearts will be assured of the promises of the grace of God. Alas, why should we not then treasure very dearly such a holy Gift, wherein we have such powerful means for the betterment of our lives!¹⁶⁸

Then follows Henkel's answer to the question of who should be permitted to attend the Lord's Supper. His answer is: those who have been baptized. He bases his judgment on the example of Israel. As circumcision constituted entrance into the heritage of the children of Israel, and since the church is the new Israel, so

blos in unserem Abendmahl vorgebildet; wir gebrauchen auch dasselbige nicht allein deswegen, das wir seinen Tod verkündigen, und seiner zu gedenken in Liebe und Dankbarkeit, O Menschen Kinder! wir haben dieses alles freilich in dem lieben Abendmahle, aber gewisslich noch mehr dazu; wir haben auch wie der Apostel lehret: die Gemeinschaft mit seinem heiligen Leibe, und mit seinem theuren Blut."

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 83. German: "Haben wir dann Gemeinschaft mit seinem Leib und Blut, so muss uns die Kraft von seinem Leiden, Sterben und Blutvergiessen in dem H. Abendmahl, doch auch gegenwärtig; ja sehr nahe sein. Es wird uns nicht nur die Versicherung von Vergebung unserer Sünden dadurch gegeben; sondern so wir anders den Worten des Heilands, und seiner Apostels galuben, so wird uns auch die Kraft zu einem bessern Leben dadurch gegeben."

¹⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 83-84. German: "Unser Glaube wird gestärkt, unsere Seele getrostet, und unser Herz von den Verheissungen der Gnade Gottes versichert. Ach warum sollten wir dann eine solche Heilige Stiftung nicht hoch und theuer schätzen, woran wir ein so kräftiges Mittel

baptism is the requirement for admission to the Lord's Supper.¹⁶⁹ The history of Israel as the covenant people serves in all its characteristic features as an example for the church to follow. The female sex were included in the covenant of circumcision, therefore, as baptism is the fulfillment of circumcision, they being baptized, are to attend the Lord's Supper. As Israel renounced Egypt, so should the church renounce Satan and follow Christ by receiving the sacrament. This implies that communicants are to separate themselves from the ungodly world. As the children of Israel equipped themselves for the wilderness journey to the promised land, so should Christians equip themselves by using all the means of grace as they travel the road of discipleship to the heavenly Canaan.

The question now raises itself quite logically, as it did for Paul Henkel in his discussion of the effectual power of baptism; what about those who fall into sin and unbelief on their journey to the promised land? As he directed the baptized to return to their baptism in repentance and faith, so now he directs the fallen sinner to use the strength which the holy supper supplies.

But should some be led astray from the right path, into sin, they should not for that reason allow themselves to be frightened away from the Lord's supper, as is the case with many. O! by no means!¹⁷⁰

zur besserung unseres Leben haben!

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 84.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 86. German: "Sollten sie sich aber

The fallen should return to the Lord's Supper with a penitent attitude. If they have offended anyone through their sins they should ask them for pardon. If they have committed a public offense, they should publicly acknowledge it before the congregation. Then, asking God for the help and assistance of the Holy Spirit to lead a better life, they should receive the Lord's Supper. ¹⁷¹ If people would do this, instead of staying away from the sacrament and being overcome by Satan and the evil world, "they would finally win out and lay hold of the victory"¹⁷² in the struggle of earthly life.

The question of the fallen sinner, finally leads to the question of unworthiness. Henkel sees this as the problem of many people. "Unfortunately it is the same old sad song of many, whether young or old."¹⁷³

They hope to become blessed, but they think that they cannot become blessed. But if they are not worthy to go to the Lord's supper, then they are certainly not worthy to die, and they could certainly not be prepared to obtain a place at the heavenly feast.¹⁷⁴

vergehen, und dadurch in Sünden fallen, so sollen sie sich deshalb nicht vom H. Abendmahl abschrecken lassen, wie es bei manchen geschieht. Ach nein!"

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 86.

¹⁷²Ibid., p. 87. German: "so würden sie endlich gewinnen und den Sieg behalten."

¹⁷³Ibid., p. 87. German: "Wie es leider zu erbarmen die Leier bei manchen Alten, so wie auch bei den Jungen ist."

¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 87. German: "Sie hoffen selig zu werden,

Their unworthiness will be no excuse on the day of judgment if they knew better and had opportunity to become worthy through the use of the holy supper.

If they ever are to become truly converted and truly pious, then why do they not wish to use the very means which the Lord himself has ordained for that purpose?¹⁷⁵

The crux of the matter is that people would rather be condemned in their self-pity which desires to have something to offer to God, than to recognize their helpless condition and take the help which God offers to them. This is the gist of Henkel's thought as he states the reason why the unworthy hold themselves back from communion.

That such should be the pitiful case is the same as saying that: they wish first to be truly converted, and have assurance that they have been born anew, and then they can go to the Lord's supper. It is just like a sick man who would say: when I have been healed, then I will use the medicine.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 87. German: "Wie wollen sie jemals recht bekehrt recht fromm werden, wann sie die Mittel dazu die der Herr selber verordnet hat, nicht gebrauchen wollen?"

¹⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 87-88. German: "Dass solche Elende darauf bestehen wollen: Sie wollen erst recht bekehrt sein, und wissen dass sie von neuem geboren sind, und dann erst zum Abendmahl gehen, ist eben als wann der Kranke sagen würde: wann ich wieder recht gesung bin, dann will ich auch die Arznei gebrauchen." The simile of the sick man and the doctor conveys the principle of objective justification over against self-justification in a dynamic and picturesque way. The principle of self-justification works itself out in man's attempt to prescribe

Paul Henkel continues his plea for men to make use of the sacrament by pointing out that those are the most worthy who have no worthiness in themselves, for it is for such that the Lord's Supper was instituted. This is the intent of his final remarks on the subject of worthiness.

If one were to ask the very people who are troubled by their unworthiness if they regarded themselves as sinners; if they knew they stood in danger because of it; realised they were deficient in their Christian life; and yet earnestly desired their soul's salvation and betterment of life, "they would all answer yes."¹⁷⁷

Whom among men would have a greater need for the Lord's supper than such people? Would not just those who had spiritual illnesses be the very ones who would require the physician of the soul? If we were not so ruined by sin we would have little need for the Lord's supper, or the other means of grace.¹⁷⁸

Then by way of a contrasting picture, which by its very contrast tends to sharpen what Henkel has said about the nature and purpose of the Lord's Supper, he concludes:

his own needs and provide his own remedies.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 88. The German is forceful: "so antworten sie alles mit ja."

¹⁷⁸Ibid., p. 88. German: "Welche Menschen hätten dann das H. Abendmahl nöthiger als solche Leute? Die wären also die geistlich Kranken, die den Seelen=Arzt bedürften. Wären wir nicht mit der Sünde verdorben so hatten wir das Abendmal nicht nöthig so wenig als andre Gnadenmittel." The recognition that man, even Christian man, has nothing in himself to bring to God, and therefore always stands as a beggar before God in need of a righteousness and justification outside of himself, is clearly witnessed here by Paul Henkel.

The Lord's supper has not been ordained for the angels or for the saints in heaven, but for poor suffering sinners, who wish to have healing for their injured souls.¹⁷⁹

The last excuse which Henkel treats is that of the "holier than thou" attitude. Some people do not want to attend communion because, in their judgment, the unconverted are allowed to attend also. These people do not want to be partakers in other men's sins. Paul Henkel advises them the Apostle has instructed each one to look to himself, prove himself, and not his neighbor.

He the Apostle has also ordered the believers in the congregation, that they should not separate and isolate themselves from the Church because the disorderly were disrupting the observance of the Lord's supper, or even because there were rotten people among them.¹⁸⁰

The elders and officers of the church are to look after the welfare of the church regarding offenders and those who live in public scandal. They are to keep them from the Lord's table until they do better. Those, however, who cause no public offense, are not to be deprived of communion even if their faith and life is deficient.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 38. German: "Das H. Abendmahl ist nicht verordnet für die Engel oder die Heiligen im Himmel, sondern für die arme und elende Sünder, die den Schaden ihrer Seelen wollen geheilet haben." The implied thrust of this statement is that the self-styled holiness which would belittle the wisdom and ordinances of Christ reveals, by its inability to understand the basic purpose of the sacrament, and one's need of the blessing of the sacrament, man's depravity.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., p. 89. German: "Er befahl auch nicht dass sich die Gläubige in der Gemeinde, von der Kirche trennen oder absondern sollten, weil Unordnungen bei der Haltung

. . . they should not be detained from the Lord's supper, even if they, perhaps, are not true believers and are unacquainted with experiential Christianity. Indeed, for that very reason, they should remain within the congregation: that through the instruction which they have through the preaching of the word, and through the use of the sacrament, they would attain a true faith in Christ their Lord, and through that faith they could become what they should become, and come to salvation.¹⁸¹

The book on Baptism and the Lord's Supper comes to an end with this last statement. The short appendix which follows is an impassioned appeal to the people of the Evangelical Church to stay within the order of the church and make use of the sacraments for their soul's welfare.

One can see a line of progression in the book, which follows the natural sequence of the church's ordering of life. Baptism is followed by confirmation, and confirmation by communion. Paul Henkel's stress upon the effectual results of the application of the sacraments upon the believing subject, then, must be understood as normative and not absolute.

des Abendmahls eingerissen war, oder weil Rotten unter ihnen waren." The Lutheran tradition in opposition to the Reformed and sectarian view, held that the Lord's Supper "werde nicht allein gereicht und empfangen von frommen, sondern auch von bösen Christen." Quoted from Schmalkaldische Artikel in Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche: Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgerischen Konfession 1930 (Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 3. verbesserte Auflage, 1956), pp. 450-451.

¹⁸¹ [Paul Henkel], A Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, p. 89. German: "sollen nicht vom Abendmahl gehalten werden, ob sie wohl keine wahre Glaubige, und mit einem

As his final arguments show, Henkel is not willing to sit in judgment upon the faith of the individual person in a quantitative sense. He absolutizes only the means of grace, that is, he does not raise the question at any time about their intrinsic effectiveness. When it would appear that they did not accomplish their purpose in the inner man, it is the fault of man and his misuse that is to blame.¹⁸² Henkel, therefore, transcends the danger inherent in Lutheran pietistic thought, namely, to make the certainty of one's relationship with God stand upon the basis of sanctification rather than justification.¹⁸³

Paul Henkel understands, by the fact of his admission to communion, those whose "true" faith [wahre Glaubige] may even be questionable, that sanctification is always in degrees. While he is devoted to "experiential-Christianity"

Erfahrungs=Christenthum bekannt sind. Eben deshalb sollen sie in der Gemeinde stehen: dass sie durch den Unterricht den sie aus dem Worte durch die Predigt usw, haben, und durch den Gebrauch des H. Abendmahls den rechten Glauben erlangen an Christum ihren Herrn, dadurch die werden können, was sie sein sollen, um selig zu werden."

¹⁸²Ibid., pp. 72-73.

¹⁸³This is not self achieved to say the Pietism ascribed the pious life to self achieved effort. The Holy Spirit's activity through word and sacrament was acknowledged as the cause of the righteous life. McNeill puts it succinctly, "In the German pietists, we see again piety associated with spiritual power; and, like Peter, they would ascribe to the power of God all the good results of their labors." Quoted from John T. McNeill, Modern Christian-Movements (Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1954), Chapter 2, p. 49. The direction of Pietism, however, was anthropocentric rather than theocentric, and the danger for the troubled soul was to look into itself, instead

[Erfahrungs=Christentum] and looks upon it as the desired goal of the Christian life, he forgoes the requirement of it as a criterion in judging a person's acceptability to receive communion. Taking into consideration Paul Henkel's training, and the impact of his environment upon him, this stance indicates a major breakthrough for his theology of objective justification.¹⁸⁴

After the printing of his Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Paul Henkel spent a few months [August to November 1809] on a mission trip to North Carolina in the interests of the printery.¹⁸⁵ While there he sold a large number of catechisms, the above mentioned book, and took orders for the new German hymnal which was in the process of publication.

The year 1810 was spent in the routines of his office, and preparing his English catechism for publication. Also in this year a book on the doctrines and origin of the

of outside oneself to the objective work of Christ's atonement.

¹⁸⁴The sum of his thought on "worthiness" shows that Henkel questions the ability of man to know his true condition in reference to the quality of his own sanctification. Man is never safe apart from the means of grace. Pietism layed stress on man's prior sinfulness before regeneration [this was the current theological climate of Henkel's day, for Pietism, and its correlatives in Puritanism and Separatism, was the source of America's theological heritage]. Henkel, however, sees man still ruined by sin after his regeneration. See the discussion on "Pietism," in Bodensieck, p. 1899.

¹⁸⁵A Chronological Life, p. 273.

Mennonists [Baptists] was reprinted by the Henkel press.¹⁸⁶
 In North Carolina, the Rev. Gottlieb Schober, a Moravian,
 was ordained by the North Carolina Synod.¹⁸⁷ Paul Henkel
 wanted to attend synod and assist at the ordination but
 he was prevented by family business.¹⁸⁸ Henkel closes
 his diary for the year with the notation that it was a
 significant year because the German hymnal had been
 published and "met with a fair acceptance in all German
 congregations."¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁶Title: The Christian Confession: Of the Faith of the harmless Christians, in the Netherlands, known by the name of MENNONISTS (Amsterdam: Ambrose Henkel and Comp., New-Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1810). This work carries no Henkel preface of introduction. It was probably printed as a monetary function of the Henkel Press, see A Chronological Life, p. 183.

¹⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 286-287. The North Carolina Synod now was composed of Lutheran, an Episcopalian [Rev. R. J. Miller], and a Moravian clergyman. Both Miller and Schober were not required to denounce their allegiency to their respective denominations or their tenents, but were expected to function in a Lutheran Synod [whether all the pastors understood it specifically as a Lutheran Synod or a union synod is open to debate] in harmony with Lutheran principles. This was to occasion problems later on. See Socrates Henkel, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel & Co., 1890), pp. 9-10; and Bernheim, pp. 337-340, Rev. Miller was licensed to preach by the Methodist Church, ordained by the Lutheran Church according to the obedience of the Episcopal Church, and Bernheim, pp. 375-376. Significantly, at this session of the synod, Philip Henkel moved that protracted meetings be held in which also "ministers of the Moravian and Reformed . . . be welcomed . . . at each of these meetings the communion is to be administered," Bernheim, p. 376.

¹⁸⁸A Chronological Life, p. 287.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 287.

The ten years from 1800 through 1810 have witnessed a number of important circumstances and events in the life of Paul Henkel that had an impact upon his theology. These events were related to revivalism and sectarianism. The revivals presented him with a basic doctrinal question about man's cooperation in conversion and regeneration. They also posed a serious question about the nature of faith. After 1805, Henkel appears to have grasped the essential Lutheran answer to these questions by responding with the objective means of grace. A major breakthrough occurred for Henkel when he began to realize that the subjective side of faith could not be absolutized. His theology reflects, in this period, a growing ascendancy of the gospel over the law.

CHAPTER V

THE LATER PERIOD (1811-1820)

The English Catechism

Paul Henkel answered to the theological needs of his day by printing and circulating his Treatise, German Hymnal, and various pamphlets which emphasized that which was permanent in Christianity. He was now to meet this same need through the medium of a book that would reach both young and old, and be available for the poorest frontier family--the catechism.

The year 1811 was even more significant for the Henkel publications because the English catechism came off the press. In fact there were three catechisms printed in this year. As the English Christian Catechism was the one which enjoyed the greatest popularity, and seemingly was dear to the heart of Paul Henkel,¹ the discussion will center on its contents.²

¹A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel: From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, Etc., selected and trans. by William J. Finck, D. D. (New Market, Virginia: n.p., 1935-1937). Typewritten Volume of 488 pp. with an appendix, in the personal library of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis, p. 283, and passim in the diary entries for the year 1811. The conjecture that the English catechism was dear to Paul Henkel is based on the fact that he speaks of its use and popularity more than he does of his other works. It was also a valuable missionary tool among the English.

²[Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism: Composed

In the Address to all Christian Parents with which he prefaces his English catechism to the general public, he says:

You find here the form and plan of Luther's smaller Catechism, yet not in all points; neither is what you find here a correct translation of said Catechism, yet containing the same doctrine. . . . It is intended for an introduction to the knowledge of the Christian religion It is designed for all Christian Professors, who may desire to have their children instructed in the word of God.³

There are some marked differences between the Christian Catechism and the kleine Catechismus, and these differences, apparently, vary in accordance with the audience they were intended to serve.⁴ The German Edition of Luther's Small Catechism is more distinctively Lutheran, while the

for the Instruction of Youth, in the knowledge of the Christian Religion, Together, With an addition of Morning and Evening Prayers, & etc. (Printed in S. Henkel's Printing Office, New Market, Va.: 1816, Fifth edition, from the fourth enlarged edition). This edition does not differ in doctrinal phraseology and content from the first edition of 1811. Since it has the most additional material it is used in place of the first edition. The three catechisms printed in 1811 were, the above; Der Christliche Catechismus [the German edition of the above]; and Paul Henkel, Der keline Catechismus des. sel. D. Martin Luthers (Neu=Market, Schenandoah County [Virg.]: Gedruckt und zu haben bei Ambrosius Henkel und Comp., 1811).

³[Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, Address, p. 3.

⁴Ibid., pp. 1-19, and passim. A comparison of the two catechisms reveals, for example that: the form and numbering of the commandments followed the Reformed tradition. See Heidelberg Catechism (Revised Edition, tercentenary text, St. Louis, Missouri: Eden Publishing House, n.d.) in the Christian, and Luther's in the kleine. In the explanation of fourth commandment [third in Luther] it is said, "That we should so fear and love God, as not to neglect or despise the preaching of God's gospel word,

Christian Catechism appears, ironically, to stride the middle of the fence between Lutheran and Reformed doctrines.

A few comparisons between Henkel's rendering of Luther's Catechism and his own Christian Catechism will indicate the manner in which Paul Henkel attempted to speak to his environment, which was largely composed of English and people of Calvinistic background.

In his treatment of the Creed, in the third article, the interpretation of Luther's explanations are intensified; on "What believest thou of the Holy Ghost?" it is said, "I believe, that by the divine operation of the Holy Ghost I can be sanctified, or made holy;" following this remark, he gives Luther's words in substance.⁵ Henkel further makes a distinction between believers by adding the word "true," to Luther's simple "believers," who shall enter eternal life.⁶

Regarding the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, Henkel translates concerning the kingdom: [it comes when] "the word of God is taught with purity and sincerity," Luther's "in" emphasizes right teaching, Henkel's "with," the right intention. The kingdom is to "be within us," and the Holy Spirit enables us through grace to "live to the glory of God." When Henkel comes to the question "What is the

especially on the Sabbath day," The Christian Catechism, p. 8.

⁵Ibid., p. 14.

⁶Ibid., p. 15.

will of God toward us?" he answers, "It is the will of God to strengthen us in the true faith, and to continue us in the knowledge of his holy word unto the end of our lives."⁷

This explanation has a Lutheran ring. The prayer against temptation also strikes a familiar Lutheran note. Henkel asks, "What are we tempted to do?" and he answers, "We are tempted to disbelieve God's holy word, and to despair of his promises, by which we are liable to fall into many sins and vices."⁸

In explaining the Ten Commandments, Henkel's interpretation on idolatry and the worship of images is more in harmony with the Reformed view than Luther's emphasis upon the Sabbath, which meant for Luther, not so much as a legal rest day, but a holiday for worship and recreation.⁹ Creation is explained by Henkel in words strongly resembling the Westminster Shorter Catechism: Henkel asks, "What did God create man for?" and says, "God created man for his own glory, and that man should enjoy him for ever."¹⁰

The irenic note with the Reformed appears to be present in Henkel's explanation of the Lord's Supper.

⁷Ibid., p. 17.

⁸Ibid., p. 18.

⁹Ibid., pp. 27-32.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 41. See Question 1 of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, in Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom: With a History and Critical Notes (Fourth edition, revised and enlarged; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1919), III, 676.

On the nature of the sacrament, he says, "It is the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the external figure of bread and wine, given to Christians to eat and drink, as it was instituted by Christ himself."¹¹ In explaining how eating and drinking can effect the giving of the benefits, he says, "Partaking of bread and wine truly effect no such things, but faith in these words [of promise] which declare:--That the body of Christ was given for us, and his blood shed for the remission of sins."¹² In defining this still further, he remarks, "These words, together with eating and drinking of this bread and wine, is the sum and substance of this sacrament."¹³ Henkel speaks here in the past tense of the body given for us, and later in the expanded section on the Lord's Supper, in answer to the question, "Whereto was his body to be given?" he states, "It was given to the Cross."¹⁴ Henkel, however, affirms that the communicant has communion with the body and blood of Christ:

¹¹[Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, p. 22.

¹²Ibid., p. 23.

¹³Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 69. John Calvin could find this congenial, for he maintained that Christ's body and blood was given to the cross, and the participant has communion with the spiritual presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Calvin said, "the Sacrament sends us to the cross of Christ, where that promise [of redemption] was indeed performed and in all respects fulfilled." Quoted from, John T. McNeill and F. L. Battles, eds., and trans., Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion. Library of Christian

What is it to eat and drink of this bread and wine.
By eating this blessed bread and drinking this blessed cup, we have communion with the body and the blood of Christ; as St. Paul saith I Corinthians, chapter 10:16.

What saith he there? He saith: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"¹⁵

Henkel unites the elements with the body and blood of Christ in these answers, as he also did in his definition of the nature of the sacrament above. The contents of the Lutheran understanding of the nature of the sacrament are there, although his presentation in the Christian Catechism is weak on the specific mode and manner of receiving the real presence. His remarks regarding just what is received are not too clear:

What do these words of St. Paul, I Corinthians 10:16 teach us? They teach us, that the effects of Christ's body crucified, and his blood shed for us, are communicated to us by partaking of this sacrament.¹⁶

Henkel, perhaps means by "effects" that the blessings of Christ's death are given the communicants in his body and blood, which would be the Lutheran sense. That this was his intention is confirmed by a question following in the immediate context, where he asks, "What are the

Classics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960) XXI, 1363, and passim.

¹⁵[Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, pp. 73-74.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 74.

benefits thereof?"¹⁷ The reception of the effects of Christ's death is a thought more in harmony with the Reformed and the tradition of the later Melanchthon, than it is in accord with strict Lutheranism; which would declare unequivocally that Christ's body and blood are orally manducated in the Lord's Supper.¹⁸ In his Treatise Paul Henkel had given a clear witness to the fact that the body and blood of Christ are given and received in the Lord's Supper, and a confirmation of the fact that he felt he had explained the nature of the Sacrament sufficiently here is borne out by his own identification of the bread and wine "as" the body and blood of Christ in his footnote concerning the judgment on the unworthy.¹⁹

On the surface, however, the Christian Catechism is broad enough to be taken in a Lutheran or Reformed sense regarding the express substance of the consecrated elements.²⁰ The presentation still gives the reader the

¹⁷Ibid., p. 74.

¹⁸See The Heidelberg Catechism, Questions 75 through 79, pp. 73-79; Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion, XXI, Chapter XVII, section 1., p. 1361, and passim; Clyde Leonard Manschreck, Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer (New York, Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1958), Chapter 18, for a discussion of the views of the later Melanchthon on the nature of the Supper. For the Lutheran view, see Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgerischen Konfession 1930, 3. verbesserte Auflage, (Gottingen; Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, p. 64.

¹⁹[Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, p. 72, footnote.

²⁰L. A. Fox, "Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod,"

content of the Lutheran confession, although much would depend on the explanation given by the pastor or teacher using it. In Henkel's treatment of the sacrament in the kleine Catechismus, he follows Luther strictly, and omits any reference to the body being given to the cross, or of speaking in the past tense of the body and blood that "was given for us;" the statements on giving and receiving in the kleine Catechismus are in the present tense.²¹

The Christian Catechism directs itself, also, to Paul Henkel's environment in a polemical way, especially against the immersionists and sectarians. This polemic is chiefly to be found in the sections on baptism. Much of what Henkel had written at length in his Treatise is carried over into question and answer form in the catechism. A few examples are in order to portray that Henkel constructed the catechism to meet the contemporary needs of his environment.

He explains the nature of baptism as a blessed water of life:

water without the word of God . . . is mere water, and not the Christian baptism; but with the word of God it constitutes a Christian baptism, and a

Lutheran Quarterly Review, XIX (January 1889), 51, remarks "Rev., Paul Henkel's catechism does not stand the test of strict Lutheranism." Fox does not elaborate further.

²¹ [Paul Henkel], kleine Catechismus, pp. 64-66.

gracious water of life and laver of regeneration in the Holy Ghost: as St. Paul saith to Titus, chapter 3

The Word of God makes the water an effectual washing in itself, in accordance with Luther's Catechism. The benefit of baptism is given as, "Baptism with faith brings the pardon of sin, delivereth from death, and the power of Satan, and gives admittance into eternal life."²³

The Baptist Confession, by comparison placed faith before baptism, making the act of baptism a witness to an already awakened faith. This immersionist interpretation was the current concept prevalent in all the areas where Paul Henkel labored: The Confession said:

For neither Baptism, nor Supper, nor Church, nor any other outward Ceremony, without faith, regeneration, change or renewing of Life, can avail to please God, or to obtain any consolation or promise of Salvation from him all Penitent believers, who, by Faith, regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit are united with God . . . ought to be baptized with Water²⁴

By saying that "Baptism with faith brings the pardon of sins," Henkel was pointing out to his religious milieu that baptism and faith are to be united, that baptism precedes faith, and that faith receives the benefits that

²² [Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, p. 20.

²³ Ibid., p. 20.

²⁴ The Christian Confession: Of the Faith of the harmless Christians, in the Netherlands, known by the name of MENNONISTS (Amsterdam: Printed, and Reprinted by Ambrose Henkel and Comp., New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1810), pp. 14-15.

baptism offers. Henkel's explanation of baptism, his stress on the divine order and authority of baptism, as well as his remarks on instructing children in the meaning of their baptism were directed against the subjectivism of those who saw in baptism only an empty symbol or testimony to a faith that had been created apart from, and previous to the act itself. Baptism, for Henkel, sealed the recipient with faith and the hope of eternal life, and by seal he understood that one had the possession of that which the seal conveyed and guaranteed.²⁵

In the expanded explanation of the third article of the Creed on the church and sanctification, one can also see great variation between Paul Henkel and the sectarian wing of his environment.

The sects taught that the church was a visible body, and her presence could be determined "by her Faith, Doctrine, Love and godly Conversation, agreeable to the Scriptures; and by a fruitful living up, Practice, and observing of the true Ordinances of Christ" ²⁶

In comparison to this anthropocentrically oriented sanctification theology, Henkel is distinctively different. He uses similar terminology, but he does not end with a

²⁵ [Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, question 273, p. 66. See also his discussion of the Kauf-Brief in His Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, supra, p. 74, n. 141, chapter IV.

²⁶ The Christian Confession, p. 16.

biological interpretation of the sanctification process. Beginning with the call of the Holy Spirit through the gospel, he sees the work of the Holy Spirit centering in the inwardness of repentance followed by true faith in Jesus Christ. The consequences of repentance and faith are that, "Our hearts are thereby changed, our minds renewed, our wills sanctified, and our souls strengthened and comforted in every affliction, John 15, 26."²⁷ When, however, he explains of what holiness consists, which he does under his definition of the church, he defines holiness in relation to the forgiveness of sins:

Whereof doth that Church consist? That church consists of all true believing Christians, in all places and at all times throughout the whole world. Acts 10:35.

Why is it called the Christian church? Because, Jesus Christ instituted that church, and every regular member thereof is baptized in his name.

Why is it called a holy church? Because, all true believing members of the Christian church are cleansed from sin and made holy. John 1:7.

By what means is it that such are made holy? That they have the word of God to teach and direct them, and the holy sacraments to strengthen their faith; and to assure them of the pardon of their sins.²⁸

Henkel indicates that in the final analysis, holiness consists in faith in the forgiveness of sins in contradistinction to the observable piety of the believing

²⁷ [Paul Henkel], The Christian Catechism, pp. 50-51.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 51.

Christian. The church is hidden under faith. The trust of the heart, is what constitutes the nature of true faith. Henkel affirms this distinctly in his presentation on worthy participation in the Lord's Supper.

Shall such also receive this sacrament who have no power to live a holy life? Yes, all such, if they have but a sincere²⁹ desire to be holy, should receive this sacrament.

In a lengthy footnote, he deals pastorally with the fear that many have that they might receive the sacrament to their damnation, if they partake "before they are fully converted to God" ³⁰ In Henkel's usage, "fully converted" means having the evidence of a sanctified life. He answers first of all, that the term judgment in this context does not mean eternal damnation, but bodily ailments, then he goes on to comfort the troubled souls by saying,

these words of the Apostle are not to be understood as many understand them, and are thereby frightened from the Lord's table, but as is already shown, all who desire to reform their lives, may without any scruples on their minds, receive this sacrament. The blessed Saviour never instituted this sacrament as a snare to entangle ignorant souls³¹

The simple desire of the sinner to want to do better was sufficient, according to Henkel, for a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper. He does not conceive of sanctification

²⁹Ibid., p. 71.

³⁰Ibid., p. 71.

³¹Ibid., p. 73.

as a process which must be achieved as a condition for man's justification before God. On the other hand, this was the intent of the theology against which Paul Henkel was reacting.

The portions of the Christian Catechism that come from the hand of Paul Henkel are decidedly characterized by an objective and evangelical emphasis.³² Keeping this in mind, along with its stated design and purpose, it is useful as a witness to his theology in this period. The environmental factors, however, out of which it arose, must be given full value since they conditioned the make-up of the catechism, and to an extent determined its content; especially must this be taken into consideration regarding its irenicism toward the German Reformed.

Frontier conditions and their impact upon religious life tended to draw the two groups together into a common cause. This bond of unity, earlier transplanted from the Palatinate, and nurtured by environmental conditions, did play a large role in cementing relations among the

³²In addition to the material here presented, The Christian Catechism contained items heretofore absent in many Lutheran catechisms of the period; the Office of the Keys, Festivals of the Church, the Creeds, the Confession of Sins, etc., See B. M. Schmucker, "Luther's Small Catechism," The Lutheran Church Review, V (April, July 1886), for a presentation of the early American Lutheran catechisms. Henkel's work was a marked Lutheran advance over the catechisms of Dr. Velthusen's North Carolina Catechism in use in the south, and Virginia, since 1787, which was comparable to the later Quitman Catechism, famed for its rationalism and subjectivism, see B. M. Schmucker, pp. 98, 174.

Germans of both communions.³³ These ties would tend to make a man cautious in creating a division, or giving offense to those upon whom he was dependent for help and support against their common foes, such as the sectarians.³⁴

Various Mission Journeys 1811-1814

After the printing of The Christian Catechism, Paul Henkel and his two sons, Andrew and Charles made another missionary trip to North Carolina [May to August 1811]. Upon the urging of his son Philip, he also extended his missionary labors into South Carolina, preaching and administering the Lord's Supper in many places.

He "went to considerable trouble to make a very plain explanation of the order and true nature of regeneration."³⁵ This was done in opposition to the "false doctrines that had crept in among the people, like holiness and irresistible grace."³⁶ Henkel's activities were characterized by preaching "upon the importance of catechetical instruction

³³H. E. Jacobs, A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States (American Church History Series, IV; New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1983), Chapter XIX, p. 309. Jacobs gives many illustrations and examples of unionism among Lutherans and the Reformed.

³⁴A Chronological Life, pp. 168, 472. These pages mention Henkel's affection for Pastor Jacob Laros, a German Reformed minister, who remained Henkel's life-long friend.

³⁵Ibid., p. 308.

³⁶Ibid., p. 309.

for old and young, and the duty of all Christians to observe the regular use of the Lord's Supper."³⁷ In South Carolina, he noted that "The people seemed hungry for the Gospel,"³⁸ and he devoted himself to explaining "the way of salvation."³⁹ Henkel, by expressly mentioning his correction of the false doctrines of holiness and irresistible grace, indicates that his correct explanation of experimental Christianity must be taken in the Lutheran sense of teaching the true nature of a living faith.⁴⁰ His work shows that he was directing the people to the source and means through which this living faith was to be nurtured and strengthened. In order to serve this purpose, Henkel also distributed and sold many of his books before returning home to Virginia.⁴¹

³⁷Ibid., p. 312.

³⁸Ibid., p. 302.

³⁹Ibid., p. 301. The context reads, "I learned from Mr. Dreher and others that the ministrations of Pastor Storch and my son Philip made the people desirous for further enlightenment in the way of salvation, especially on the subject of experimental Christianity. I held a brief service at candle light." The place was South Carolina.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 309. Henkel remarks that "We fought the battles vigorously with the sword of the Spirit" [that is, the Word of God].

⁴¹Ibid., p. 294, and passim. Gottlieb Schober received a large number of the English catechisms; and an old Negro was given one to read to his bretheren; the new German hymnbook was widely distributed. His relations with Schober were most cordial. In 1811, the Henkel press also reprinted a little book titled A Choice Drop of Honey from the Rock Christ, or a Short Word of Advice to all

After returning to Virginia, Paul Henkel moved to Point Pleasant in October 1811. David, one of Paul's younger sons, who later became the most articulate theologian of the Henkel family, remained in New Market with his older brother Solomon to further his studies for the ministry. David was then in his sixteenth year.⁴²

Some of the notable events out of the year 1812 which reflect upon the ministry of Paul Henkel, and which serve to provide the background toward understanding his theology were developments shaping up in Ohio and North Carolina.

The North Carolina Synod again had a misunderstanding about their time of meetings, and after meeting briefly in September 1811, decided to continue this synod in April 1812.⁴³ The important business conducted in April

Saints and Sinners (London; Printed in the Year MDCCXXVIII [1738]). And Reprinted by Ambrose Henkel and Co., New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1811). It bears an inscription to the reader signed G. Schober. The merit of this little work is the high view of justification solely by the merits of Christ without any worthiness in man which it contains. It tends, though, to separate grace from the means of grace. "Judas may have the sop, the outward privilege of baptism, supper, church fellowship, but John leaned on Christ's bosom, John 13:23." [p. (27).] This little work was widely distributed by Schober in North Carolina. Paul Henkel's thought, however, is moving more concretely toward the usage of the means of grace as containing the promises in which faith trusts.

⁴²A Chronological Life, pp. 314-315. David specialized in the languages, especially Latin and Greek, and outlined a Greek Grammar. It is hard to determine just who tutored David in theology, but the evidence shows that his father, Solomon, and the printing establishment had considerable influence upon him. This influence is to have impact upon David's theological growth.

⁴³Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North

included the opening of correspondence with the Pennsylvania Synod toward establishing a closer union,⁴⁴ and passing a resolution regarding the use of Paul Henkel's catechism.⁴⁵

From Point Pleasant, Paul Henkel made a brief missionary trip to Ohio in this year. While there he noted that the "Immersionists have wrought much confusion among these people."⁴⁶ Although Henkel could be a sharp critic of the sectarians, he did not refuse to participate with them even at this later period.⁴⁷ Significantly, however, a trend toward the development of a stronger Lutheran consciousness in Ohio is beginning to awaken, for in the year 1812 the first special conference of Lutheran pastors took place.⁴⁸ Paul Henkel was a guiding light to this formation and

Carolina. From 1803-1826, Twenty-Three Conventions.
Translated from the German Protocol by F. W. E. Peschau
(Newberry, S. C.: Aull and Houseal, Printers, 1894), pp.
12-15.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 15.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 15. The Minutes read: "In answer to the question, Which catechism should be the basis of instruction? It was unanimously resolved that Luther's Smaller Catechism must ever be the basis of catechetical instruction; and the catechism of Ambrosius Henkel, explaining Luther's, can be used, but this is left to each pastor to do as he pleases."

⁴⁶A Chronological Life, p. 239.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 335, and passim. In the years 1812 through 1814, Paul Henkel records sharing a service with a Baptist preacher, allowing a Presbyterian to preach for him in New Market, and maintaining on-going fraternal relations with the Reformed.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 336. See also C. V. Sheatsley, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States: From the Earliest Beginnings to 1919 (Century

his spirit was early imprinted upon it.⁴⁹ The year 1813 contains little of note in his diary.⁵⁰

The year 1814 found Paul Henkel on a mission tour of South Carolina. His theological remarks indicate that he was conscious of strengthening the people in the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran church.

Though I had preached twice in Bethel Church, I was urged to preach again today, which I did stressing the doctrines of our Lutheran Church and touching on the practical subjects of conference, language, etc.⁵¹

His concerns center especially on the Lord's Supper.

In South Carolina, he records,

At the request of Mr. Dreher [Lutheran pastor] I explained in both languages the doctrines of

Memorial Edition; 1919), pp. 51-53, for a description of the first conference. Paul Henkel could not attend because of the War of 1812, as his biographer notes.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 349-350. W. D. Allbeck places the position of leadership upon Johannes Stauch and as the leading resident pastor of Ohio this is probable, but the diary accounts [see supra, p. 64 n. 113] show that Paul Henkel exercised theological guidance over Stauch, and the later theological character of the Synod of Ohio reflects the impact of Henkel's conservatism. For a fuller treatment of the special conferences, see Willard D. Allbeck, A Century of Lutherans in Ohio (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1966), pp. 38-56.

⁵⁰A Chronological Life, pp. 349-350. Henkel attended the special conference of Ohio in 1813. Much of the time he spent at home in Point Pleasant working on hymns for his English hymnal.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 384-385. What is significant about these remarks is the mention of the name Lutheran, and specifically the doctrines of the Lutheran Church. This identification rarely occurs in the diary of Paul Henkel. This is the first mention of the name Lutheran in the diary.

the Lord's Supper. Many things I presented seemed new to the people.⁵²

Some weeks later at a communion service in the Cove Creek Church in Tennessee, Henkel reflects,

We were greeted by a very large gathering as is always the case on Communion days. Both of us [his son, Philip] preached. My sermon made a deeper impression than any that I preached on the whole trip in that district. I myself felt the significance of the sermon and administration of the Communion more than usual.⁵³

In this year, when his awareness of distinctive Lutheranism appears to be coming more to the foreground, Henkel does not draw from it, however, a demand for isolation from other religious persuasions. An incident occurred in South Carolina which resulted in these comments:

The next day I preached in an old Reformed Church; the sermon seemed to make a deep impression. What seemed to arouse the greater curiosity was the fact that there were two Lutheran ministers in that community that refused to join any conference or synod with other ministers. Their congregations did not acknowledge me as a regular minister and there I was not to preach in their churches, but this condition stirred up an interest and many came to hear me preach to learn for themselves.⁵⁴

⁵²Ibid., p. 386. There is little theological comment in his diary from this year. Thus it appears that what Henkel does mention was important to himself.

⁵³Ibid., p. 391. This celebration was preceded by a period of inner contemplation. The day before, Henkel during a service, "spent the moments in deep thought. The inward contemplations continued even after we left the church and crowded themselves into my mind" Henkel's diary is normally marked by its absence of self-reflection.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 385. Paul Henkel did not change this stance, although after 1820 and the formation of the Tennessee Synod there are indications that his thinking

It had been in this neighborhood that he had preached in German and English on the doctrines of the Lord's Supper, which seemed so new to the people.

Before returning to New Market, Paul Henkel visited his son David.⁵⁵ He also attended the twelfth convention of the North Carolina Synod. Henkel took a leading part in the transactions of this synodical meeting (1814), which passed resolutions restricting the somewhat loose practices of the licensure system.⁵⁶ At the close of the year he returned to Virginia.

The Church Hymn-Book of 1815-1816

Paul Henkel spent the greater part of the year 1815 working toward the publication of his Church Hymn Book.

on church fellowship were altered toward a more rigid position.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 392-393. Paul and his son David frequently corresponded [Ibid., p. 360, 1813]. This year he visited and worked with his son. It is important to make note of these factors to offset [or at least balance] the opinion that there developed an alledged rift [about 1817] between Paul and David. Mention of apparent disagreement between them is cited in L. A. Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod [An address delivered at its Centennial Celebration in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920] pp. 8-9.

⁵⁶Concerning the North Carolina synodical meeting of 1814, David Henkel was continued as a catechist [he had been licensed as catechist in 1813], and a resolution was passed that "no uneducated person shall receive license to preach until he has studied under one of our pastors and is twenty-one years of age." Synod had also passed a resolution in the previous year [1813] that it would no longer allow any two pastors to license a catechist, hereafter it would be done alone by the Synod. See, F. W. E. Peschau, Minutes of the North Carolina Synod, pp. 18-24.

It is dated 1816, but was probably printed in October 1815.⁵⁷ There are more than 600 hymns in the work, with 291 from the hand of Paul Henkel.⁵⁸ In his Preface to the reader, he outlines the format of the hymnal and the purpose of his arrangement.

The reason why these Hymns are suited to certain portions of the Holy Scripture, is, because such order anciently was and is yet observed in some Christian Churches; and those who wish still to follow that order, will find a conveniency to do so; and those who wish not to observe that order, will find nothing in this order to impede them in using these hymns as they may see cause.⁵⁹

The hymnal is universal in scope. It follows the order of the Christian year, and has hymns for every church occasion, personal devotion, all aspects of Christian faith and life [these follow the traditional pattern of the creed, the order of salvation found in Lutheran catechisms, or that may have been found in one of the

David Henkel is later to experience difficulty with the strictures here beginning to be imposed.

⁵⁷A Chronological Life, p. 404.

⁵⁸For a presentation and evaluation of this hymnal, see B. H. Pershing, "Paul Henkel: Frontier Missionary, Organizer, and Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, VII (January 1935), pp. 115-118. Pershing also has a good evaluation of The Christian Catechism, pp. 111-115.

⁵⁹Paul Henkel, Church Hymn Book: Consisting of Newly Composed Hymns, with an addition of Hymns and Psalms, from other authors, Carefully adapted for the use of Public Worship, and many other occasions (First edition; New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia: Solomon Henkel's Printing Office, 1816), pp. v-vi.

popular compendiums],⁶⁰ for the military, for travelers, and seasons of the year.

The hymnal, according to its design, was intended for the whole English-speaking church of its day, and therefore does not lend itself so readily as a witness to the theology of Paul Henkel. One can denote Henkelian accents, however, in a number of his own hymns. One on baptism, for example, betrays its close familiarity with his Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

God did to father Abrah'm say,
I am a God to thee:
And I will bless thy race and they
Shall be a seed for me.

Thus Abrah'm b'liev'd the promise true,
And gave his sons to God.
As water seals the promise now,
It then was seal'd with blood.

His offsprings then were circumcis'd,
Tho' none, but just the male:
But male and female are baptiz'd;
Baptism is the seal.

To all the nations as they are:
The heathens and the Jews,
May claim an equal right and share,
As the Apostle shews.

⁶⁰One of the popular compendiums was Johannes Anastasias Freilinghausens, Theological Definitions, or Theological Descriptions of the Christian Articles of Faith, being the fundamentals of theology in the form of a compendium with the citations of the principal Bible passages for the proofs of holy Scripture, prepared and collected together by a lover of godly truth (Ninth edition; Halle, printed in the Orphanage, 1767). German Title: Definitiones Theologicae, oder Theologische Beschreibungen der Christl. Glaubens=Articul, aus Hrn. Joh. Anastasii Freilinghausens, Pastoris zu St. Ulrich in Hall, Grundlegung der Theologie und deren Compendio, Mit Anführung der vornehmsten zum Beweisthum gehörigen Sprüche der heiligen Schrift, Verfertiget und zusammen gezogen von einem Liebhaber

Then as the water is appli'd,
 And God his gifts impart;
 The creature then is sanctifi'd,
 And circumcis'd at heart.⁶¹

Regarding the confession of sins, Henkel puts into verse the imperfections of the sanctified.

My case is bad, and still much more,
 Although distress'd I feel;
 I do not yet possess that pow'r
 That sanctifies my will.

But thou, my God, hast pow'r I know;
 Such graces to impart,
 That can create my mind anew
 And work a change of heart.⁶²

Again, he points up the impossibility of the Christian to even know himself rightly, before God, and this pleads His mercy.

My sins are great, I must confess,
 Far more than I can know;
 But O, thy love and pard'ning grace!
 Are great and boundless too.

Yet save my soul from deep despair,
 According to thy word;
 To thee, I make my feeble pray'r;
 To thee, my gracious Lord.⁶³

Henkel's own communion hymns, as well as the selections he makes from others, contain only the emphasis on the

der göttlichen Wahrheit.

⁶¹Paul Henkel, Church Hymn Book, hymn CLXXII, pp. 175-176.

⁶²Ibid., Hymn CLXXX, p. 181. The emphasis is on what God gives and works in man.

⁶³Ibid., Hymn CLXXXI, pp. 181-182.

sacrament as the gospel.

Dear Lord, if sin can be a plea,
Then there is grace in store for me;
Through mercy I shall find a place,
And with the rest be sav'd by grace.

I come, O Saviour as I am!
Thy merits I do humbly claim;
Thy promise give me free access,
To everlasting life and peace.⁶⁴

Paul Henkel does not go into detail on the nature of the Lord's Supper in his communion hymns. The "whatness" of the sacrament is stated, but the hymns stress the benefits received, primarily the infinite love of the Father and the Son portrayed in terms of invitation, forgiving grace, and merciful acceptance of the person as he is, not in what he should become.

O Jesus! thou my precious friend,
Here at thy table I attend,
Here Lord, I come with sin oppress'd,
Yet, I desire to be thy guest.

Jesus, this feast himself ordain'd,
Great are the blessings here obtain'd,
The choicest and the richest food,
In his dear body and his blood.

We praise him for his precious love,
That love which we here taste and prove,

⁶⁴Ibid., Hymn CLXXXIV, pp. 184-185. This is the characteristic motif of all the communion hymns. All man can plead is his sin. The somewhat bold statement that the communion hymns contain "only" the emphasis on the sacrament as gospel is justified on the basis of the notable absence of the idea of "amendment of life" after receiving grace. The response of the communicant is that of thanksgiving and praise. This serves to confirm Henkel's central thought on the use of the sacrament, that the sacrament is not judgment, but grace and forgiveness. His deep concern for the troubled conscience which feared the sacrament manifests itself in the choice and composition of his communion hymns.

Such love as to the world unknown,
The love God hath to sinners shown.⁶⁵

A hymn on the "true Christian faith" indicates that Henkel views faith more in its relational or dynamic nature [as Luther] than its metaphysical dimensions.

God's grace it is by faith embrac'd,
The Saviour is receiv'd;
All confidence in him is plac'd,
His promises are b'liev'd

This faith it worketh confidence,
And casts out slavish fear:
Then shall that work of grace commence,
And we learn what we are.⁶⁶

True faith is a living, active things, according to Luther, and Henkel expresses the power of faith to "work a living hope," "and "cheer the mind," in a hymn that concludes with this prayer:

My God create such faith in me!
Confirm my confidence in thee;
Establish thou my wav'ring heart,
Till I shall see thee as thou art.⁶⁷

Justification receives a clear testimony by disclaiming all efforts and offerings of the Christian as meriting God's favor.

All off'rings were in vain,
That ever could be brought,
Without effects they must remain,
And were esteemed as nought.

⁶⁵Ibid., Hymn CXCI, pp. 194-196. This communion hymn traces the plan of salvation and centers it in the events of the passion history. Again, one can see Henkel's basic approach to the Bible as the book of salvation history.

⁶⁶Ibid., Hymn CCLXXV, pp. 268-269.

⁶⁷Ibid., Hymn CCLXXVI, p. 269.

That righteousness I plead,
 For which my Jesus died;
 No other righteousness I need
 To make me justified.⁶⁸

Following hymns on justification [in good Lutheran order] are two on sanctification.⁶⁹ Sanctification is seen by Henkel as the result of God's grace bestowing likeness to God and Christ. Grace is the motivating power for Christian life, not the threat of punishment, or future retribution. Uniquely, Henkel views the unsanctified life as being so out of harmony with the nature of God that it would not enjoy heaven unless purified. This purity, however, is basically a disposition of the heart, not a biological transformation, in the sense of an increased quantity of holiness. He says,

Tho' I had all my sins forgiv'n,
 But yet to vice a slave,
 And could possess the courts of heav'n,
 What comforts could I have?

Was I invited to a feast,
 And welcome to the place;
 Half naked, ragged, meanly dress'd,
 How could I show my face?

Such is the case with sinners too,
 Should they with angels dwell,
 Their just and holy God to view,
 Would prove to them a hell.

Grant me dear Lord thy spirit's pow'r,
 To make me pure in heart,

⁶⁸Ibid., Hymn CCLXXIX, pp. 272-273.

⁶⁹Following hymns on sanctification are those on spiritual warfare, watching unto prayer, Christian life, and so on.

Which makes me able to endure
To see thee as thou art.⁷⁰

Purity of heart for Paul Henkel means honesty before God. This is an honesty that knows oneself as a sinner, acknowledges the fact, accepts forgiveness, and then strives out of the love received to live a life pleasing to so gracious a God. He views the Christian life as service to God over against the service of Satan. He does not view it as a testing ground to determine whether the reward will be won on merit. His sanctification theology is one of "be what you are--a justified sinner/saint." His hymns on "heaven and future happiness" attest this paradox.

We are but men and oft we fail;
What changes in this life take place;
When Satan, world and flesh prevail,
How soon it mars and breaks our peace.

Lo here we seek, but there we find,
Where we in glory shall appear,
And perfect peace shall fill the mind,
And banish ev'ry doubt and fear.⁷¹

In relation to its environment, and considering the free church character of Christianity on the frontier at this period, the Church Hymn Book presents an authoritative view of the church. Its high regard for the order

⁷⁰Ibid., Hymn CCLXXX, pp. 273-274.

⁷¹Ibid., Hymn CCXXXVI, pp. 234-235.

of the church, and its sense for the continuity of history witness to this view.⁷²

The Gathering Storm of Doctrinal Conflict 1816-1818

Events in North Carolina

Three important developments took place in 1816, occurring in each of the states in which Paul Henkel exercised his ministry.

David Henkel and his wife visited their parental home in Virginia, and David worked in the congregations with his father. From the diary it appears that David had a lecture which he had prepared on baptism and the Lord's Supper, and he delivered it on a number of occasions.⁷³ Paul Henkel calls it a sermon, but it required "four hours in its delivery,"⁷⁴ and aroused questions in the minds of the hearers.

⁷²Ibid., see the hymns for the Ordering of Church Wardens, and the Ordaining of Priests and Bishops. The terms are quite significant, and the later view of the Tennessee Synod was that the local pastor is a bishop of the church universal. See The Constitution of the Tennessee Synod, Art. VI, with the Remarks by David Henkel in Liturgy, or Book of Forms Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1843), pp. 213-215. It has its antecedents in embryo here. The sense of history is witnessed to by the inclusion of the ancient litanies and suffrages, and so on.

⁷³A Chronological Life, p. 422. David preached this four hour discourse on June 9, 14, and 20 in different churches.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 422-423. On the 20th of June David "was called into question in regard to his doctrines." Paul

In Ohio the trend is continuing toward an independent Lutheran synodical structure. Andrew Henkel had gone to Ohio from North Carolina in this year to serve in that field. He is listed as the secretary of the sixty special conference of Ohio that met at Lancaster, August 31 to September 4. The important event of this conference was the appeal which it made to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania "to form a synod of their own, in order that they might license and ordain ministers for their large and needy field."⁷⁵ Paul Henkel was absent from this meeting, probably due to his preparations for removal to Point Pleasant from New Market later in September.⁷⁶ On the literary side, this session printed the Augsburg Confession for the benefit of the adults of the church, and appended it to the minutes of the conference. This would find full concurrence by Paul Henkel.⁷⁷

Henkel knew at first hand his son's doctrinal emphases, some three years before the fateful North Carolina Synod of 1819, in which these same doctrinal issues formed the basis for the later rupture.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 427. It is significant that Henkel uses the term "synod," since for all practical purposes the Ohio conference began to function as a synod before it was convened as such, officially, in 1818; some of the pastors looked upon the conference as a synod already in 1817 before authorization was received from the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. A full discussion is given in Allbeck, pp. 50-54.

⁷⁶A Chronological Life, p. 427.

⁷⁷Supra, p. 45, n. 48, chapter IV, for the same reason Paul Henkel had the Augsburg Confession printed in

The most significant events bearing on the theology of Paul Henkel and his sons took place in North Carolina. In the previous year, Philip Henkel served as President of the Synod, and David and Andrew were licensed as candidates for the ministry.⁷⁸ Strictures governing the licensing of catechists and candidates continued to become more rigid, having been a continual concern of the Synod since 1813, and signs of discontent reveal themselves in the Minutes of this year (1816). David Henkel expected ordination, "but this was not approved."⁷⁹ In the place of it, he was given a special concession of being allowed to administer the sacraments in all congregations, although the Synod had passed a resolution at the same convention that "Candidates who perform

Virginia and North Carolina, that is, for the benefit of the church. See Allbeck, p. 29, where this information is contained.

⁷⁸Peschau, pp. 24-26.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 29. The normal procedure was licensing a catechist and a candidate on a yearly basis. David Henkel had been a catechist since 1813. In 1815, since four of the oldest pastors were absent, the Synod decided to permit no ordinations in that year p. 24. The reason is not given why David Henkel was not approved for ordination. The Minutes speak of "bitterness from Lincoln" manifesting itself. G. D. Bernheim, History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina, From the Earliest Period of the Colonization of the Dutch, German and Swiss Settlers to the Close of the First Half of the Present Century (Philadelphia, The Lutheran Book Store, 1872), pp. 425-429. Bernheim elaborates on the cause of the so-called bitterness. Commenting upon the minutes of 1816 [unobtainable by the present writer], he quotes, "under the pretext that disturbances had been caused in said county [Lincoln] by the impression that

all ministerial acts are limited to certain congregations." This concession appears to have been a sop given to David in lieu of his expected ordination. The probable reason that David was not ordained in this year, which would have been normal practice, was the doctrinal differences between himself and Schober, especially over the Lord's Supper. An important letter from Schober to David, dated October 20, 1818, reveals the disparate views of Schober over against David Henkel on the nature of the sacrament. This letter contains an important reference to a meeting they had together in 1816, after David had returned from a visit with his father in Virginia. Schober wrote, "as I told you once at my home when you returned from Virginia and asked me on this subject [of the nature of the Lord's Supper], so I think yet" ⁸¹ Schober held to a

it was antichristian for any one to administer the sacraments without ordination, it was vehemently insisted upon that the candidates be ordained." The writers who favor the North Carolina Synod over against the Henkels tend to slant the origin of the rupture as being due to David Henkel's personality clash, primarily with Schober. The evidence, however, points to the fact that David had come to deeply held convictions on the basis of the Lutheran Symbols, through which it became a theological necessity for him to strive for ordination. Daniel Moser, like David, was licensed in 1813 and ordained in 1817, while David was not. Schober and David had already clashed over doctrine in 1815, see the presentation in L. A. Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod (An Address Delivered At Its Centennial Celebration in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920) (n.p., n.d.), passim.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 28.

⁸¹Portions of this letter are quoted in full in F. Bente, American Lutheranism; Early History of American Lutheranism and the Tennessee Synod (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing

spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Their discussion hints at the fact that Schober and David were engaged in an on-going debate about the sacrament. As has been noted, in this same year, David was presenting his lecture on the sacraments. These factors, taken together, make it a tangible certainty that the fundamental issue brewing in North Carolina had already been cast by 1816, and the licensure question was in reality only the surface symptom of a deeper disparity over distinctive Lutheran doctrines. The personal resentments developing between these two men, arising out of these basic differences, could have led the older man in power to prevent the young David from achieving that position which he much desired.⁸²

House, 1919) I, 129. A copy of this letter was handwritten into a pocket diary of 1820 of Paul Henkel's and is to be found in hardly legible form in ink-covered condition in the Archives of the Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri. The trip to Virginia mentioned above is beyond doubt the one referred to by Schober, as Paul Henkel records no other visit by David to the Virginia home. This substantiation is important to document since Paul Henkel is notably silent in his diary about troubles in the south, see the remark by Jacob L. Morgan, B. S. Brown, and John Hall, ed., History of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina (Published by the authority of the United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1803-1953, n.p., n.d.), p. 44.

⁸²For the two-sided question whether the conflict between Schober and David Henkel was personal or doctrinal, see the discussion of Bernheim, pp. 434-435, for the view "that doctrinal differences did not, at first, cause the division in the Church in the years 1819 and 1820;" and Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, for the view that "there was the personal element in the attitude of Schober and David Henkel that became stronger until it grew into bitterness, but there was also the doctrinal element from the very beginning that intensified the personal dislike" [p. 3]

At any rate, the convention of 1816 marks the beginning of a theological disagreement which will continue to gain momentum, and finally end in a synodical schism in 1820.

The impression given by the writings, and events of the year 1816 show a corresponding relationship between the Henkels and their environment. The growth of their Lutheran consciousness is bringing to light the doctrinal laxness of their correlative effect of sharpening the Henkel's Lutheran sensitivities. The theology of Paul Henkel is both molding, and being molded by his environment.⁸³ The direction has been mapped out, from now on it is a matter of the intensified impact of his theology upon its milieu.

This beginning occurred already in 1815, when at Organ Church an argument between Schober and David Henkel ensued over ordination. "Schober's ears from that time were open for evidence against him" [p. 2]. A hint that there may have been internal trouble of a marked degree already in 1814 is suggested by a letter of Henry Zink, a preacher in the state of Tennessee, who wrote a letter to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania about the relations between her and North Carolina. He received this reply from Dr. Helmuth: "That no schism exists between our Ministerium and the Ministerium of North Carolina, and advise him [Zink] to connect with the Carolina Ministerium." Quoted in William Edward Eisenberg, The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962, including An Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee (Lynchburg, Virginia: J. P. Bell Company, 1967), p. 122.

⁸³Without the theology of Paul Henkel manifesting itself in the earlier years, it remains unexplainable why David Henkel raised the particular questions that he did on the Lord's Supper, baptism, faith and the authority of the Augsburg Confession. When David's theology is studied, its accents are remarkably those of his father,

The Book called Luther

The tercentenary of the Reformation was celebrated in 1817, and the American children of the Reformation honored the occasion with services and publications recounting the blessings of the Reformation.⁸⁴ The general characteristic of the American observances reflected the spirit of the times, which was a prevailing unionism.

The North Carolina Synod contributed to the observance in accordance with this spirit, by authorizing and printing a book by Schober, popularly titled Luther.⁸⁵ Ironically, this book by Schober only serves to show how far Lutheranism in America had departed from the theology of the Reformation.

only intensified and developed more systematically. Hence, Paul Henkel's theology resulted in its continuation through his son, which then made its impact upon its environment, in North Carolina. Paul Henkel will be seen moving toward an intensified Lutheran theology in Ohio, infra, p. 136.

⁸⁴Alvin Kohlmann, "The Tennessee Synod--It's History and Church Polity," (Unpublished Masters of Sacred Theology Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1958), pp. 10-13. He provides a good terse overview of the observances in the United States, and quotes a hymn written for the tercentenary that captures the spirit of how the Reformation was interpreted: "Luther! Zwingli! Joined with Calvin! From error's sin The Church to free Restored religious liberty." See also Abdel R. Wentz, A Basic History of Lutheranism in America (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955), pp. 13, 95.

⁸⁵The full title is given in The Library of Congress Catalogue of Printed Cards, Vol., 136, 1945, p. 60. "A Comprehensive Account of the Rise and Progress of the Blessed Reformation of the Christian Church. By Doctor Martin Luther: began on the thirty-first of October, A. D. 1517. Interspersed with views of his character and doctrine, extracted from his books, and how the Church, established by

Its main theological features are, on the one hand, a latitudinarianism which would enable all denominations to unite, who "worship Jesus as a God;"⁸⁶ and, on the other hand, a toning down of certain articles of the Augsburg Confession "making them agreeable to all denominations."⁸⁷ The book Luther encouraged crass unionism along naive lines. Schober remarked within its covers:

Why are we not all united in love and union? Why these distances, controversies, disputes, mutual condemnations, why these splitting of formulas? Why cannot the Church of Christ be one flock under one Shepherd? . . . what a fortunate event would it be if all churches would unite and send delegates to a general convention of all denominations and there could settle down on Christ, the Rock, while at the same time each denomination would be permitted to retain its peculiar ways and forms." . . . I have attentively examined the doctrine of the Episcopalian Church . . . the Presbyterians . . . the Methodist . . . the Baptist Among all those classes, who

him, arrived and progressed in North America, as also, the constitution and rules of that church, in North Carolina and adjoining states, as existing in October, 1815."

⁸⁶Quoted in, Bernheim, p. 434.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 433. For the contents of the book Luther see also, Bente, I, 120-122, and Socrates Henkel, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel and Co., Printers and Publishers, 1890), pp. 11-13. The work itself contains the personal views of Schober, endorsed by a synodical meeting. They are not necessarily the views of the member pastors, though some concurred in them, principally Storck. There is evidence pointing to the arbitrary rule of the synod by Schober, which would make one cautious in saying, as Bernheim, "that the sentiments therein expressed [in Luther] were the sentiments of Synod at that time, and that all its ministers were united in faith as therein exhibited," Bernheim, p. 434.

worship Jesus as a God, I see nothing of importance to prevent a cordial union.⁸⁸

Regarding the Augsburg Confession, the translation used in Luther was that of E. L. Hazelius, "with all its omissions and notes."⁸⁹ The word "true" was omitted in the tenth article from before the word "body," and the word "external" was added which occurred in neither the Latin nor the German text. In place of the German word "Gestalt" [form or appearance], which would convey the Reformers' sense of the outward form of a material, or substantial object, the word "sign" from the Latin was used, which in English bears the interpretation of signification.⁹⁰ In his own appended notation, Schober explains the Lord's Supper merely as a memorial act, and says nothing about receiving the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament.⁹¹

Confession and absolution are disregarded as a remnant of Romanism:

This article [the eleventh] was inserted at

⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 433-434, and F. Bente, I, 121. The quotation is a compilation from the quotations given in these two sources.

⁸⁹Socrates Henkel, p. 11.

⁹⁰S. S. Schmucker, The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated, in Several Occasional Discourses (Fifth Edition; Philadelphia: E. W. Miller, Ranstead Place, 1852), p. 175, and A. L. Gräbner, Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in America (Erster Theil; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1892), p. 648. The above information is a compilation from both these sources.

⁹¹Schmucker, American Lutheran Church, p. 175. Schmucker quotes Schober's notation.

the time of the delivery of this Confession, chiefly to show a conciliatory spirit to the other party; but the practice of private confession and absolution is entirely discontinued in our Lutheran Churches⁹²

The synodical committee appointed to examine Luther and report on its findings was composed of R. J. Miller, Philip Henkel, and J. E. Bell. They reported that, "they had examined said manuscript, and do highly approve of its contents, and recommend it to be published, believing that it will have a beneficial effect throughout our congregations, and give succinct information to other Christians what the Lutheran Church is."⁹³ The Synod approved and authorized the book. Bernheim concludes from this that since both David and Philip Henkel were present at this convention, and neither protested against the book, but both circulated it for sale, that they must have been agreeable to it.⁹⁴ It is doubtful, however, whether that would have been the case. After Paul Henkel's written and avowed theological stance, his opposition to the false concepts of holiness and the regeneration theology of revivalism, and standing alone in North Carolina years before for the regular order

⁹²Ibid., p. 175.

⁹³Quoted in Bernheim, p. 433. Bernheim also says, "Synod unanimously adopted said report, and directed the treasurer to have 1500 copies printed." See also, for Confirmation, Peschau, p. 34.

⁹⁴Bernheim, p. 435.

of the church, it is unlikely that he would be in sympathy with the loose doctrinal views expressed in Luther. David had been teaching the true Lutheran doctrine of the real presence "as early as 1815 with such force as to create antagonism,"⁹⁵ for "exception" had been taken to his teaching on the sacrament by a Presbyterian, Mr. Hoyle.⁹⁶ It is therefore inconclusive that he would have consented to the the theology of the book.

The solution to the problem of why the Henkel's did not officially protest at this time must be sought in other reasons than their supposed agreement with the doctrine and practice current in North Carolina in 1817. That David, at least, publicly and privately protested is affirmed by his debates with Schober, which date back to 1815 when Schober and David clashed over doctrine.⁹⁷ Three tangible reasons suggest themselves as possible solutions. The first is that David Henkel looked upon the book, Luther, as a legal document containing the constitution of the synod, without subscribing to the specific views, or sections, personally belonging to Schober.⁹⁸ Secondly, they may have been

⁹⁵Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 4.

⁹⁶B. D. Wessinger, "The Work of the Pioneers of the Tennessee Synod" [An Address Delivered AT Its Centennial Celebration By Its President, In Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920], p. 13.

⁹⁷Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, pp. 2-3.

⁹⁸David Henkel, The Carolinian Herald of Liberty, Religious and Political (Salisbury, N. C.: Krider and

reluctant to damage the close ties of friendship, and the external peace and work of the church, and thus were laboring toward a harmonious solution. Paul Henkel had the conservatism of his older years, and the manner in which he tried to retain the relations between the Ohio men and the Ministerium of Pennsylvania indicate that his method would favor "silent persuasion through teaching" rather than that of abrupt confrontation.⁹⁹ The third, and most weighty consideration, which is passed over in silence by the historians of the North Carolina Synod, is the increasingly articulate advocacy of unionism by the leaders of the Synod. The onus of being disputatious cannot be placed on David Henkel alone, for it appears from the records that as Schober and Storch, chiefly Schober, acquired more voice in the Synod, they also became more open about their desired goals. The unionistic grew and became more public, official, and synodical. Two articulate forces, each interacting upon the other, were heading toward open conflict.

Items from the North Carolina Convention of 1817

Added to the broad unionistic statements expressed by Schober in Luther were other items endorsed by the 1817

Bingham, 1821), pp. 20-27, for his view of Luther as containing the constitution and rules of Synod, legally binding on Synod's constituency.

⁹⁹Infra, p. 136 n. 103.

convention which indicated the growing tendency of the leaders to carry the synod increasingly toward unionism. One was the adoption of the English agenda which Quitman had prepared for the New York Synod's liturgy as one of the symbolical books of the North Carolina Synod. The other was a resolution authorizing the use of a joint hymn book [Gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch] in congregations served by the Synod.¹⁰⁰

Other important actions taken by this synod were the approval of the licensure system as it stood, the extension of presidential powers, and fixing a new meeting date for the annual meeting of synod. All these contribute toward later problems, and play their own specific role in the eventual schism.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰For a description of the "New York Liturgy," see Harry J. Kreider, History of the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, Written at the Request of Synod, 1954), I, 171-173; and Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy (Third printing; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947), p. 170. For reference to the joint hymn book, see Peschau, p. 32, and Jacobs, pp. 323-324.

¹⁰¹For the actions and resolutions of the Synod, see Peschau, pp. 30-35. Regarding the licensure vote, Paul Henkel evidently voted yes in favor of retaining it, as five ministers voted yes, one [R. J. Miller] no, and there were only five present. Paul Henkel sent his vote in as A Chronological Life, p. 429, shows.

L. A. Fox mentions letters between Schober and Paul Henkel which on the surface would suggest a disagreement between father and son. Fox says, "as early as 1815 Paul Henkel in manifest reply to a letter censuring David's attitude in regard to licensure commends Schober for having "acted wisely." In January, 1818, Paul writes another letter from Point Pleasant to Schober: "You act quite right to cool hotheaded David as much as possible. He certainly has had

Matters in North Carolina would wait until 1819 to reach a higher pitch in the strained relations caused by theological confusion in doctrine and practice. In the intervening year of 1818, Paul Henkel's theology would make further strides in imprinting itself upon important decisions taking place in Ohio.

Developments in Ohio--1818

The Ohio Synod officially came into being this year, although it was a foregone conclusion at the special conference of 1817 that its synodical formation would take place at the 1818 meeting.¹⁰² Paul Henkel, although favoring, at first, the conference's continued daughter relationship with the Pennsylvania Ministerium, cast the deciding vote ushering in the new Synod.¹⁰³ Immediately, he was called upon to set

severe reproof from me, and in such a manner that he does not write to me any more. But he must have his course for a time," quoted from his, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 8. Paul Henkel's remarks refer more to his criticism of David's behavior than his doctrine. Later, in the critical year of 1819, Paul would investigate matters for himself. Fox intimates that Schober misrepresented the true situation in his letters to Paul and David's brother Solomon, yet Schober knew that the central question was doctrinal, Fox, p. 9.

¹⁰²A Chronological Life, p. 428. See also Allbeck, pp. 52-54, and his quotation from Sprague, n., 53.

¹⁰³W. J. Finck, "The Lutheran Pioneer," p. 322. The impetus for establishing an independent Synod of Ohio is credited to the younger men, but from the remarks in A Chronological Life, pp. 428-429, it would appear that Paul Henkel was not so much opposed to the formation of its indigenous status as he was reluctant to see the ties with

forth the distinctive Lutheran characteristics of this new organization. He did so, irenically but firmly, in a twenty-two page document based on the Word of God to be accepted through faith.¹⁰⁴ This document was written in answer to certain charges made against Lutheran teaching by the sects and other denominations on the frontier. The charges were broadly stated as a "departure from the pure Gospel," and included such specifically mentioned matters as "a failure to awaken a deep conviction of sin, lack of sufficient prayer in public, the use of set prayers, and the teaching that Baptism saves ex opere operato [by the performance of the act]."¹⁰⁵ From another source, the contents of this document set "true Lutheranism," in opposition to the subjectivism and concentration on human cooperation in salvation that Paul Henkel had been combating since 1800.

It rejected revivals, protracted meetings, the "New Light" and direct inspiration of the Holy

the Pennsylvania Synod severed, Allbeck assumes that it was the three older Pastors, one of whom was Paul Henkel, who were responsible for "cordial relations" being preserved with Pennsylvania, and Ohio's adoption of the constitution of Pennsylvania "in toto," see Allbeck, p. 53.

¹⁰⁴This is the description of its nature given by B. H. Pershing, p. 110. Reference is made to this document in Henkel's A Chronological Life, p. 430, and is entitled, "an article on The Difference between our Doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper and those of Other Denominations, [added] as an appendix to the Minutes." See also Allbeck, pp. 57-60.

¹⁰⁵Pershing, p. 110. The full text of the original document is given in Verrichtungen der ersten Generalkonferenz, pp. 7, 11-32, unobtainable by the present writer. These German Minutes are cited throughout Pershing's article.

Spirit and emphasized conscientious instruction of the young and careful preaching of the Word.¹⁰⁶

The fact that Paul Henkel wrote the doctrinal position which was to characterize the theology of the Ohio Synod from its inception, taken together with the Synod's rejection of the General Synod two years later, tends to confirm the view that his theology is responsible for the Lutheran consciousness that was rising in Ohio as a counter reaction to the confessional laxness on the frontier in the east, and in the south. The content and argumentation of his theology shows essential unity with that of his son, David, and suggests that any disparity between them must be one of method and temperment rather than conviction.¹⁰⁷ What Paul is

¹⁰⁶Roy A. Johnson, "The Lutheran Church and the Western Frontier," p. 245. Allbeck, p. 60, states that the motivating reason for the publication of this document was that Ohio "was concerned to propagate its doctrinal convictions." One can denote in the formation of the Ohio Synod a conservative reaction to the spirit of unionism and compromise then gaining the ascendancy in American Lutheranism. Johnson, p. 246, sees the origin of the Ohio Synod as "the first expression of sectional consciousness on the part of Lutheran leaders," and further speaks of Ohio's "aversion to the liberal doctrines of the East." One could also say that the doctrinal statement prepared by Paul Henkel had an eye trained on the aberrations in North Carolina.

¹⁰⁷The resolution of the Ohio Synod regarding Paul Henkel's document reads: "That a paper shall accompany the minutes of this year setting forth the difference between our doctrine of Baptism and the Lord's Supper and that of the religionists who oppose us. Pastor Henkel, Sr., will prepare this paper," quoted in Sheatsley, pp. 62-63. Thus with the Word and the Sacraments Henkel opposed the "New Lights," the "New Measurists" and the "Spiritualists," yet he was not himself opposed to fellowship with other denominations. He seconded a resolution for yearly fraternal meetings with the Reformed, but as Sheatsley observes,

striving for in Ohio, and David is struggling to bring about in North Carolina is a restoration of the objective-gospel as the foundation of the faith over against a pietistic and humanistic rationalism.¹⁰⁸

The theological material from the year 1818 reveals that Paul and David see the issues involved from the standpoint of the same doctrinal perspective. The aberrations they were combatting in their respective geographical areas were cut out of the same cloth. The central theological error which had come over American Christianity was the subjectivism of human experience as the ground of faith.

Schober's Letter to David Henkel of 1818

It was unfortunate that the combination of this subjectivism, both of head and heart, should be reflected in the principal leader of the North Carolina Synod, Gottlieb

"the doctrinal admonition attached to the minutes of 1818 [had] . . . the right ring and the inconsistency of the suggested course soon became manifest." The fraternal meeting was never held, see Sheatsley, pp. 64-65. In 1819, Paul Henkel records conducting a service in a Methodist Church, A Chronological Life, p. 436, and passim, [entries for that year]. The fact is, David also held joint services, A Chronological Life, p. 422, and this was presumably their custom until the origin of the Tennessee Synod.

¹⁰⁸For the relationship of rationalism to new measurism, see David H. Bauslin, "The Genesis of the 'New Measure' Movement in the Lutheran Church in This Country," The Lutheran Quarterly, XL (July 1910), 380. Subjective pietism gave way to subjective rationalism. The pentecost of a self-induced holiness was followed by "The Pentecost of Unbelief," p. 378.

Schober.¹⁰⁹ His letter to David Henkel of October 20, 1818, embodies the principle of the subjective theology against which both the Henkels were contending at this time.

Schober's rationalism is evident when he says,

that Christ is with His body everywhere present, is excellent on paper, but not so in the pulpit
 [for] such as reason will shake heads at a thing to be believed, but not explainable, and to none will it effect conviction of the necessity of spiritual regeneration and of adopting Him as their God and Savior crucified.¹¹⁰

He fails to perceive the mystery of the real presence, and assent to it by taking his reason captive, for he militates against the concept of ubiquity and the reception of the real presence by evil persons:

How easy is it to go to heaven, for an adulterous heart to be absolved by Mr. Henkel, and as a seal to receive from Mr. Henkel the Sacrament, who by his few words made bread body and wine blood-- and such a holy divine body, without limitation of space, as is compelled to enter into all substances and beings, whether they will or not, so that a Belial, when he receives it, must thereby be made an heir of heaven.¹¹¹

Schober unmistakably denies the union of the body and blood of Christ with the consecrated elements, and maintains that even the worthy receive no more than the spiritual

¹⁰⁹A lengthy biographical sketch of Schober is to be found in The Evangelical Review, VIII (January 1857), pp. 404-415. A biography of Charles A. G. Storch is contained in the same volume, pp. 298-404.

¹¹⁰Quoted in Bente, I, p. 129.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 129.

essence of the Godhead:

when Mr. Henkel consecrates bread and wine, it is the body and blood of our Savior to such with whom He can unite; but to those who are not of pure heart and yet partake, and that with reverence, the spirituality of the true essence does not unite with their souls; they eat bread and wine, for they have not such a faith, love, and humility as enables them to possess the divine essence . . . those of contrite spirit . . . the Lord in the Sacrament will unite with them spiritually and seal their heavenly inheritance.¹¹²

The worthiness of the communicant in contradistinction to what Paul Henkel had been saying since 1809, and the idea of that type of holiness against which Paul Henkel had directed his document censuring new measurism in Ohio, is made the precondition of grace by Schober:

if they approach with reverence, it [the sacrament] may be made the means of viewing the condescending love of God ready to unite with them, and their own depravity, which will or may make them cry, and, if pure in heart, obtain mercy.¹¹³

Schober felt that David was "making people secure in forms and not in realities;"¹¹⁴ and this statement, ironically, capsulized the issue between the Henkels and their religious environment.

Schober, and many of his contemporaries found the realities of faith in the sanctified man, while the means of grace were pragmatic and utilitarian forms to be used in achieving that state. The Henkels, on the other hand,

¹¹²Ibid., pp. 129-130.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 130.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 129.

were at this time, coming closer to the concreteness of Luther's understanding; the "forms" of the faith contain the realities of God. The means of grace convey the spiritual blessings of God, but these spiritual blessings are substantial realities in themselves. What to Schober was mere form to the Henkels was embodied realness, that is, the bread and wine is the very body and blood of Christ. What to Schober was reality was to the Henkels form, that is, the form of the sanctified man was not the real man before God. The real man was the man whose life was hid in Christ by faith. His outward appearance, however, was not his real self, just as the appearance of bread and wine was not the only substantial reality in the Lord's Supper. The outward word of forgiveness was not merely an empty hope directed to the adulterous heart which became true and could be claimed after reformation [Schober's view], but absolution in itself was the reality of God speaking apart from and irrespective of the assent, or worthiness brought to it by the hearer, and its true-ness and validity required no ratification by the believing heart to make it true. Man was merely the passive recipient [David Henkel's view]. The Henkels felt that to wish to add necessary resultative accomplishments to God's gifts destroyed their objective reality as embodiments of the gospel. By explaining "spiritual regeneration" through the categories of certain pious virtues, such as "reverence," and "humility," as necessary conditions of the sanctified

life, Schober betrayed his view that salvation is assured on the basis of a transformation taking place within man which is manifested by an observable piety. It is understandable, therefore, that he would stress the formality of the means of grace, and base their utility on the consequence that they result in deeds and virtues.¹¹⁵

His thought is wholly conditional. "If," although a little word, speaks volumes in the realm of justification, and puts a question mark at the end of every sentence on grace. Schober, by implication, questions justification at its source, and the love of God loses its indicative mood and becomes an optative "may" of uncertainty.

The specific doctrines mentioned as controverted points; the word of God, baptism, Lord's Supper as means of grace, and faith as the product of grace; whether defended against the aberrations current in Ohio, or North Carolina, demonstrate the the Henkels saw the heart of the issue as centering in the nature of the gospel.

¹¹⁵The revivals had charged the Lutheran church in North Carolina with permitting an antinomian life to exist among her members, and Schober was sensitive to this charge. In the Synod of 1813, the tenor of the convention reflected a deep concern about lawless living. Rules and church discipline were urged, in order that the "calumniators from without and the ignorant from within, may be prevented from asserting that we live without rules" quoted from Principal Transactions of the Lutheran Gospel Ministry of North-Carolina, in Synod Assembled, in the Month of October, 1812 (Salisbury, N. C.: Coupee and Crider, 1813), p. 9. Also in a circular letter attached to the minutes, the president R. J. Miller, urged the pastors to awaken the people to godly living that they may "be preserved from the baneful influence of those loose,

In summary of the events thus far, Paul Henkel had set the pattern for a stronger Lutheran confessionism in Ohio. Although, surprisingly, as W. D. Allbeck has indicated, he advocated the adoption of the constitution of Pennsylvania as the standard for the new synod. At its first convention, therefore, Ohio had established no confessional base.¹¹⁶ It, apparently also, approved the use of the joint Lutheran and Reformed hymn book [Gemeinschaftliches Gesangbuch].¹¹⁷ There had always been "outspoken confessors" of Lutheranism, and perhaps, as one of these, Paul Henkel felt that the "errors which . . . [he] abhorred and condemned could not live long, but must inevitably in a short time run their course."¹¹⁹ "There was never any express renunciation of the distinctive

legal, pharasaical and antinomian doctrines" p. 16. North Carolina succumbed to this pressure, while in Ohio in the face of the same charges, Paul Henkel defended the gospel's integrity.

¹¹⁶M. Loy, "The Joint Synod of Ohio," in The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States (Third edition; Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1902), pp. 5-6, characterizes the Ohio pastors' high regard for the Confessions of the church, although the symbolical books were not formally declared until 1847.

¹¹⁷Richard C. Wolf, Documents of Lutheran Unity in America (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 45, n. 3. See also, J. L. Neve, History of the Lutheran Church in America (Burlington, Iowa: Lutheran Literary Board, 1934), pp. 259-261.

¹¹⁸H. E. Jacobs, p. 313.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 314.

doctrines of Lutheranism,"¹²⁰ among the principle members of the various synods heretofore, and Henkel as well as others, probably interpreted the adopted constitution of Pennsylvania as affirming the old Lutheran standard.

This appraisal would seem to fit Paul Henkel's method of correction through instruction in the Word of God. Events taking place in North Carolina, however, were to put his method to a test.

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 313. This is Jacobs' assessment of the attitude toward the distinctive Lutheran doctrines in the period up to 1820.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERIOD OF CONTEST 1819-1820

The Theology of Paul Henkel Meets With Dissent in the "Untimely Synod" of 1819

The fundamental problem between a theology of objectivity and one of subjectivism could not long remain unclarified or undisputed. This basic issue, which had progressively sharpened in focus for the past three years, was bound to come to a head, and it did so at the convention of the North Carolina Synod in April of 1819. The background provided in the previous chapters forms the basis for an understanding of what happened at Buffalo Creek Church, Cabarras County, North Carolina, during the sessions of April 26 through 29, of that year. At this synod, the principles of the theology formulated by Paul Henkel, and enunciated in depth by his son, David, were to meet with open dissent.

The meeting of synod in which David Henkel was tried for false doctrine, and then reprimanded by receiving a reduction in ecclesiastical rank and placed on probation is commonly referred to as the "Untimely Synod."¹ It received this designation because it was called by the President and a few other ministers living in his vicinity,

¹For the term, see F. Bente, American Lutheranism: Early History of American Lutheranism and The Tennessee Synod

allegedly to resolve upon an important matter that would bridge of no delay, namely, to decide upon North Carolina's participation in the meeting of the Pennsylvania Synod, in which a discussion was to be presented toward proposing a general union of all Lutheran synods in America.² On the basis of what is going on behind the scenes, the leaders were probably in haste to convene the synod.³ The censure

(St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919), I, 122.

²The meeting in Baltimore, Trinity week, 1819, was simply their annual regular meeting "where the question was to be discussed as to the propriety of organizing a General Synod," see G. D. Bernheim, History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book Store, 1872), p. 438. Schober was the only delegate outside the Ministerium of Pennsylvania present. He took a vigorous part.

³Schober and Dr. Quitmann of New York were the only ones mentioned as directing correspondence to the Ministerium advocating "The desire for a closer union" See Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the annual conventions from 1718 to 1821 (Philadelphia: Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1898), see the convention proceedings of 1819, pp. 524-540. Considering the fact that the idea of a closer union had been a matter of correspondence between the Synods of North Carolina and Pennsylvania since 1811, the urgency question seems false. See F. W. E. Peschau, Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina: From 1803-1826, Twenty-Three Conventions. Translated from the German Protocol (Newberry, S. C.: Aull and Houseal, Printers, 1894), p. 15. The matter that the tentative constitution for the organization of a General Synod [Planentwurf] was to be drawn up by the above mentioned special committee and then was adopted at the Baltimore session bears the marks of undue haste, and suggests that the matter itself, and its contents were pretty much cut and dried beforehand, see Documentary History cited above, passim. Fern intimates that a probable reason for the haste may have been the fear that the present synods themselves were on the verge of disruption into smaller district bodies. The movement toward union

and demotion of David Henkel was also a big item at this called convention, especially in view of the fact that he, along with Daniel Moser, was promised by resolution of the last synod to be ordained on Trinity, 1819. There is reason to believe that the synod was also called in order to forestall David's ordination and bring him to trial for false doctrine.⁴ The manner in which the synod was called, the way in which it was conducted, and the fact that many members either were notified too late, or not notified at all, plus the fact that the synodical leaders failed to heed a written admonition from Philip Henkel asking synod to forego the called meeting and meet at the fixed time on Trinity, all suggest an arbitrary

was "a way out" of the threatening disruption"

Vergilius Ferm, The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology: A Study of the Issue Between American Lutheranism and Old Lutheranism (New York, London: The Century Co., 1927), p. 35, see the whole of Chapter II. Schober and the leaders of Pennsylvania, as the principal architects of the plan, seem arbitrary in the manner in which they ushered it through both their respective synods. See Peschau, p. 46, for the way in which the North Carolina dealt with the "Plan" in 1820. See also, F. Bente, I, 126, for a letter from Schober to the Pennsylvania Synod, which suggests a pre-determination about the approval of the "Plan."

⁴Jacob L. Morgan, Bachman S. Brown, Jr., and John Hall, eds., History of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina 1803-1953 (Published by the Authority of the United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, n.p., n.d.), p. 47, for the evidence that synod in 1817 "had provided for the ordination of David Henkel and other candidates on Trinity Sunday, 1819," Socrates Henkel, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel and Co., Printers and Publishers, 1890), pp. 17-18, devotes a lengthy discussion to David's ordination. Synod leaders said David's ordination was not set as to date and time. S. Henkel speaks of an episode regarding the "little

administration on the part of the principal leaders of the North Carolina Synod.⁵

More important, however, than the legal and administrative confusion surrounding the constitutionality of the "untimely synod" were the doctrinal disputes that were now, presumably for the first time, waged publicly on the floor of synod in connection with David Henkel's trial. These

piece of blank paper pasted over the word Trinity," which had been pasted over the word after the book Luther in which the resolution was contained had been printed, but before it had been distributed. Strangely enough, Peschau in his Minutes [of 1817] records the resolution to ordain Moser, but does not mention Henkel, p. 33. Peschau's Minutes [the present writer does not have access to the German minutes] indicate that Trinity Sunday was the set time for the ordinations. On the subject of David's trial as a reason for the called synod, see infra, p. 155.

⁵Peschau, pp. 35-41. Peschau varies somewhat from the printed German minutes, which are entitled, Kurze Nachrichten von den Verrichtungen des Deutsch und Englischen Lutherischen Synods, für Nord-Carolina und angränzenden Staaten, gehalten an der Buffaloe-Creek-Kirche, den 25. April 1819 (Baltimore, Schäffer und Maund, 1819), 23 pages.

Concerning the calling of synod, Peschau states that the members of synod "living farthest away received notice of it," p. 36. This is not contained in the German minutes. The Henkels maintained that the time of notification was too short, and that some knew nothing of the meeting until it was over, see Socrates Henkel, p. 16, see also David Henkel, Carolinian Herald of Liberty, Religious and Political (Salisbury, N. C.: Printed by Krider and Bingham, 1821), p. 39. The Henkels further contested the constitutionality of the called meeting because the time was firmly fixed and synod had authorized no one to call a special meeting in which regular synodical business was to be transacted, see Carolinian Herald, p. 28. In point of fact, the synod legalized the president's action on the called meeting of April, post facto., see the resolution in Peschau, p. 36; the German, p. 5, item 2; and David Henkel's remarks, p. 28.

Regarding the admonition from Philip Henkel asking synod to meet according to rule, ["The letters were received and read in April,"] see Carolinian Herald, p. 28, but the

disputed points centered in the charges of false doctrine and conduct made against David. The specific charges mentioned in the Minutes are the following: that David had excommunicated one of his members improperly; that he taught the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation; that he had the full right to forgive sins; and that he had disturbed the fraternal peace of the church by offending

German minutes do not contain a reference to them, and Peschau is unclear, p. 35. Peschau states that "Paul Henkel promised to come, but did not come," p. 35. Reference to Paul's absence is not given in the German minutes, whether excused or unexcused, though he is delegated certain duties by the Synod. L. A. Fox, "Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," The Lutheran Quarterly, XIX (January 1889), 50, suggests that since Paul Henkel was pronouncedly against the General Synod before the April 1819 meeting, therefore, neither he nor Philip attended.

The question of the synod's view of this called meeting, whether or not it was to be considered the regular meeting of 1819 is important. Peschau elaborates beyond what the German minutes say, "Synod unanimously, without an opposing word allowed and sanctioned this Synod, as the Synod of 1819," p. 36. Whether he got this additional clarification from "Synod's Record Book" which is an addition to the published Minutes, as he claims in his Preface, or whether he is editing and interpreting, is a matter the documents themselves would have to determine. The German minutes say simply, "this Synod unanimously approved of our present meeting," [so genehmigte dieser Synodus einmüthig die jetzige Versammlung desselben], p. 5, and so Bernheim, p. 437, translates it. That the synod did not interpret it other than a called meeting is borne out by the item that follows, which empowers the president with the consent of two or three ministers to act on an interim basis of a called synod until "the succeeding meeting of the Synod," Bernheim, p. 437, and German minutes, p. 5. This would justify the Henkels in meeting at the regular time of synod.

The above points indicate the arbitrary and "autocratic" convening and conducting of this called synod, see Bente, I, 122. Bernheim sees no reasonable excuse for its necessity, p. 438.

Christian brethren among the Presbyterians and Reformed.⁶ The German Minutes add that he taught, "whoever is baptized and goes to the Lord's Supper needs nothing more for salvation," and "that he held other doctrines, which could lead to superstition, . . ."⁷ Synod found insufficient proof that David taught the doctrines thus stated, and he denied that he ever taught as charged, "because they are not the doctrines of the Lutheran Church."⁸ David maintained that the charge of false doctrine raised against him, "arose only through misunderstanding,"⁹ and he declared that he would never teach such doctrines. He further promised that he would conduct himself in a brotherly manner toward other Christian denominations, and reconciled himself with Mr. Hoyle, who together with several Presbyterian preachers had preferred the charges against him.¹⁰

⁶Peschau, pp. 38-39.

⁷Kurze Nachrichten von den Verrichtungen...Lutherischen Synods, für Nord-Carolina, den 25. April, 1819, p. 11. German: "dass wer getauft ist und zum Abendmahl gehe, weiter nichts brauche zur Seligkeit," and "dass er andre Lehren führe, welche zum Aberglauben leiten--."

⁸Ibid., p. 11. German "dieweil sie nicht Lehren der Lutherischen Kirche sind--."

⁹Ibid., p. 11. German: "und nur aus Missverstand ihm nachgesagt werde . . ."

¹⁰F. W. E. Peschau, pp. 38-39. Peschau also gives the information that David "expressed himself as satisfied" with the reduction to the rank of catechist, and being placed on one year's probation, reducable to six months for good behavior. This information is not contained in

It must not be assumed, however, that the trial was held and David adopted the passive role of the accused. Henkel, rather, carried his arguments and his defense back to his opponents and debated with them on the controverted matters.

During the time that David was supposedly on trial, "he could not but talk of Lutheran doctrine."¹¹ There had been a paper read on the person and nature of Christ, which undoubtedly David gave, as Schober and Storch both denied its contents on the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ.¹² Storch had said in response to this paper:

one hundred Bibles would not convince him that the manhood of Christ was taken up into the Godhead and therefore Christ was invested with all divine perfections.¹³

the German Minutes, see pp. 10-11., nor do they contain the further information that Peschau adds from "Synod's Record Book," [or the Protocol], about "other grave violations [Verbrechen, i.e., crimes] proven against him," Peschau, p. 39. Was "Synod's Record Book," compiled by Schober and Storch?

¹¹L. A. Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, (An address delivered at its Centennial Celebration in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920), p. 9.

¹²This paper is mentioned in the German Minutes of the first Conference of the Tennessee Synod, titled: Kurze Nachricht von den Verrichtungen der ersten Conferenz der Deutschen, Evangelisch Lutherischen Prediger, gehalten in dem Staate Tennessee, den 17ten Julius, 1820 (Neu-Market: S. Henkel's Druckerei, 1821), p. 20, section IV., and is cited in Bente, I, 123.

¹³Quoted in Fox, "The Origin of the Tennessee Synod," p. 9. Fox says Storch's remark was made in a private conversation with David Henkel at the April meeting. David Henkel in his Carolinian Herald of Liberty, p. 41, says, [Storch] "declared that he could not believe what

This paper witnesses to the fact that David defended the doctrine of ubiquity before the synod. His concern evidently was to protect the sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the superficial view of being a mere memorial of an absent Lord, who was localized in heaven, and consequently not present on earth in real communion with His people.

David's defense of the ubiquity of Christ was soteriologically based, and was directly related to the sacraments and faith.¹⁴

His opponents, however, failed to understand him, and misconstrued his teaching as heretical, because they could not grasp, or did not believe Lutheran doctrine. This is made clear in their interpretation of his teachings:

Mr. Hoyle's letter preferring charges said;

[David] held and taught some doctrines which I considered dangerous, such as that the new birth of which our Savior spoke to Nicodemus was water baptism would produce our salvation if we would only believe in it, that the Holy Ghost would accompany water baptism, that the Presbyterians were infidels, as they deny eating the real body

was read there"; but whether he made his remark on the floor of synod, or in private, David says, "several of them well knew it," and Storch was not to his knowledge ever censured for denying the doctrine.

¹⁴For the soteriological importance which David Henkel saw in the doctrine of ubiquity, and the union of the two natures in Christ, see his, David Henkel Against the Unitarians: A Treatise on The Person and Incarnation of Jesus Christ, in which some of the principal arguments of the Unitarians are examined (Published by Order of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod; New Market: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1830), pp. 96-103 are especially appropo to the above controversy. Henkel concludes this book with the confession that only this God-man, our brother, can save us, pp. 118-119.

of Christ and drinking his real blood in the Lord's Supper and all who did this were infidels.¹⁵

A Rev. James Hall, a Presbyterian minister, had written in his letter:

The doctrine maintained by Mr. Henkel savored more of Roman Catholic doctrine than anything I had ever before known of the celebrated Luther. From every view I could take of his doctrine the tenor of it was transubstantiation.¹⁶

David responded to the contents of these letters in a conciliatory way, while still defending the truth: He answered:

It is readily admitted that since the sacrament was instituted we must eat and drink Christ in two ways: First with bread and wine with the mouth, and secondly, with our souls by faith, and that the eating with our mouth is to assist our soul, hence a person who eats and drinks with the soul as well as with the mouth has eternal life.¹⁷

In his defense of the Lutheran view of the sacrament, Henkel used the traditional terms, "corporeal," and the "manhood" of Christ, in order to convey Christ's real presence in the Lord's Supper. He further defended the truth, as witnessed in his answer above, against the old charge that "whosoever is baptized and partakes of the Supper wants no other and further repentance."¹⁸

¹⁵Quoted in Fox, "The Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," p. 52.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁷Quoted in Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 9.

¹⁸Quoted from Schöber's letter to David, October 20, 1818, cited in Bente, I, 129. Note the close similarity between

The documentary evidence used against David Henkel at the trial were the above cited letters of Mr. Hoyle and Rev. Hall.¹⁹ It would appear on the surface that Mr. Hoyle was David's chief opponent, whereas in fact it was Schober, who with all the proficiency of his experience at law had faithfully done his homework in preparation for his trial. "It was a trial for heresy as much as for conduct, for perversity of doctrine as for perjury."²⁰ A few years previous, David Henkel had been cited in a court case for perjury, but it was proven unfounded.²¹ This matter was introduced, along with the above letters, which Schober had received sometime before, and had now submitted as evidence against him.²² It had been Schober who arranged to have President Storch change the meeting from May to April, and it had been "arranged to hear complaints against David Henkel."²³ Later, after the

the phraseology of this letter, and the wording in the German Minutes of this convention, supra, p.151, n. 7.

¹⁹Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 4, mentions that David Henkel's doctrinal differences with Mr. Hoyle had been going on since 1815, and with Rev. Hall since 1817. The letter of Rev. Hall's was in Schober's possession since 1818.

²⁰Ibid., p. 5.

²¹Fox, "The Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," pp. 49-53.

²²Ibid., pp. 49-53, and Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, pp. 4-5

²³Ibid., p. 5. This is Fox's judgment.

schism had occurred within the North Carolina Synod, Schober himself intimated in his book called Review that it had been a trial for heresy.²⁴

Smoldering in the background of the April meeting was an older incident between Schober and David Henkel, the wound of which had perhaps not healed. It was the incident over the Book of Concord, which occurred sometime between 1815 and 1818. Schober had charged David with incorrectly translating from the Latin Book of Concord, and consequently teaching false doctrine on the basis of it. David happened to discover a German edition of the Book of Concord in the house of a member, while on a preaching tour. He was, therefore, enabled to show that his translation and interpretation of Lutheran doctrine was correct, and upon convincing the church council who could read German, that he had been right, the council demanded of their pastor, Schober, that he submit, asking him:

We want to know whether you intend to preach according to this book, in the future. The minister hesitated and evaded, but being pressed, he raised the book up and brought it down on the table, saying, From this day henceforth, I will not; it is nothing but a controversial book. The elder . . . then raised the book up, and brought it down on the table, saying, From this day henceforth, you won't be our preacher.²⁵

²⁴Ibid., pp. 5. See page 7 for the identification of this book as the Review.

²⁵Socrates Henkel, p. 14. See also, Alvin Kohlmann, "The Tennessee Synod--It's History and Church Polity" (Unpublished Master's of Sacred Theology Thesis, St. Louis, 1958), pp. 42-43, who identifies the minister as Schober.

Now it had been Schober's day in court. "David Henkel without an attorney, without even the presence of his father or brother, without the opportunity to offer counter evidence [although he defended himself by debate] . . . [had been] prosecuted by an experienced lawyer"26

Schober felt that he had won a victory and had brought David to a retraction of his alledged false teachings, for he wrote later in a summary of the trial in his own favor, that

Upon such facts he [David] was made only a catechist and sent back to work branded as a suspicious character. . . . He said Henkel on the trial retracted his heresy and declared he had never preached such doctrines and never would.²⁷

The truth was that David had denied teaching the misconceptions with which he was falsely accused, but not the doctrines themselves, and synod by its own declaration that the charges lacked sufficient evidence virtually acquitted him.²⁸

²⁶Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 5.

²⁷Ibid., p. 5.

²⁸Ibid., p. 5. Fox says, "Henkel did not retract. He denied having preached transubstantiation and the power to forgive sins, but Schober did not know enough about theology to understand the difference between the things charged and the real facts." This, however, is doubtful, for Schober's ability to define terms and think clearly are adequately demonstrated in his book Luther and his book Review. See S. S. Schmucker, The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated, in Several Occasional Discourses (Fifth edition; Philadelphia: E. W. Miller, Ranstead Place, 1852), pp. 215-216, for selections from the Review. Closer to the truth is the fact that Lutheran and Calvinistic thought clashed at the core.

Another evidence of his acquittal was a letter of recommendation signed by the officers of synod, which is surprising in its content in view of the preceding trial:

Nomine Jesu. This is to certify, that Mr. David Henkel has been examined agreeably to the order of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerial Assembly of the state of North-Carolina, and adjacent states, with respect to his knowledge of the Evangelical doctrine, and the requisite qualifications to bear the office of an evangelical teacher; in consequence thereof, he is hereby authorised to preach publicly, to catechise, and to baptise, in the congregations of Lincoln county, and in all other vacant congregations of the evangelical church, wherever it may justly be requested, until the next conference. Testified by us, the officers of said conference, with the signatures of our names, and the ministerial seal affixed, this 30th April, 1819.²⁹

David made much of this letter of recommendation as a testimony of synod's approval of him; unless it had been given dishonestly.³⁰ It appears to have been given, however, for the sake of peace, in order to pacify David's congregations, who were angered over the trial.³¹ David was not alone in his views, even in North Carolina. On the basis of this conciliation, David finally submitted to the synod.

²⁹The text of the letter is given in David Henkel's, Carolinian Herald of Liberty, pp. 23-24. See also the reference to it in the German Minutes, Kurze Nachrichten von den Verrichtungen...Lutherischen Synods, für Nord=Carolina, p. 11. Paul Henkel copied this letter also into his handwritten pocket diary of 1820, along with the afore-mentioned Schober letter to David of October 20, 1818, see supra, p. 140, n. 110.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 24-25.

³¹Ibid., pp. 24-25. See also Peschau, p. 39, for the information contained in "Synod's Record Book," but not given in the German Minutes. Peschau says, "we were threatened

Nothing definite had been achieved toward settling the doctrinal differences at the "untimely synod." One overriding fact had, however, been established--the respective theologies in contention there were irreparably divergent at the core. Both principle leaders in the controversy felt they had been true to the essence of Lutheran doctrine. Schober had entered the Lutheran Church because her "doctrine of reconciliation through Christ [corresponded] . . . so entirely with the instructions [he had] . . . received in the Moravian Church," and he found "the greatest satisfaction. . . ." in her services.³² He evidently felt he had been true to the defense of the doctrine of reconciliation, for his pamphlet on the "Rock Christ," which he circulated profusely in North Carolina, was a presentation on the doctrine and application of justification by faith alone. It contained over again, such remarks as:

Go to Christ in sights of your sin and misery, not of thy grace and holiness. Have nothing to do with thy graces and sanctification (they will but veil Christ) till thou hast seen Christ first faith will have to do with none but Christ, who is inexpressibly glorious, and must swallow up thy sanctification as well as thy sin³³

by his adherents with the consequences."

³²Quotations are from the biography of Schober in The Evangelical Review, VIII (January 1857), 410.

³³A Choice Drop of Honey from the Rock Christ, or A Short Word of Advice to all Saints and Sinners (London: Printed in the Year MDCCXXXVIII. And Reprinted by Ambrose Henkel and Co., New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1811), p. 28. The Henkel Press had printed 859 copies of

Schober knew the gospel message, but he failed to see that the word is always attached to an object through which it conveys itself, either as proclamation or through the sacraments. The object of fiducial faith is Christ alone, who is in and giving Himself through the means of grace. This was the reality that Schober, as well as the greater portion of the Lutheran Church of that day, failed to recognize. The bane of the Lutheran Church's deteriorated condition was that it had fallen victim to the sentiment of faith trusting in faith itself.³⁴ Through the loss of the relationship between faith and the visible objects of faith, in which Christ clothes Himself, the church had relegated Christ to the far distant heavens and the still distant future. The Henkels realized this, and the objectivized gospel became increasingly the center of their theology.

The orthodoxy of the one and the heterodoxy of the other set the stage for, and was the chief cause of the rupture that took place at Lincolnton in 1820.³⁵

this book for Schober alone, see Elon O. Henkel, ed., The Henkel Family Records (Second printing, 1926; New Market, Va.: The Henkel Press, Inc., 1960), p. 617.

³⁴Henry Eyster Jacobs, A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. The American Church History Series (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893), p. 307, characterizes the period 1787-1817, as the period of "Deterioration."

³⁵Fox, "The Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," pp. 49, 53. "Mr. Schober's reply Review repeatedly refers to it [doctrine] as the ground of separation, but he declines any statement of the doctrine as held by his Synod or any direct refutation of the arguments of Mr. Henkel."

Before the end of the year 1819, Paul Henkel and his wife traveled to North Carolina to investigate into what had taken place.³⁶ After ascertaining the facts, he vindicated his son, David, and joined forces with him.³⁷ Their theological unity was in evidence through their mutual work and preaching, as well as by the changed attitude that Schober and Storch maintained toward their colleague of many years standing.³⁸ Philip, near the close of the year, first conceived of the

³⁶A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel: From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, etc., selected and translated by William J. Finck, D.D. (New Market, Virginia: n.p., 1935-1937). Typewritten Volume of 488 pp. with an appendix in the personal library of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis, p. 447. See also Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, pp. 8-9. Paul Henkel interviewed boards of review that consisted in their totality of ninety-five men. The Paul Henkel's evidently had previously put the best construction on synod's censure of David, for Paul's wife wrote to Schober after the April 1919 meeting that Synod had done a father's part for David. This investigative trip was to clarify their understanding of the facts.

³⁷Ibid., p. 8.

³⁸Ibid., p. 9, for Schober's attitude and ridicule of Paul Henkel. See A Chronological Life, p. 450, for the remark while visiting in a home in North Carolina, "We were annoyed here by Pastor and Mrs. Storch."

That the Henkel doctrine was in harmony is shown by the Diary which records that Paul spent August 5 to October 4 with Philip, Bell, and Zink in Tennessee. An important entry occurs in Paul Henkel's journal regarding the time spent in Tennessee. On September 20, Henkel notes: "Today we took the initial steps towards forming a conference in Tennessee. Tuesday and Wednesday, 21, 22. We continued and concluded the work of the conference." p. 466. Henkel's theology is reflected in his preaching and ministrations with Philip. One of his sermons was on "The Misuse of the Word," p. 466; he shows a high

idea of starting a new synod if matters could not be reconciled at the next convention on the basis of the Augsburg Confession.³⁹

regard for the objective grace of baptism and the Lord's Supper. He promised to baptize a mentally disturbed alcoholic if he would appear at the next preparatory service, pp. 445-446, and he communed a poor widow whose husband had been executed some months previously for murder, p. 466. Hence, Paul Henkel indicates that he looks to what God will give and not to the worthiness of man.

Paul was with David from October 4 to November 8. Significantly, Henkel's entry for Sunday, October 3, 1819 states: "The next day [October 4] at 10 o'clock we reached the home of our son David. Tuesday to Thursday, rested. On Friday Philip left." p. 477. Paul, Philip and David, therefore were together four days. It is reasonable to assume that they discussed the matter of the formation of a new synod, already in September and October 1819, unless by a conference in Tennessee nothing more was intended than a geographical alliance for that state. The context of the entries, however, for these months, and later developments in the fall of 1819 in North Carolina, indicate that the Henkel's were assessing the situation, the meaning, and the possible conclusion of the events which had transpired at the April synod of 1819. These factors all confirm that their theology was in agreement, and further raises the question as to who really conceived of the idea of a new synod. Was it really Philip? See next footnote. Paul and David worked together in David's congregations. Paul noted that David "conducted a class of instruction, or a school of discussion and debate," p. 449. The Diary records no criticism of David, Philip, or the other men of Tennessee, or their work, and as Paul's manner in his Diary during these critical years is to remain silent, his brief remark about Storch in the light of what happened is an indicator of an important truth--the theology of the Henkel's enjoys harmonious unity, and its original author was Paul Henkel.

³⁹F. Bente, I, 237. Bente says in full, "Philip Henkel was first to conceive the plan of organizing the Tennessee Synod. In a letter to his brother, David, dated December 9, 1819, he wrote that he would do his utmost to induce Pastors Zink and Miller to join them. "But," he added, "do not say a word of it to anybody, not even to your best friend, lest they get wind of it."

Paul Henkel's Theology Gains Ground
in Ohio, 1819

Meanwhile, the seeds that Paul Henkel had planted of distinctive Lutheran theology were bearing fruit among the Ohio men, and opposition to the plan of union [Planentwurf] was increasing during the year 1819.⁴⁰ The consideration and adoption of the proposed plan by the Ohio Synod at its convention that year must not be interpreted necessarily as full agreement, but as a fraternal gesture to study the idea. Although the resolution to adopt the plan was not rescinded until 1820, the opposition to it was earlier.⁴¹ Paul Henkel, "may have been the one who first raised objections."⁴²

⁴⁰See W. D. Allbeck, A Century of Lutherans in Ohio (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1966), p. 67, and the whole discussion on Ohio and the General Synod, pp. 61-67.

⁴¹C. V. Sheatsley, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio, p. 66, for an account of the adoption by Ohio in 1819. That the opposition to it was earlier is confirmed by H. E. Jacob's narration of events and relations between Pennsylvania and Ohio, as well as other synods, before 1819. Ohio undoubtedly had knowledge of the correspondence on the subject of the General Synod which Pennsylvania had initiated in 1818, see his History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, pp. 357-360.

⁴²Allbeck, p. 67. William Edward Eisenberg provides the names of the pastors who were on the Ohio field already by 1812. They were all Stauch and Henkel men, and Stauch's guidance was strengthened by that of Paul Henkel, see his The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962, including An Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee (Lynchburg, Virginia: J.P. Bell Company, 1967), p. 119.

An anonymous document containing eight objections against the plan said, among other things,

The introduction of uniform hymn-books and liturgies is contrary to Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession; the freedom and parity of the ministry is infringed upon, since the delegates to the General Synod will usurp their rights; an act of incorporation will follow, and the resolutions will be enforced by the strong arm of the law; the Ministerium of Ohio must remain a German-speaking body, and in the General Synod, the English will soon prevail; etc.⁴³

The similarity between these objections and the arguments against the General Synod offered by the Henkels suggest their interrelationship.⁴⁴ The united voice of the Henkels sounding

⁴³H. E. Jacobs, pp. 358-359. The German title of the document is Americanische Ansichten von dem Gottesdienst und andern Eigenheiten der Deutschen (Philadelphia, January 1820). Note the date! See F. Bente, American Lutheranism, pp. 159-160. Paul Henkel influenced the writing of this document.

⁴⁴Report of the Transactions, of the Second Evangelical Lutheran Conference: held in Zion's Church, Sullivan County, Tennessee, October 22, 1821, also Two Letters; and the Objections Against the Constitution of the General Synod (New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1821), pp. 17-20. The footnote beginning on page 17 contains the information that the authors of the anonymous document were Revs. Leist, Steck, Scheid, Kaemmerer, and Andrew Henkel of Ohio.

The same anonymous document had been contained in the Verrichtungen der ersten Conferenz . . . in dem Staate Tennessee, of 1820, pp. 60-68, under the German title Bedenklichen Ursachen.

The Carolinian Herald of Liberty, p. 45, is mentioned by the clerk of the committee that drew up the Objections as an addition in English to the German Bedenklichen Ursachen. A perusal of the three documents (Bedanklichen . . . is the same as the Americanische Ansichten) will reveal that their basic argument against the General Synod is that it sets aside the Augsburg Confession and opens the door for a hierarchial principle.

forth from Ohio, Tennessee, and North Carolina was calling the church to return to Luther and live by the Augsburg Confession.⁴⁵ Whereas, up until this time, this call had been confined to the individual efforts of the various Henkel men laboring in their respective fields, the time was quickly approaching when their united testimony would be converted into united action. Down through the years their witness molded by Paul Henkel had been given, sometimes weak, at other times strong, at no times silent. The events of 1819 had crystalized their theological stance, and prepared the way for the joint response which the Henkels were to give in answer to the deteriorated condition of the church.

The circumstances which had now developed in North Carolina were to make the synodical convention of 1820 the focal point of the contest between their awakened confessional

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 19, the footnote; where David Henkel gives a brief account of the history of the Lutheran Church in America, saying that as the synods established themselves "their standard of unity was far more noble and exalted: [than that of the "General Constitution"] and pure scriptural doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of faith, was their meridian sun, they viewed with united eyes. . . ." This view of the historical development of the synods helps to explain the reason why, perhaps, Paul Henkel, and the other Ohio men, did not write the Augsburg Confession into the constitution of the Ohio Synod in 1818.

See also M. Loy, "The Joint Synod of Ohio," in The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, third edition, 1902), pp. 5-6. In other words, since the doctrines of the Confessions were accepted and agreed upon by the Ohio men, they assumed adherence to them without a formal subscription.

Lutheranism and a Lutheranism which had succumbed to the spirit of rationalism and pietism. The Henkel conviction which was to meet any ensuing eventuality of that convention was early summarized in a letter from Philip to David, dated March 14, 1820:

If I am spared, I shall attend synod. . . . If the old ministers will not act agreeably to the Augsburg Confession, we will erect a synod in Tennessee.⁴⁶

The Theology of Paul Henkel is Rejected at
the Synod of Strife, 1820

In May, Paul Henkel and his wife journeyed to North Carolina to attend the synod which was to convene on May 28, Trinity Sunday, 1820.⁴⁷ One could say, in actuality two synods met to determine who had the legal right to the official title of the North Carolina Synod. By meeting on the fixed day for synod the previous year, according to the constitution, the party that met at the constituted time had the legal right to the claim of being the North Carolina Synod.⁴⁸ The

⁴⁶Quoted in F. Bente, American Lutheranism, I, pp. 152, 237.

⁴⁷A Chronological Life, p. 452. There are no diary entries for the year 1820, and the compiler acquired his materials from other sources, see p. 451.

⁴⁸David Henkel, Carolinian Herald of Liberty, pp. 20-41, passim. David understood by their breach of the constitution, which he cited against them from Luther (which was synod's official handbook), p. 153, article 2, page 156, article 13 (David Henkel, Carolinian, p. 22) that the opponents had deprived

assumed power, however, was matched against their claim to constitutionality, and on the basis of the principle of majority rule, the opposing party was to defend their right to be acknowledged as the North Carolina Synod.⁴⁹

On the surface, the approaching synod, which gained for itself the ignominious label of being the "Synod of Strife,"⁵⁰ would appear to have been debated on the "question of parliamentary law."⁵¹ The constitutionality question was actually, however, on its deepest side, the old plaguing question of doctrine. The upholding of the constitution on the one hand, would show whether the synod meant to take its confession of faith seriously, while on the other, if it would not abide by the constitution, as the Henkels suspected, the opposing party would stand exposed as not regarding the Augsburg

themselves of being the "regular" synod, p. 39. By meeting at the fixed time, David had legalized the transactions of the timely synod of 1819, and declared illegal those of the "untimely synod." Thus his ordination stood on constitutional grounds. The most singular evidence that synod was to have met again after April at the regular time was the presence on Trinity of Daniel Moser!, p. 20, 25.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 21. The autocratic manner in which the constitutional party was treated is evidenced by the reply of President Storch to the request for him to open synod on Trinity, 1819: "I am indisposed; and if I were not indisposed, I would not attend; for conference is over, and there is none now depending."

⁵⁰F. Bente, American Lutheranism, I, p. 123.

⁵¹Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 5.

Confession (which was constitutionally affirmed) as the standard of the synod.⁵² The old doctrinal question which the Henkels were to address to the Lutheran Church in America through this contest in North Carolina was: would the church acknowledge the Augsburg Confession and the doctrines it contains as the foundation of her faith and life, or would she capitulate to the wavering foundation of the human spirit expressing itself through majority opinion?⁵³ Paul Henkel's long-standing concern for the church's return to her objective ground of faith, now of twenty-three year's

⁵²David Henkel, in his Carolinian Herald of Liberty, p. 30, intimates that both sides knew that the question of constitutionality was going to be brought up when synod met again in 1820. "Why did they deny the constitution? They well knew that they had violated it in 1819; that we were about to bring them to an account for it; that, agreeably to it, their transactions in April [1819] would be declared void." He further shows by his argumentation that the question was the authority of the Augsburg Confession: "The constitution, inasmuch as it makes the Augsburg Confession of faith the point of union, is expressly against said plan of the General Synod," p. 29, and passim.

⁵³Ibid., p. 39. Henkel says, "The very intention of a constitution is, to be a check upon the majority; otherwise, if the majority could act as they list, a constitution would be useless, as the majority would then be the constitution." That the Henkels, through the contest which had focused itself in North Carolina, actually understood this local problem as the embodiment of the doctrinal problem facing the American Lutheran Church as a whole, is evident from the fact that David addresses his Carolinian Herald to the "Lutherans of North America," p. 3. Over against the rule of a general assembly expressing its unity, and governing its member through majority opinion, Henkel calls American Lutheranism to recognize that it already had a foundation which provided these things: "The Lutherans already have a standard: the Augsburg Confession of faith, which is considered scriptural," p. 5. The historical question is, did the Lutheran Church in America at this time really have this foundation, since the confessional base had been omitted in the written constitutions of all the

duration,⁵⁴ was to meet its day of decision. This is why the Henkel stance over against the General Synod and their doctrinal debates with the leaders of the North Carolina Synod must be viewed as an expression of their more basic concern for the truth by which the church lives. It is misleading, therefore, to interpret, either the division which occurred at Lincolnton, or the organization of the Tennessee Synod, as a piece of rising sectional consciousness created by the awakened spirit of frontier independence in the sphere of religion.⁵⁵ That there was a political dimension to the rationale underlying the cause cannot seriously be questioned, however, the political reasoning and the interpenetration, the interaction, and the interrelationship of

synods existing at that time? The answer would have to be decided upon the basis of intention. The Henkels answer the question affirmatively on the basis of the fact that the synods never rescinded the old doctrinal base by a conscious act. S. S. Schmucker represents the negative answer, for he interpreted the history of the gradual departure from the stricter confessional subscription of the fathers down to the progressively non-committal stance of their children as an act of deliberate intention, see his The American Lutheran Church, Discourse V, Chapter II.

⁵⁴Paul Henkel first introduced the motion of printing the Augsburg Confession to the Special Conference of Virginia in 1797. See A Chronological Life, p. 32.

⁵⁵Roy H. Johnson, "The Lutheran Church and the Western Frontier," p. 246 and passim. Johnson leaves the impression that frontier conditions were a major contributing factor in the conservatism of western Lutheranism. See also W. D. Allbeck, A Century of Lutherans in Ohio, pp. 53, 57-67, for a similar view.

political-religious ideas must be clearly distinguished.⁵⁶ The basic cause, and the motivating principle was that of right doctrine. The Henkel reaction which manifested itself in the distinctive Lutheran character of Ohio, in their opposition to the General Synod, their firm stand for the constitution of the North Carolina Synod, and their disagreements with the leaders in North Carolina, was their final answer to the old lingering spirit of doctrinal compromise and rationalization.⁵⁷

It was regrettable that Schober, above all others, represented this spirit, and became one of the principle antagonists in the contest. The personalities involved on both sides, however, should not be allowed to diminish the fact that the central issue was over truth, and right belief. The immediate protagonists were the channels through which the doctrinal issue would resolve itself. Doctrine was the drama, the men composing both parties in the North Carolina Synod were the actors, the culminating events over the years were the stage.

⁵⁶David Henkel had written (in 1823) to Pastor Markert and other pastors in Ohio, "This [General Synod] looks like Federalists' work, yea, like monarchy itself. A few to govern a whole free, independent community is too much to swallow. But it is evident that Federalists are at the head of the matter," quoted in Allbeck, p. 64. See also David Henkel, Carolinian Herald, pp. 18-20.

⁵⁷Ferm, commenting on the reason for the formation of the Tennessee Synod, says: "This event may be taken as the first organized effort to bring the Lutheran Church back to a confessional consciousness since the days of the Patriarch. . . ." Vergilius Ferm, The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology, p. 64.

The above discussion provides the necessary background for interpreting the meaning of what happened at the synod of 1820.

It was evident before hand that it would be a very serious meeting, and the members came with anxious hearts. . . . No one could forecast [the turn of events] Mr. Storck [Storch] was willing to blot out the past, all forgive and be forgiven. Shober [Schober] was willing for that if nothing else could be gotten, but he was ready to fight. . . . [David Henkel] was going to bring the charge of Lutheran heresy against Schober and Storck. This was the crux of the whole matter. When that was denied the division . . . [would be] inevitable.⁵⁸

It is difficult to reconstruct from the varying accounts just what did happen. Trinity Sunday went by without an overt incident. Storch preached in German and Bell in English, the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and the synod was dismissed to meet the following day at 9:00 A.M., for the transaction of business.⁵⁹ Early Monday morning, the Henkels "took possession of the Church,⁶⁰" and "refused admission to the rest.⁶¹" "After some parliamenterring, written and verbal, both parties entered the church,"⁶² and the long,

⁵⁸Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 6.

⁵⁹Peschau, p. 41.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 41.

⁶¹F. Bente, American Lutheranism, I, p. 123.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 123-124.

heated discussion got down to the doctrinal issues involved.

the validity of David Henkel's ordination was denied. Henkel proposed to be tried by the Confessions of the Lutheran Church and the Constitution of Synod, and if found wrong he would submit. On the other hand he demanded that the actions of Schober and others be tried by the same rule. This Schober refused and demanded the submission of Henkel to the decision of the majority.⁶³

Against this demand, and in opposition to the superior attitude exhibited by Schober, David Henkel responded in a graphic manner as recorded by L. A. Fox, one of the biographers of this memorable day:

[David] stood up as a sudden revelation alike to his friends and his enemies, and perhaps to himself. . . . He defended his cause with a force of argument that was irresistible even by the old lawyer with all his experience in the courts. He was invincible alike in attack and defense. Instead of a suppliant begging for mercy and claiming the gracious privilege of remaining even a suspected man in the Synod as they expected, he arraigned the court convened to try him. He convicted it of violating its own fundamental principles. The flood of evidence he turned upon it made the president and secretary in their despair deny that the Synod had a constitution and then in their helplessness retract their denial.⁶⁴

"David Henkel demanded three things: that they admit they had a constitution; that they try him by it; and also that they themselves be tried for heresy. They did the first; they were willing to do the second, but preferred not; the third

⁶³Quoted in B. D. Wessinger, The Work of the Pioneers of the Tennessee Synod, [An Address Delivered at its Centennial Celebration by its President, Rev. B. D. Wessinger in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920], p. 14.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 15-16. See also Socrates Henkel, pp. 20-23, for a descriptive account of this day's events.

⁶⁵Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod, p. 6.

was contemptuously rejected."⁶⁵ The third point was essential (while the others were technical) and brought forth the doctrinal debate.⁶⁶

The debated doctrines were baptism, the Lord's Supper, creedal subscription, unionism, regeneration, conversion, and predestination, involving also their subsidiary ramifications.⁶⁷

Representative theological statements of the North Carolina Synod regarding their view of baptismal regeneration were given in answer to questions raised by the Methodist observer, Rev. James Hill.

We do not say that all who are baptized with water are regenerated and converted to God, so that they are saved without the operation of the Holy Spirit, or in other words, without faith in Christ.⁶⁸

The Henkels responded to this by warning against the errors of the enthusiasts, "that conversion and regeneration was effected by anxious shrieking, united prayer, and the exertion of all the powers of the body and soul,"⁶⁹ to "move the Holy Spirit, or even to force Him, to finish the work of regeneration."⁷⁰

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 6.

⁶⁷As listed in Bente, I, pp. 125-128, and his whole discussion of the Tennessee Synod, p. 148, *passim*. Bente cites from the original German Reports, Verrichtungender ersten Conferenz, which he footnotes according to an older methodology, for example, (Tenn. Report, 1820, 27), etc. The present writer has compared Bente with the original.

⁶⁸Quoted in Bente, I, p. 127. See also Peschau, p. 45, for reference to this letter.

⁶⁹Bente, I, p. 128.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 209.

This method, according to the Henkels, was basically "to preach the law and its curse."⁷¹ The Henkels regarded this as the destruction of the gospel, and the nullification of all certainty for faith. They said, rather, "we are not to seek salvation in any work which we ourselves can create or perform, no matter whatever its nature may be, but only through faith on the Lord and Savior Christ. . . ."⁷² Faith itself is a bestowed gift through baptism and is in itself regeneration, conferring the grace of Christ on man, while man is a passive recipient. Baptism is so intimately the means of regeneration that they must be held together in an indissoluble bond, so that whoever is baptized is also regenerated. The Henkels said:

[Christ] . . . alone has done everything for us, and through the grace which He bestows and confers on us in Holy Baptism, whereby we are regenerated. . . . the washing and cleansing from sin is effected alone through Baptism, and that by faith alone such grace is appropriated. . . . [Thus] whoever is baptized and has true faith in Christ, is in need of nothing else in order to die a blessed death.⁷³

Their opponents held a spiritual view of the Lord's Supper. In answer to the query of Mr. Hill, whether his understanding, that for thirteen years the North Carolina Synod taught the bodily presence was incorrect, they testified:

⁷¹Ibid., p. 209.

⁷²Ibid., p. 210.

⁷³Ibid., pp. 210-211. The quotation is a compilation of statements from these pages.

We do not believe and teach that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are bodily received with the bread and wine in the Holy Supper, but that the true believer receives and enjoys it spiritually together with all saving gifts of His suffering and death, by faith in Jesus Christ.⁷⁴

David Henkel understood the consequences of their explanation as a denial of the real presence. He said, "They admit no other partaking than a spiritual one by faith,"⁷⁵ hence, their view obliterates the fact that the body and blood are really present and administered "corporeally," and the communicant, whether believer or unbeliever, "receives nothing but bread and wine."⁷⁶ Henkel maintained, "If the body and blood of Christ are at all received, they must be received corporeally; because there can be no body unless it be a body."⁷⁷ He then compared the view of the North Carolina Synod with that of Luther, showing that Luther taught the real bodily presence of the body and blood in the bread and wine. David quotes Luther's realistic statement, "[they are fanatics and sacramentarians] who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Lord's supper is his real (human) body, whom the wicked, or

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 127.

⁷⁵David Henkel, Carolinian Herald, p. 32. The Carolinian contains the major portion of David Henkel's writings on the Lord's Supper.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 32. David Henkel acknowledges that the opponents confessed a spiritually partaking of the body and blood for the believer, but his arguments indicate that they conceived of the spiritual presence as a mere shadow and a token of remembrance, thus if the real body was not received then nothing but bread and wine were received by anyone.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 32., supra above.

Judas, receives with his mouth, as well as St. Peter, and all saints."⁷⁸ David uses the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession as translated in the book Luther to prove to them that the body and blood are "there really present and administered. . . ."⁷⁹ Although David used the word corporeal, human, and natural, either as his own term or by approved citation, he did not mean that this true body and blood were received "in a gross, carnal manner, and devoured by pieces, like the eating of other meat, etc."⁸⁰ It was, nevertheless, in full reality the true natural body and blood eaten and drunk with the mouth, yet in a manner "divinely mysterious" and "inconceivable my human reason."⁸¹

Regarding predestination, one of the members of North Carolina "declared, and sought to maintain, that it was impossible for a man to fall from the grace of God after he had once been truly converted."⁸² Another said, "Can I not

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 35. The word human is italicized and bracketed.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 33 and footnote (b).

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 33, footnote (b). In the footnote he contrasts the translation of the book Luther with the original German, saying, the German is more emphatical than Luther but not contradictory. This shows that the Henkels could accept the book Luther and interpret in a Lutheran sense, while their opponents could interpret it in a Reformed. Since David could interpret the wording here in a Lutheran way, it is probable that Paul Henkel's Christian Catechism definitions were understood similarly by the Henkels.

⁸¹Ibid., supra, above.

⁸²Bente, I, pp. 127-128.

be a predestinarian [German: Gnadenwähler] and also a Lutheran? For he believed that the teaching of predestination could be proven from the Bible."⁸³ The Henkels looked upon this idea as a false and deluding security, saying:

They [the opponents] declare: We are born anew, and we know indeed that it is so, for the Spirit of God has given testimony to our spirit. But if one desires to learn how He had given this testimony, whether they had seen Him or heard Him, or in what manner or whereby He had given such assurance, they appeal to their imaginations and sensations, from which also something peculiar, like an apparition, may come to them; but whatever this is we do not know. One can be absolutely sure, however, that it is not the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴

In place of this delusionary reliance upon human experience, the Henkels set the firm "testimonies of Holy Scripture," the promise of the gospel confirming to men the forgiveness of their sins, and the certainty of their baptism.⁸⁵

Unionism was also one of the chief points of discussion debated on that fateful Monday, and the Henkels saw unionism as the overriding reason that prevented the North Carolina Synod from acknowledging their mistakes so that the breach may not have become final, and the doctrinal disagreements may possibly have been reconciled within the synodical framework through the course of time.

⁸³Translated from the Verrichtungen der ersten Conferenz, p. 25. See also Bente, I, p. 128, where he brackets (Presbyterian), which is not in the original. The original does not necessarily refer to the denomination which holds the doctrine, but to the doctrine itself.

⁸⁴Bente, I, 209-210.

⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 207-213. The Henkel response is gleaned from these pages.

yet the desire [on their part] to organize the General Synod and to bring about a union with all religious bodies, especially with the Presbyterians, was so strong as to outweigh everything else.⁸⁶

When the Henkels criticized them on this account, their opponents responded by reminding them that they themselves had served all religious parties with the word and sacrament and thus had evidenced their own participation in, and desire for, union with others. The Henkels admitted this, and felt that their service had not been without blessing to some, however, at the same time they had never compromised the truth.

they [the Henkels] had always taught such people what our Church teaches, and that they had never preached anything else in deference to them, or to please them. Now, if any one was agreed with our doctrine, and hence felt free to hear our doctrine and to commune with us, we could not hinder him. We do not regard the name of such people, but what they believe.⁸⁷

This approach to the matter of unionism is confirmed also by David's attitude toward his relation with the Evangelical Reformed. He communed them on the basis of their belief and not on on the basis of their person or religious affiliation.⁸⁸

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 125.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 216.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 216. Bente sees an inconsistency here. The Henkels, however, were fully consistent with their principle that faith constitutes worthiness of reception, not outward affiliation. Bente thinks denominationally--right belief necessarily implies right organization. The Henkels would see this as a nullification of the faith principle, if it were logically pursued.

What the Henkels saw in an organizational unionism that sacrificed doctrinal agreement was basically a threat to the true freedom of the Church, which in effect cast doubt upon the certainty of justification by faith alone. David Henkel points this out rather stringently in his writing against the General Synod.

If union is also to centre in a General Synod, how, then, can it centre in Christ only? Whosoever is justified by Christ, is also united to him: his soul being impressed with his lovely image, he is in fellowship with all saints and angels in the universe, whether they dwell in any of the regions here below, or in the high climes of bliss. The union of believers, like their king, is invisible-- "their life being hid with Christ in God," it therefore does not matter whether their human ceremonies and modes of government harmonize.⁸⁹

The fear that human coercion based on obedience to human mandates, social pressure, the papal principle, human tradition, would all rise up to destroy Christian liberty, and what is more, result in the loss of the heart of the gospel, moved David to the emotional pitch of declaring that the principle of a general Lutheran synod, or a national synod of Protestants would mean "farewell thou sweet doctrine of free justification, through the crucified. . . ." ⁹⁰ Consequently,

⁸⁹David Henkel, Carolinian Herald, p. 7.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 8. The motif of justification runs throughout his criticism of a general synod as the major criterion with which he evaluates its principles.

he sought to direct the church toward the freedom that the Augsburg Confession guaranteed to her. He saw this principle of freedom especially in the seventh article of the Confession. He maintained that only by adhering to the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession would the church preserve her true faith and unity.⁹¹

The doctrinal differences were not only unresolved, but the controversy which had waged for only half a day, revealed that the distance between them was as wide as it was 291 years long:

The rupture, then, was inevitable: the doctrinal and spiritual gap between Schober and his compeers on the one hand and the Henkels and their adherents on the other hand being just as wide and insurmountable as that between Zwingli and Luther at Marburg 1592.⁹²

The material principle which divided them in doctrine and in spirit was the principle of objectivity. This had been evident already in the beginning of the morning session when both parties had entered the church. Schober, true to his spirit, had argued for a settlement on the basis that:

Synod was not bound to any fixed or definite regulation, according to which controversies or differences are to be decided, but that such things are to be decided only according to the majority⁹³ of votes of the ministers and lay-delegates. . . .

The Henkels, in accordance with their hard-won theological principle of letting God be God, and not subjective humanism, contended:

⁹¹Ibid., pp. 1-20, and passim.

⁹²Bente, I, 128.

⁹³Socrates Henkel, p. 21.

that the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, which they felt certain could be proved to be in accord with the teachings of the Bible, ought to be of greater consideration, than is the majority of the votes of persons, who are opposed to the doctrines and regulations of the Church.⁹⁴

The Restoration of the Augsburg Confession
to the American Lutheran Church

Two different spirits had come to the ultimate question-- the question of authority, man or God. Although the words were couched in the terminology of being a true Lutheran, of defending the truth over error, of being right or wrong, of having a fixed standard over against a functional one, the issue was basically that one part viewed Christian doctrine from the standpoint of relativity, while the other viewed doctrine from the principle of absolutism, chiefly the doctrine of the gospel.⁹⁵ Schober's relativism, which was

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 21.

⁹⁵The Henkels, however, must not be understood as operating with a kind of unitary concept of doctrine. The circle of their theological concerns revolved around the doctrines of justifying faith, baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the word of God as law and gospel, with justification as the center out of which the circle evolved to include the doctrines of Holy Scripture. An analogy would be like that of a stone being thrown into a pool of water. Since the Augsburg Confession and the Book of Concord witnessed to the centrality of the gospel of justification by faith, they championed it, and felt that thereby the age old problem of Bible interpretation would have an interpretative guide to keep the church centered on the gospel. This is not to say that they were only concerned with the doctrine of the gospel. The Henkels confessed in principle all the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, but

also the motivating principle governing the constitution of the General Synod, manifested itself in his personal view of the constitution of the North Carolina Synod:

He claimed, that it was only a kind of plan or form, which, in the course of time, if deemed necessary in the future, might be formed or arranged into a rule of order, but for the present, no one [needed] . . . anything of the kind.⁹⁶

The closing words exchanged between the two groups indicate how the Henkels viewed the inner nature of their opponents theology. The other party terminated the discussions "To put an end to David's coarseness. . . ."97

The scene is described by Socrates Henkel:

they were mainly concerned about relating the teachings of the Bible to its chief teaching---the gospel. See the "Basis and Regulations" for the Tennessee Synod in Socrates Henkel, p. 25, article 2. See also David Henkel's Remarks on Articles 1 and 2 of the Constitution of the Tennessee Synod, in, Liturgy, or Book of Forms: Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1843) pp. 203-205.

⁹⁶Socrates Henkel, p. 21. See the relativistic tenor of the 4th Article of the Proposed Plan (Plan=Entwurf) for the General Synod as printed in 1819, in, Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748 to 1821 (Philadelphia: Board of Publications of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1898) p. 542.

⁹⁷Peschau, p. 42. Peschau records numerous citations against David Henkel, and one resolution against him which occurred in the sessions held from Monday afternoon, May 29, through to the end of the synod. Of course, the Henkels and their opponents had severed ties after that fateful Monday morning, May 29, 1820. Thus, these commendations of an ill-nature were handed out in absentia.

In the midst of the discussion of these subjects, so vitally important, one of the officers of the Synod, who was so enthusiastic in regard to his idea of a general union, exclaimed: "Whoever is a right Lutheran, let him follow us out to J. H.'s hotel,"-- "there we will begin our Synod!" A reply came from the other side: "Whoever is a real fanatic" (Schwarmer), "Let him follow; for you are no true Lutheran preachers; you are fanatics, and to such you belong."⁹⁸

And old term of Luther's had come out of the past, and it characterized the central theological problem that stood between them.

It was a sad Monday morning, years of fraternal fellowship and service had reached the point of no return. Both sides evidently felt certain that they were being faithful to the truth of the gospel. A young teacher added a parting word to the departing majority:

According to the testimony of Holy Scripture, it is impossible for us to regard you as anything but false teachers. Then one of the old ministers turning toward the assembly, said: "Now you yourselves have heard the boldness and impertinence of this young man, who charges us, old and respectable ministers that we are, with false doctrine."⁹⁹

One of the older ministers stopped at the door of the church and said that "he was astonished," but the Henkels replied, that they "could not help that," since the majority would

⁹⁸Socrates Henkel, p. 22.

⁹⁹Quoted in F. Bente, p. 126.

not answer to the doctrines in dispute and agree to settle them according to the Augsburg Confession.¹⁰⁰

On July 17, 1820, the Henkel men formed the Tennessee Synod at Solomon's Church, Cove Creek, Green County, Tennessee. For the first time since 1792, an American Lutheran Synod had a firm confessional base that "unreservedly received and acknowledged the Unaltered Augsburg Confession . . ." as the foundation on which all its doctrines and life would be based, in conformity with Holy Scripture.¹⁰¹

The old motion which had first been made at Woodstock, Virginia, the first Sunday in October, 1797, revealed an inner theology that produced the confessional stance now formalized into a synod. In that day, however, it was opprobriously termed "Hinkelism" by many contemporaries.¹⁰²

Paul Henkel's theology brought forth, nonetheless, a most singular blessing to the Lutheran Church of his day--- the restoration of the Augsburg Confession as an official standard of the church. His theology paved the way for the Confessions of the church to be taken seriously. The judgment of history would, therefore, rather concur with Bernheim:

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 126. The quotations are taken from Bente.

¹⁰¹Socrates Henkel, p. 32.

¹⁰²This is the term used by E. L. Hazelius in his History of the American Lutheran Church: From its Commencement in the Year 1685 to the Year 1842 (Zanesville, Ohio, n. p., 1846) p. 151. He is an example of the ridicule which the men of Tennessee received from their contemporaries. Another negative treatment is that of S. S. Schmucker in his The American Lutheran Church, pp. 214-219. Schmucker cites contemporary opposition to the "Henkelites," from a number of sources, p. 218.

admirers of Luther there were in abundance, even among other denominations, but few knew anything of the secret which made Luther the conscientious, fearless and zealous man that he was. Multitudes admired Luther's energy and labors, but they knew little of the faith which actuated his labors, and of the doctrines upon which that faith was based. [Through the Tennessee Synod and the Henkel Press there] . . . issued more truly Lutheran theological works in an English dress than any similar institution in the world.¹⁰³

Bernheim, of course, benefits from the perspective of historical results. He is able to place an affirmative value judgment on the Henkel work because hindsight had revealed the blessings which came through their efforts. It was, however, a blessing in disguise for the ones who lived contemporaneously to the events of 1819 and 1820. The majority remained with Schober and the non-Henkelian branch of the North Carolina Synod. Things looked rather dismal for the future of the constitutional element of the North Carolina Synod (the new Tennessee Synod). A handful of men, four pastors, nineteen laymen, representing nine congregations limited to the state of Tennessee, was all that could have been placed in a statistical yearbook at the organizing convention of the fourth Lutheran synod in America.¹⁰⁴ David Henkel

¹⁰³G. D. Bernheim, pp. 444-446.

¹⁰⁴Socrates Henkel, pp. 24-31, provides a brief overview of the first session of the new synod.

himself was not able to be in attendance due to domestic affairs, but he approved of the transaction by acquiescence.¹⁰⁵ The organization of the Synod was an act of faith against reasonable appearances, and her critics predicted that it would fold overnight.

The critics, however, failed to assess the extent of the influence that David Henkel and the Henkel men had among many people in North Carolina. One must recall that theological discussions and presentations of the distinctive Lutheran teachings had been going on at least since 1816. Paul Henkel did an extensive amount of instruction in the chief doctrines on his tours to the south, and David had been lecturing and holding classes of debate in conscious counter-action to the theological views represented by Schober and Storck.

An interesting letter copied by Paul Henkel in the aforementioned pocket diary of 1820, gives a graphic example of what must have been a general occurrence in the years preceeding the synodical schism. The letter was written to David Henkel, dated May 28, 1820, and reads:

Rev'd Sir: Your being at my home and delivering that short discourse on Tuesday morning the 2d of May; has excited a great deal of stir in our neighborhood amongst the people, and regretting that they missed

¹⁰⁵L. A. Fox, "Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," p. 53, states the reason why David Henkel did not attend the organizing session of the synod as that of domestic affairs. David Henkel in his own account of this meeting offers no reason for his absence, see his Carolinian Herald of Liberty, p. 42.

hearing you. But upon hearing that you are expected to be at the same place ere long; express a most ardent desire to hear you and the same subject that [you] preached upon at Mesr's Lang's [?] on Thursday, the 24th of February, and a short sketch of the same sermon at my house on Tuesday morning the 2d of May appears to be the subject that the people generally desire to hear.¹⁰⁶

This letter is valuable as an indication that David Henkel, as well as the Henkel men, responded more to requests upon them to explain the theological issues which had become a matter of public concern, than that they openly fostered contentions among the people; one contemporary historian suggested this as a common Henkelite practice.¹⁰⁷ Perhaps, this is why Paul Henkel copied the letter; for the copied correspondence and entries in this pocket diary of 1820 includes, as cited previously, the letter to David from Schober on the Lord's Supper, and the letter of David's recommendation given by the synodical officers after his trial of April 1819. The letter of recommendation is a copy of the original German showing that, in all probability, it was copied from the letter itself which David had retained in his possession.¹⁰⁸ The inference is, that Paul Henkel assured himself of the justification of David's position and

¹⁰⁶This letter is contained in Paul Henkel's pocket diary of 1820, in the Archives of the Concordia Historical Institute, as described supra, p. 126, n. 81, Chapter V., and is quoted as copied. The letter was deciphered under infra-red light.

¹⁰⁷Ernest L. Hazelius, p. 151.

¹⁰⁸David Henkel, Carolinian Herald of Liberty, p. 24.

conduct, and kept a copy of these documents as proof that David was vindicated in his actions, and the Tennessee Synod was not the product of personal animosities. The letter continues:

And if you still are [.] in the same mind to come to my house and preach a sermon. I expect that the same subject would be very gratifying to a large and numerous audience, which you may rely upon will be thereto hear you. When you write direct to Wm. Harris, Cabarrus County, Concord Post Office, and if possible be there over night or surely to begin publick service at 12 o'clock on whatsoever day you appoint. I will pilot you (or find a pilot) to conduct you to Mesrs. Flagler's [?] the next day. If possible you can bring me a book of the discipline of the Lutheran Church, I will regard it as a particular favor. So conclude yours.

William S. Harris¹⁰⁹

There are other important notations in this pocket diary written in German, and Latin script, which may prove an important source to the historian in analyzing and interpreting what judgments the Henkels were putting upon their own, and their opposition's actions, in the years 1818 through 1821. Sufficient evidence has been adduced, however, to add to a reappraisal of the factors leading up to the first schism within a Lutheran synodical structure in the United States. The reappraisal may further confirm the basic thesis of this study, namely, that the theology of Paul Henkel redounded to

¹⁰⁹Paul Henkel's pocket diary of 1820.

the doctrinal blessing of the Lutheran Church in America,
and that considering the circumstances and deteriorated con-
dition of Lutheran theology at that time, the mantle of
charity must be placed over the Henkel name in the theological
enrichment they rendered to American Lutheranism.

CHAPTER VII

CLOSING YEARS AND SUMMARY STATEMENTS

The Closing Years 1820-1825

The preceding presentation of the theological conflict that occurred in North Carolina in May 1820 tells the story of the culminative development and impact of the theology of Paul Henkel in relation to his environment. The theological clarity and position that revealed itself at Lincolnton became embodied in the Tennessee Synod, and its history. The sons of Paul Henkel continued the theological accents of their father, enriching and deepening them. This deepening is seen primarily in the doctrinal writings of David Henkel.¹ Although some wish to see a new development in David, which served as a correction upon his father and brothers, the evidence points more strictly to a deepened understanding and delineation of Paul Henkel's basic principles than to anything new or corrective.² Any difference would have to be discovered in the area of their respective temperaments, and in the methodology by which they applied their theology, as

¹A list of David Henkel's theological works is given in Socrates Henkel, History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel and Co., Printers and Publishers, 1890), pp. 81-2.

²B. D. Wessinger, The Work of the Pioneers of the Tennessee Synod [An address delivered at its centennial celebration by its President, in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920], p. 16.

their content was the same.³ Compare, for example, Paul Henkel's Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper of 1809 with the works of David on the same subjects, and one will find nothing new, only enlarged.⁴

³William Edward Eisenberg raises the question of Paul Henkel's approval of the 1819 events occasioning the formation of the Tennessee Synod, implying that he was a victim of circumstances and had to make the best of the situation. See his The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962, including an Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee (Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell Company, Inc., 1967), p. 136. The present study tends, however, to show that Paul Henkel was personally involved in an affirmative way. Theological unity existed between Paul and his son David long before Lincolnton, 1820. That Paul Henkel as well as David deplored the schism is beyond question. It must be remembered, however, that David did not receive a sympathetic synodical hearing for four years (1816-1820) before the break; that during these four years his requests for clarification were attended by petitions from his congregations; and that, the most that could be said in behalf of synodical action would have to be (to use a modern phrase) "David's case--referred to committee." Simultaneously, however, steps were taken continually to repress David Henkel's standing in synod. While it may be that the temperament of Paul and Philip Henkel would not have occasioned the Tennessee Synod, and it took David's to do so, it remains for the historians to fully weigh, on the other hand, the legalism of Schober, as well as the coercive implementation of the prevailing unionism, as the real occasioning factors in the rise of the Tennessee Synod. Where was the Henkel alternative to be found?

⁴This is the judgment of Bente. F. Bente, American Lutheranism: Early History of American Lutheranism and the Tennessee Synod (St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1919), I, p. 130. The present writer concurs. See Socrates Henkel, History of the Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: Henkel and Co., Printers and Publishers, 1890) pp. 81-82, for the published works of David Henkel. The present writer has examined all of these writings with the exception of the first work, and finds Bente's judgment substantially correct. David Henkel's writing, Fragments on Justification contained in his Answer to Joseph Moore, the Methodist (New Market, Va.: Henkel's office, 1825), could be considered a major contribution, but not a new, or one different in spirit from the theology of his father.

Paul Henkel's closing years witness to his agreement with his theology which had now come to fruition in his sons.

In December of 1820, S. S. Schmucker came to New Market and began laboring in the congregations served by Paul Henkel.⁵

Schmucker intensified the feelings of many Lutherans against the conservative nature of Paul Henkel's theology. This intensification found outward expression in the doors of the church Paul Henkel had organized being closed against him.⁶

Schmucker represented the same tendencies as Schober and the North Carolina Synod, and Paul Henkel was instrumental in organizing a new congregation which would remain faithful to the confessional theology so necessary to be proclaimed to the weakened church of that day.⁷ Henkel never severed his relations with the old Ministerium of Pennsylvania, as it was

⁵A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel: From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, etc. Selected and translated by W. J. Fink (New Market, Va.: 1935-1937), typewritten manuscript in the personal library of Professor Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis, p. 452.

⁶C. W. Cassell, W. J. Finck, and Eldon O. Henkel, History of the Lutheran Church in Virginia and East Tennessee (Strasburg, Va.: Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., published by the Authority of the Lutheran Synod of Virginia, 1930), pp. 218-219.

⁷B. H. Pershing, "Paul Henkel: Frontier Missionary, Organizer, and Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, VII (January 1935), p. 103. See also S. S. Schmucker's remarks against the Henkels in his The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated, in Several Occasional Discourses (Philadelphia: E. W. Miller, Ranstead Place, fifth edition, 1852). p. 219.

not in his nature to do so.⁸ Although the disruption had occurred in North Carolina, and he devoted his main attention to the Tennessee Synod, this, however, did not interfere with his fraternal relations with the men of other denominations, at least on a personal basis.⁹ In 1823, at the time of his severe illness, the North Carolina Synod sent an official letter of reconciliation to settle the quarrel between the two synods, but there is no record that Paul answered it.¹⁰ Henkel's concern for the truth was perhaps too strong to permit him to convey any spirit of compromise, especially toward those who were at the source of the problem. His testimony to the truth of the gospel, therefore, must be sought as the cause for any divisions in which he was involved. Generally speaking, the reported evidence places the act of separation on those who took exception to his teachings in defense of the gospel.¹¹

⁸A Chronological Life, pp. 473. Paul Henkel remained a member of the synods of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Tennessee till death. The Henkels always regarded themselves as the true North Carolina Synod since they abided by the constitution. The act of separation was not on their part.

⁹Ibid., p. 470, 472, 473, for Paul Henkel's continued correspondence with Reformed ministers, old colleagues in the Pennsylvania Ministerium, and a letter to Rev. Henry A. Muhlenberg of Reading, Pennsylvania, dated July 30, 1825. These letters may have contained doctrinal admonition, but even so, this witness to his "method by persuasion."

¹⁰Ibid., p. 470. This information was gathered by the compiler of the Diary. See F. W. E. Peschau, Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina. From 1803-1826, Twenty-Three Conventions, translated from the German Protocol (Newberry, S.C. "Aull and Houseal, Printers, 1894), for the action of the committee, p. 57.

¹¹Cassell, Finck, and Henkels, eds. History of the Lutheran

The closing years of his life were spent actively in the service of the Tennessee Synod. He probably served as its president for the year 1821, and was appointed that year to provide a suitable liturgy for the synod.¹² He wrote many letters throughout his remaining years to the pastors and congregational officers of the synod, strengthening, and directing them in their work.¹³ He took an active part in the convention of the synod in 1824, in which he saw his son Ambrose ordained into the ministry to succeed him in the pastorates of the Virginia congregations. Also at this convention, Daniel Moser came over into the Tennessee Synod from North Carolina.¹⁴ The aged father could well rejoice at this convention, for his sons were active in the states of

Church in Virginia and East Tennessee, pp. 218-219, illustrates this point. See also, A Chronological Life, p. 463, entry for Sunday, September 8, 1822.

¹²A Chronological Life, p. 457. See also the Preface to the Liturgy or Book of Forms: Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod (New Market, Va.: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1843).

¹³Ibid., pp. 455, 467, 470.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 472. The youngest son Charles was an active minister in the state of Ohio. He added his testimony to the theology of his father by translating and editing an edition of the Augsburg Confession to which he prefixed a brief history of the Reformation. See his, Charles Henkel, translator and editor, Augsburg Confession of Faith, translated from the German language with Preliminary Observations by the translator. (New Market, Va.: S. Henkel's Office, 1834).

Ohio, Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee to witness to the confessional character of true Lutheranism, which they did, not always in the evangelical manner of their father, but nevertheless always faithful to the theology they had imbibed from him.

In the last year of his life (1825), Paul Henkel sent in his last synodical report.¹⁵ He preached his last sermon on Sunday, October 9, 1825. The text was the words recorded in St. Luke, "Behold this Child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against."¹⁶ The words spoken at his funeral, in November, witness to the nature of the theology which characterized his lifelong convictions in the ministry.

His greatest concern during his sickness was that we might all remain true to the pure Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, and manfully, in gentleness and patience, fight for that for which he had fought so hard.¹⁷

These words also summarize the legacy Paul Henkel left to posterity.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 473-474. His last synodical service to the Ohio Synod in this same year was an admonition for them not to join the General Synod, admonishing them to "always remain true to the old Evangelical order." [immer der alten Evangelischen Ordnung treu bleiben]. The letter was read to the convention in his absence. See B. Pershing, p. 110.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 474.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 475.

Summary Evaluation of the Theology of Paul Henkel

The theology of Paul Henkel was characterized by its objective thrust. It is true that he had remained for a greater portion of his life within the framework of pietism, casting it off determinatively in later years. Even at that, his pietism speaks more to his terminology and manner of expression than it does to his conception of theological meaning. From early years, as his sermons attest, his theology was stamped with the motif of judging by faith and not according to appearances. He was ever striving for that which is permanent and certain, beyond the vagaries of human experience. His theology, therefore, tended, increasingly towards what God has done in Christ for man's salvation, and what He continually does for man through the means of grace, chiefly in promising and bestowing upon him the forgiveness of sins. Paul Henkel's theology, and its continued deepening enrichment manifested in the theological work of his sons, was concentrated in the objectivity of God's grace.¹⁸ The unique Henkelian contribution to the Lutheran thought of their day was their witness to this grace as it was there for man in the preached word and sacraments. The present grace of God was what the church had

¹⁸F. Bente, I, p. 210.

lost sight of, which as a consequence turned man in upon himself, driving him to seek refuge in those things which were within the province of human achievement, and rationality. The sacraments were rationalized at the expense of the mystery which they proclaimed and communicated. Faith became synonymous with pious feeling and the desire to possess the experience of what one believed. It was an age of the triumph of the human spirit in American Christianity.

The Henkel theology represented a counter-reaction to that spirit which exalted man as the measure of faith. Their concentration, therefore, emphasized the central aspects of Christian doctrine most closely related to the person and work of God himself; hence, their sacramental theology. Their emphasis on the Word as promise and forgiveness, simply to be believed and trusted, requiring no other certain evidence or condition than the acceptance of forgiveness as a gift, struck a hard blow to human pride, but brought true comfort to many in a period of uncertainty.¹⁹

Luther's understanding of the gospel has been described as the act and word of God's gracious forgiveness in Christ

¹⁹S. Henkel, p. 23 and 37. The later Henkels understood the nature of the pietistic and indefinite spirit of doubt against which their fathers had contended.

which comes to man from the outside (extra nos) as declaration.²⁰ The Henkels captured the essence of Luther's concept of the gospel, although they were not as able to verbalize it as Luther had been. Their study of Luther and the theology of the Reformation,²¹ however, enabled them to detect the basic error in their religious milieu and to answer it with what can be affirmed as the motivating principle of their theology-- justification by faith. David Henkel summarized the material principle of the Henkel theology five years after the fateful doctrinal debate at Lincolnton, when he wrote:

There are many men, who would rather be saved in any other way, than by faith without the deeds of the law. Though they confess that they are to be saved by faith in Christ; yet how they labour to join with it their supposed well meaning legal deeds! . . . Now whilst a man imagines that his works are good; so that they contribute something towards his salvation, he is upheld in his pride, and is well contented to do all works, which have a good external appearance. Hence as the doctrine of justification without works, strikes at the root of his pride; contradicts his own righteousness; condemns all his works, even such as by the world are esteemed good, and laudable; and ranks him with malefactors; and gives all glory to²² Jesus the crucified Lord: he hates it

²⁰Werner Elert, The Structure of Lutheranism, translated from the German Morphologie des Luthertums, by Walter H. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), Chapter II, section 7, passim.

²¹Bente, I, p. 155. Bente titles this section, "Back to Luther! Back to the Lutheran Symbols!" He provides a brief overview of the publications which through the Henkel Press put Luther and the Symbols into English, the Book of Concord for the first time in 1851.

²²David Henkel, Answer to Joseph Moore, the Methodist, pp. 162-163.

Pride is the plight of man, and as the Henkel's learned through their environment, holy pride represented man at his worst. They were led to see that there could be no other ultimate alternative than that man would throw himself on the objective grace of God. That man would receive, and learn to live by trust in God's declaration of pardon for Christ's sake, which was continually new for him, and continually came to him from the outside; mediated through word and sacrament. "Justification is a forensick [sic] term, and signifies the acquittal of a person that is impleaded in judgment."²³ Forensic justification then, was the hallmark of the Henkel theology.²⁴ Paul strove to clarify it, David succeeded, and the Henkel Press published it for the benefit of the church in America.

S. S. Schmucker, whose father was trained for the ministry by Paul Henkel, once wrote:

If our old Lutheran brethren are willing to regard their peculiarities as non-essential, and live in peace with us, they are welcome to take part with us in our ministry and ecclesiastical organizations; but if they cannot refrain from either regarding or

²³Ibid., p. 142. See the whole section. David Henkel does not deny sanctification, but because it remains imperfect in this life, man is not to attempt to live apart from the constancy of faith as trust in the merits of Christ.

²⁴For an easily accessible reading of the justification theology of David Henkel in its relationship to law and gospel, see the compilation of his material contained in Carl S. Meyer, ed., Moving Frontiers: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964) pp. 31-34. Previous to this material this work also contains selections from the Journals of Paul Henkel. A merit of this work is its setting of translated, and original source documents within their historical framework.

denouncing us as dishonest, and pseudo Lutherans
 . . . whilst we wish them well as individuals,
 we desire no ecclesiastical communion with them. .
 . . In less than twenty years they will themselves
 see their error, and change their position, and
 their children will be worthy members of our
American Lutheran Church.²⁵

Charles Porterfield Krauth, however, portended the
 direction of American Lutheran theology more correctly.
 In a letter to Joseph A. Seiss, dated August 7, 1851, he wrote:

The New Market men have finished their translation
 of the Symbols, and have actually passed it through
 the press. The Valley of Virginia will now have
 the credit of having produced the most important
 contribution to the Lutheran Theological Literature
 of this country, which has yet appeared. . . .
 It marks a distinct era in the history of our
 Church in this country.²⁶

Perhaps, L. A. Fox indulged in a bit of tribute to the
 fathers, when he remarked at the hundredth anniversary of
 the Tennessee Synod that "the Book of Concord . . . sub-
 stituted Henkel for Schmucker in the leadership of the
 Church,"²⁷ but it is a historical truth that the confessional
 revival eventually gained the ascendancy over the spirit of
 "American Lutheranism" throughout the Lutheran Church in
 America.²⁸ Although the planting of the seed was small, "One of the

²⁵Schmucker, The American Lutheran Church, pp. 245-246.

²⁶Adolph Spaeth, Charles Porterfield Krauth (New York:
 The Christian Literature Co., 1898) I, 194.

²⁷L. A. Fox, The Origin of the Tennessee Synod [An Address
 Delivered at its Centennial Celebration in Lincolnton, N. C.,
 October 14, 1920], p. 10.

²⁸Abdel R. Wentz, A Basic History of Lutheranism in
 America (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955) p. 246. Wentz
 says, "It is interesting to observe . . . that the progress
 of every Lutheran body in this country has been marked by an
 increasing appreciation of the confessions of the church."

first in the East to raise a vigorous protest against the non-confessional trends of the "American Lutherans" was the Reverend Paul Henkel"29

The theology of a rather obscure country preacher, therefore, may well have been the voice in the wilderness that started the whole confessional revival.

Eisenberg, the latest historian to examine the record of the Henkels, adds this confirmation to the significant impact which Paul Henkel's theology made upon the church of his day, as well as the bequest it left to future generations:

The Lutheran Church in the American colonies had been ravaged by deterioration for decades. She was in grave danger of losing her peculiar genius, which is likewise her peculiar treasure, namely, her distinctive proclamation of the Gospel. Always under pressure from other churches of Protestantism, and from the secular forces within the American success environment, she was sorely tempted to wander along strange by-paths. The Tennessee Synod was the first body of Lutherans in America to grapple in a forthright manner with this problem, and to try to keep the Church within the traces of her own heritage and tradition. . . . [she] became an important factor in having . . . the Book of Concord recognized as the foundation stone upon which rests the structure of Lutheran Church organization in America today.³⁰

The best testimony to the theology of Paul Henkel remains, however, with his son Philip, who alludes to that

²⁹Carl Mauelshagen, American Lutheranism Surrenders to the Forces of Conservatism (Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, Division of Publications, 1936; published Doctoral Thesis), p. 46.

³⁰William Edward Eisenberg, The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962, including an Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee (Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell Company, Inc., 1967), p. 138.

"tower experience" which had gripped them all in these days when they were passing through the "valley of Baca." In the preface to a pamphlet edition of "Three Sermons of Luther," Philip Henkel wrote:

Many, who have read those sermons in the German language, were so completely convinced, of the necessity of being saved by grace, that they immediately changed their opinions, which they had imbibed, contrary to the order of salvation, that they now feel themselves fully satisfied.³¹

Paul Henkel's theology of the objective-gospel, which early had drawn its corrective from Luther,³² and which set in motion a theological revolution in American Lutheranism, was founded upon the ground-principle of Paul Henkel's great namesake, the Apostle Paul: "Man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3,28).³³

³¹Philip Henkel, and John N. Stirewalt, translators and editors: "Three Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther, As they were written by himself in the German language; and now translated into the English tongue, which are an excellent dissertation of FAITH AND HOLY BAPTISM: also containing profound proofs on Infant Baptism; and also the doctrine of the Lord's Supper." (New Market, Va.: Dr. S. Henkel's Office, 1827.).

³²Andrew Henkel states that his father had changed from a Melancthonian to a Lutheran view of the Augsburg Confession quite early in his life. See his biography of Paul Henkel in William Buell Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit (New York: R. Carter, 1857), IX, 63-64.

³³See Philip Henkel and Stirewalt, Title Page.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Henkel Writings and Publications

- A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel, From Journals, Letters, Minutes of Synods, etc. Selected and translated by William J. Finck, D.D. New Market, Virginia: n.p., 1935-1937. Typewritten volume of 438 pp. with an appendix in the possession of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Cooper, F. E., and Clement L. Martzoff, translators and editors. "Rev. Paul Henkel's Journal: His Missionary Journey to the State of Ohio in 1806," Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, XXIII (April 1914), 162-218. Translated from the German by Rev. F. E. Cooper of Milwaukee, Wisconsin and edited by Clement L. Martzoff, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
- Dr. Martin Luther's Church-Postil. Sermons on the Epistles: For the Different Sundays and Festivals of the Year. Translated from the German. New Market, Va.: New Market Evangelical Lutheran Publishing Company, Henkel and Calvert, printers, 1869.
- Graebner, Theodore, translator and editor. "Diary of Paul Henkel, Pioneer Missionary, 1801," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, I and II (April and July 1928), 16-20, and 43-47.
- Henkel, Ambrose, general editor. Luther on the Sacraments: or the Distinctive Doctrines of The Evangelical Lutheran Church, Respecting Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Translated from the German. New Market, Va.: Solomon D. Henkel and brothers, 1853.
- Henkel, Ambrosius. Das kleine A BC Buch, oder erste Anfangs-Büchlein. Neu Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia: Salomon Henkel's Druckerei, 1819.

Henkel, Andrew and others. "Bedenklichen Ursachen, Angegeben von einigen Evangelische-Lutherischen Predigern, im Staat, Ohio, und verschiedene Andere, warum sie den Plan-Entwurf der sogenannten Central-Synode nicht annehmen wollen, welcher im Jahr 1819 an der Lutherischen Synode in Baltimore verfasst wurde," Kurze Nachricht von den Verrichtungen der ersten Conferenz, der Deutschen, Evangelisch Lutherischen Prediger, gehalten in dem Staate Tennessee den 17ten Julius, 1820. Neu Market: S. Henkel's Druckerei, 1821.

Henkel, David. Against the Unitarians. A Treatise on the Person and Incarnation of Jesus Christ, in Which Some of the Principle Arguments of the Unitarians are Examined. Published by Order of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. New Market, Va.: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1830.

----- . Answer to Mr. Joseph Moore, the Methodist: With a Few Fragments on the Doctrine of Justification. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1825.

----- . "A Treatise, or a Few Fragments on Prayer," Report of the Transactions of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, During their Ninth Session, September 1828. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1828.

----- . "A Treatise, or a Few Fragments on Regeneration, 1830," Minutes of the Forty-Third Session of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod, October 17-21, 1863. Salisbury, N. C.: the "Watchman" Office, 1863.

----- . "Constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod with Remarks," Liturgy, or Books of Forms. Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1843.

----- . Carolinian Herald of Liberty, Religious and Political: Or A Testimony against attempted measures which in their nature are calculated to lead to the establishment of Popery among Protestants . . . in an Oration. There are also other subjects inserted in this title work, highly interesting to the Lutheran community. Salisbury, N. C.: Krider and Bingham, 1821.

----- , translator and editor. Doctor Martin Luther's Smaller Catechism, in the original German, accompanied by an

English translation; with Preliminary Observations by the translator. To which are added sundry Hymns and Prayers. Revised and Published by Order of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1829.

----- . Heavenly Flood of Regeneration: or, A Treatise on Holy Baptism. Salisbury, N. C.: Bingham and White, Printers, 1822.

-----, editor. "The Objections of the Committee Against the Constitution of the General Synod, Containing a Brief Account of the History of the Lutheran Church in America by the Clerk of the Committee, 'in a footnote,'" Report of the Transactions of the Second Evangelical Lutheran Conference, October 22, 1821. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing office, by Ambrose Henkel, 1821.

Henkel, Paul. Church Hymn Book, Consisting of Newly Composed Hymns With an Addition of Hymns and Psalms, From Other Authors, Carefully adapted for the use of Public Worship and many other occasions. First edition. New Market, Virginia: Solomon Henkel's Printing Office, 1816.

----- . Church Hymn Book, Consisting of Hymns and Psalms, Original and Selected: Adapted to Public Worship, and Many other Occasions. Third edition, enlarged and improved. Published by Order of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. New Market, Virginia: Solomon D. Henkel and Brothers. Joseph Funk and Sons, Mountain Valley, near Harrisonburg, Virginia: Printers and Binders, 1850.

----- . Der Christliche Catechismus, verfasst zum Unterrichts der Jugend in der Erkenntniss der Christlichen Religion; samt Morgen- und Abend-Gebäte, usw. wie auch eine kurze Erklärung der Fest-Fast- und Feier-Tagen, und besondere Sonntagen, usw. Zweite Auflage, verbessert und vermehret. Neu-Market, Schenandoah County, Virginia: S. Henkel's Druckerei, 1816.

----- . Der kleine Catechismus des sel. D. Martin Luthers, worin die fünf Hauptstücke zergliedert und in kurzen und besser begriffen werden kann, nebst andern Fragstücken: wie auch erbauliche Morgen-Tisch- und Abend-Gebäten und Liedern, und was sonst nöthig ist. Neu-Market, Schenandoah County, Virginia: Ambrosius Henkel and Comp., 1811.
(8ten Februar, 1811)

----- . Eine Kurze Betrachtung der Heil. Taufe und Abendmahl, Zum Unterricht des gemeinen Mannes. Verfasst von einem Menschenfreund und verehret des Reiche Christi. New-Market, Schenandoah Caunty, Virginia: Ambrosius Henkel und Comp., 1809.

----- . "Pocket Diary of 1794," Archives of the Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri.

----- . "Pocket Diary of 1820," Archives of the Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri.

----- . The Christian Catechism, Composed for the Instruction of Youth, in the Knowledge of the Christian Religion, Together with an Addition of Morning and Evening Prayers, etc. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1811 (April 1, 1811). An original edition in the possession of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner, St. Louis, Missouri.

----- . The Christian Catechism, Composed for the Instruction of Youth, in the Knowledge of the Christian Religion, together with an Addition of Morning and Evening Prayers, etc. Also An Explanation of Sundry Feasts, Festivals and Sundays, etc. Fifth edition, from the fourth enlarged edition. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1816.

Henkel, Philip, and John N. Stirewalt, translator and editors. Three Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther, As They Were Written by Himself, in the German Language, and How Translated into the English Tongue: Which are an Excellent Dissertation of Faith and Holy Baptism: Also Containing Profound Proofs of Infant Baptism: As Also of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1827.

Liturgy, or Book of Forms. Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1843.

Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, Together with An Historical Introduction: To Which are Added the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and a Selection of Hymns and Prayers Adapted to Catechetical Instruction and Family Devotion. Translated from the German. Second edition, revised. New Market, Virginia: Solomon D. Henkel and Brothers, 1855.

The Christian Book of Concord, or Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church: Comprising the Three Chief Symbols, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, The Apology, The Articles of Smalcald, Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, The Form of Concord, An Appendix, and Articles of Visitation. To Which is Prefixed An Historical Introduction. Translated from the German. New Market, Virginia: Solomon D. Henkel and Brothers, 1851.

The Christian Book of Concord, or Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church: Comprising the Three Chief Symbols, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, The Apology, The Smalcald Articles, Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, the Formula of Concord, And an Appendix. To Which is Prefixed An Historical Introduction. New Market, Virginia: Solomon D. Henkel and Brothers, 1854.

Books

A Choice Drop of Honey From the Rock Christ, or A Short Word of Advice to all Saints and Sinners; With a Note to the Reader by G. Shober. London: Printed in the Year MDCCXXXVIII. And Reprinted by Ambrose Henkel and Co., New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1811.

Clarke []. Erasmi Colloquia Selecta. London: Pater-Noster-Row, Hitch and Haws, sellers, n.d. This copy contains the signature of Paul Henkel and is found in the Archives of The Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri.

Freillinghausen, Johannes Anastasi. Definitiones Theologicae oder Theologische Beschreibungen der Christi. Glaubens- Articul, Grundlegung der Theologie und deren Compendio, Mit Anführung der vornehmsten zum Beweisthum Gehbrigen Sprüche der heiligen Schrift, Verfertiget und zusammen gezogen von einem Liebhaber der göttlichen Wahrheit. Editio IX. Halle: in Verlegung des Waesenhauses, 1767.

Henkel, Eldon O., editor. The Henkel Family Records: A Periodical Publication Devoted to Collecting and Preserving the History of the Henkel Family in Europe and America 1637-1717. One volume. Published by Authority of the Henkel Family Association. New Market, Virginia: The Henkel Press, Inc., 1926.

Morris, John Gottlieb. Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry. Baltimore: James Young, 1878. The book contains many personal reminiscences.

Semple, Robert B. A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia. Richmond, Virginia: John O'Lynch, 1810. This history contains much eyewitness material.

Stapleton, A., editor and publisher. The Henkel Memorial: Historical, Genealogical, and Biographical: A Serial Publication Devoted to Collecting and Preserving the History of the Rev. Anthony Jacob Henkel. Organ of the Henkel Memorial Association. York, Penn.: 1910-1919.

The Christian Confession of the Faith of the Harmless Christians in the Netherlands, known by the name of Mennonists. Amsterdam: Ambrose Henkel and Co., New Market, Shenandoah County, Virginia, 1810.

The Journal of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg in Three Volumes. Translated by Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein. Published by The Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1958.

Letters

Coiner, Mary Moore, "Letter to her son Harry Gordon Coiner," dated February 28, 1960, containing the information that Dr. Solomon Henkel, son of Paul Henkel, directed in his will that his sons publish The Christian Book of Concord in English. In the possession of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner.

----- "Letter to her son, Harry Gordon Coiner," dated February 28, 1960 containing information regarding the history of the schism in the North Carolina Synod. In the possession of Rev. Prof. Harry Gordon Coiner.

Henkel, Luther S. "Letter to Rev. William J. Finck," dated June 29, 1927, regarding the disposition of the original Journal of Paul Henkel from which a great portion of A Chronological Life of Paul Henkel was translated. Archives of the Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri.

Reports

Bericht der Verichtungen der zweiten Ev Lutherischen Conferenz, von dem Staat Tennessee, den 22sten October, 1821. Nebst den Einwendungen gegen die Grundverfassung der General-Synode. Wie auch zwei Briefe von zween Predigern von dem Staat Ohio.

Bericht der Verrichtunge, während des Synodi des Luth. Ministeriums, gehalten im Staat Nord Carolina, im Jahre unsers Herrn 1813, mit einigen Anhängen. Neu-Market: Ambrosius Henkel und Co., 1814.

Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748-1821. Compiled and translated from records in the Archives and from the written Protocol. Philadelphia: Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, 1898.

Kurze Nachricht von den Verrichtungen der ersten Conferenz, der Deutschen, Evangelish Lutherischen Prediger, gehalten in dem Staate Tennessee, den 17ten Julius, 1820. Sammt einem Bericht von der Spaltung der Ev. Lutherischen Synode, welche hat sollen gehalten werden den 31sten May, 1820, in Lincolnton, N.C. Wie auch der Plan-Entwurf der General-Synode, und die Bedenklichen Einwendungen dagegen. Also auch die unverhanderte Augsburgische Confession, und etliche Anmerkungen wegen der Heiligen Taufe, usw. Neu-Market: S. Henkel's Druckerei, 1821.

Peschau, F. W. E. Minutes of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, from 1803-1826, Twenty-three Conventions. Translated from the German Protocol. Newberry, S. C.: Aulland Houseal, Printers, 1894.

Principal Transactions of the Lutheran Gospel Ministry of North Carolina, in Synod Assembled, in the Month of October, 1812. To which is added, A Circular Letter to the Clergy of Said Church. Salisbury, N. C.; Coupee and Crider, 1813.

Report of the Transactions of the Second Evangelical Lutheran Conference, the 22nd of October, 1821. Also two letters and The Objections Against the Constitution of the General Synod. New Market, Virginia: S. Henkel's Printing Office, 1821.

Verrichtungen des Evangelischen Lutherischen Synodi für Nord Carolina und angränzenden Staaten, gehalten An der Lauer Kirche, am Feste Trinitatis, den 17ten Junius, im Jahr unsers Herrn Jesu Christi, 1821. Friederich-taun: Ritschie und Magill, 1821.

Wolf, Richard C. Documents of Lutheran Unity in America. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

B. Secondary Sources

General Histories on American Christianity

Hudson, Winthrop S. Religion in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. Christianity in A Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe: The America, the Pacific, Asia and Africa. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961, III.

Olmstead, Clifton E. History of Religion in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Sweet, William Warren. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

General Histories on the Lutheran Church in America

Jacobs, Henry Eyster. A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. The American Church History Series, Vol. IV. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893.

Neve, J. L. A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America. Second revised and enlarged edition. Burlington, Iowa: The German Literary Board, 1916.

----- History of the Lutheran Church in America. Burlington, Iowa: Lutheran Literary Board, 1934.

- Wentz, Abdel Ross. A Basic History of Lutheranism in America. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955.
- Wolf, Edmund Jacob. The Lutherans in America. A Story of Struggle, Progress, Influence and Marvelous Growth. With an Introduction by Henry and Eyster Jacobs. New York: J. A. Hill and Company, 1890.

Synodical Histories and Studies

- Allbeck, Willard Dow. A Century of Lutherans in Ohio. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1966.
- Bernheim, Gotthardt Dellmann. History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North and South Carolina. From the Earliest Period of the Colonization of the Dutch, German and Swiss Settlers to the Close of the First Half of the Present Century. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book Store, 1872.
- Cassell, C. W., W. J. Finck, and Elon O. Henkel. A History of the Lutheran Church in Virginia and East Tennessee. Published by the Authority of the Lutheran Synod of Virginia. Strasburg, Virginia: Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., 1930.
- Eisenberg, William Edward. The Lutheran Church in Virginia 1717-1962, including an Account of the Lutheran Church in East Tennessee. Published by the Trustees of Roanoke, Virginia. Lynchburg, Virginia: J. B. Bell Company, Inc., 1967.
- Henkel, Socrates. History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. Embracing an Account of the Causes which gave rise to its organization; its organization and name; its position and confessional basis; its object of its organization; work; development, and various sessions; its policy; and its future. New Market, Virginia: Henkel and Co., 1890.
- Kollmann, Alvin V. "The Tennessee Synod--Its History and Church Policy." Unpublished Master of Sacred Theology Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri 1958.
- Kreider, Harry J. History of the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England. Volume I, 1786-1860. Written at the request of the Synod. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954.

Mechling, G. W. History of the Evangelical Lutheran District Synod of Ohio. Published by the Synod, 1911.

Morgan, Jacob L., Bachman S. Brown, and John Hall. History of the Lutheran Church in North Carolina. Published by the authority of the United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1803-1953. n.p., n.d.

Sheatsley, C.V. History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States. From the Earliest Beginnings to 1919.

Suelflow, August R. The Heart of Missouri: A History of the Western District of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, 1854-1954. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954.

Sweet, William Warren. Circuit-Rider Days Along the Ohio: Being the Journals of the Ohio Conference (Methodist) from Its Organization in 1812 to 1826. New York, Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923.

Wentz, Abdel Ross. History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland of the United Lutheran Church in America 1820-1920. Together with a brief sketch of each congregation of the Synod and Biographies of the Living Sons of the Synod in the Ministry. Published by the authority of the Synod. Harrisburg: Evangelical Press, 1920.

Special Histories and Studies

Beck, Walter H. Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States. A History of the Development of Parochial Schools and Synodical Educational Policies and Programs.

Bente, Frederick. American Lutheranism. I and II. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919.

Beyreuther, Erich. August Hermann Francke und Die Anfänge Der Ökumenischen Bewegung. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evang. Verlag. GmbH., 1957.

Faust, Albert Bernhardt, The German Element in the United States: With Special Reference to its Political, Moral, Social and Educational Influence. I and II. New York: The Steuben Society of America. Printed and Bound Kingsport Press, Kingsport, Tenn., 1927.

- Ferm, Vergilius, The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology: A Study of the Issue Between America Lutheranism and Old Lutheranism. New York: London: The Century Co., 1927.
- Finck, William J. Lutheran Landmarks and Pioneers in America. A Series of Sketches of Colonial Times. Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1913.
- Fox, L. A., The Origin of the Tennessee Synod. Address delivered at its Centennial Celebration in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920, n.p., n.d.
- Gewehr, Wesley M. The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790. Durham, N.C.; Duke University Press, 1930.
- Graebner, A. L. Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in America. Erster Theil. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1892. This history brings the story up to 1820.
- Hazellius, Ernest L. History of the American Lutheran Church From its Commencement in the Year of Our Lord 1685 to the Year 1842. Zanesville, Ohio: n.p., 1846.
- Koch, Earl. "Influences That Contributed to the Theology of Samuel S. Schumacker." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1960.
- Mann, William J. Life and Times of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg. Second edition. Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1911.
- Lutheranism in America: An Essay on the Present Condition of the Lutheran Church in the United States. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857,
- Mauelshagen, Carl. American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, Division of Publications.
- Meyer, Carl S., editor. Moving Frontiers: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.
- Qualben, Lars P. The Lutheran Church in Colonial America. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1940.

- Schaeffer, C. W. Early History of the Lutheran Church in America. From the Settlement of the Swedes on the Delaware, to the Middle of the Eighteenth Century. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book Store, 1868.
- Schmauk, Theodore Emanuel. A History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania 1638-1820. From the Original Sources. Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1903.
- Schumacker, Samuel S. The American Lutheran Church Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated, in Several Occasional Discourses. Fifth edition. Philadelphia: E. W. Miller, Ranstead Place, 1852.
- Spaeth, Adolph. Charles Porterfield Krauth. I and II. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1898.
- Strobel, P.A. The Salzburgers and Their Descendants. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1953.
- Sweet, William Warren. Revivalism in America: Its Origin, Growth, and Influence. New York; Nashville: Abingdon Press (Apex Books). Reprint of the original edition, 1944.
- The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. Third edition. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1902.
- Wessinger, B.D. The Work of the Pioneers of the Tennessee Synod. Address delivered at its Centennial Celebration by its President, Rev. B. D. Wessinger in Lincolnton, N. C., October 14, 1920.

Source Materials, Encyclopedias, and Theological Works

- Arndt, Johann, Devotions and Prayers. Selected and Translated by John Joseph Stoudt. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1953.
- Bekennnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgerischen Konfession 1930. 3. verbesserte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

- Bergendoff, Conrad John Immanuel. The Doctrine of the Church in American Lutheranism. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956.
- Bosensieck, Julius, editor. The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church. Edited for the Lutheran World Federation. Three volumes. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.
- Elert, Werner. The Structure of Lutheranism: The Theology and Philosophy of Life of Lutheranism, Especially in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Translated from the original German Morphologie des Luthertums by Walter A. Hansen. St. Louis; Concordia Publishing House 1962.
- Heidelberg Catechesism. Including a Short History of the Heidelberg Catechism, Introduction, Tercentenary Text, Selected Bible Passages, Suitable Hymns and Selections from the Scriptures. St. Louis: Eden Publishing House, n.d.
- Hunnius, Nicholas Rev. Epitome Credendorum. Containing A Concise and popular view of the doctrine of the Lutheran Church. First edited in 1625. Translated from the German by Paul Edward Gottheil. Nuremberg: U. E. Sebald, 1847.
- Jacobs, Henry Eyster, and Rev. John A. W. Hass, editors, The Lutheran Cyclopedia. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Krauth, Charles Porterfield, The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology. As represented in the Augsburg Confession and in the history and Literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1899.
- Ludwig Ernst Fuerbringer Hall. Concordia Seminary Library, St. Louis, Missouri. St. Louis: Printed by Color-Art Printing and Stationery Co., September 30, 1962.
- Lueker, Erwin L., editor in chief. Lutheran Cyclopedia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954.
- McNeill, John T. Modern Christian Movements. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
- Manschreck, Clyde Leonard. Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer. New York: Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958.
- Mayer, Frederick E. The Religious Bodies of America. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954.

- Mode, Peter G. Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History. Menasha, Wisconsin: The Collegiate Press, George Banta Publishing Co., 1921.
- Reed, Luther D. The Lutheran Liturgy: A Study of the Common Service of the Lutheran Church in America. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947.
- Reep, Arthur C., Confirmation in the Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.
- Richard, James W. The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1909.
- Sasse, Hermann. This is my Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959.
- Schaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom. I, II, III. Sixth edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Harper & Brothers, revised by David S. Schaff, 1931.
- Schlink, Edmund. Theology of the Lutheran Confessions. Translated from the original German Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften. Third edition, by Paul F. Koehneke and Herbert J. A. Bouman. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- Schmid, Heinrich. The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Translated from the German and Latin by Charles A. Hay, and Henry E. Jacobs. Third edition. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, reprinted, 1961.
- Smith, H. Shelton, and Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, editors. American Christianity: A Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents. I and II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.
- Spaude, Paul W. The Lutheran Church Under American Influence: A Historico-Philosophical Interpretation of the Church in Its Relation to Various Modifying Forces in the United States. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1943.
- Spener, Philip Jacob. Pia Desideria. Translated, edited, and with an Introduction by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press (Seminar Editions), 1964.

- Starck, John Frederick. Daily Hand-Book in Good and Evil Days, containing all the meditations and prayers of the complete German original edition. Translated by Joseph Stump. Seventh edition. Burlington, Iowa: Lutheran Literary Board, 1904.
- Sweet, William Warren. The Presbyterians. Vol. II. Religion on the American Frontier: A Collection of Source Materials. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Tappert, Theodore, and others, translators and editors. The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Weigelt, Horst. Pietismus-Studien. I. Teil. Der spenerhallische Pietismus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1965.

Articles

- Bauslin, David H. "The Genesis of the 'New Measure' Movement in the Lutheran Church in This Country," The Lutheran Quarterly, XI (July 1910), 360-391.
- Edmonds, Albert Sydney. "The Henkel Family of New Market, Va., Early Printers in the Shenandoah Valley," William and Mary Quarterly, Second Series, XVI, (July 1936) pp. 414-416.
- "The Henkel Press, the First Sixty Years," Virginia Cavalcade, XIII (Winter 1963-64), 16-22.
- "The Henkels, Early Printers in New Market, Virginia, With a Bibliography," William and Mary Quarterly, XVIII second series, (April 1938), 174-195. The bibliography is important as it lists all the publications of the Henkel Press and gives information on their present location.
- Finck, William J. "Paul Henkel, The Lutheran Pioneer," The Lutheran Quarterly, LVI (July 1926), 307-334.
- Fox, L. A. "Origin and Early History of the Tennessee Synod," The Lutheran Quarterly, XIX (January 1889), 45-68.
- "German Books and Broad sides Printed in Virginia, 1804-1834," Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland Twenty-eighth Report, (1953), 58-66.

- Graebner, Theodore, "Paul Henkel, an American Lutheran Pioneer, in Missions, Organization, and Publicity" Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, V (July 1932) 58-63.
- Henkel, Andrew. "Paul Henkel, 1792-1825," Annals of the American Pulpit. Edited by William Buell Sprague. IX. New York: R. Carter, 1857. Pp. 92-95.
- "Henkel, Paul," Dictionary of American Biography, VIII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, Pp. 538-539.
- "Rev. David Henkel," American Lutheran Biographies. Edited by J. C. Jensson. Milwaukee: Press of A. Houtkamp and Sons, 1890, Pp. 338-339.
- "Rev. Paul Henkel," American Lutheran Biographies. Edited by J. C. Jensson. Milwaukee: Press of A. Houtkamp and Son, 1890. P. 340-342.
- "Rev. Philip Henkel," American Lutheran Biographies. Edited by J. C. Jensson. Milwaukee: Press of A. Houtkamp and Son, 1890, P. 334
- Johnson, Roy. "The Lutheran Church and the Western Frontier, 1789 to 1830." The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (July 1930), 225-248.
- "On the Various Divisions of the Decalogue," Lutheran Intelligencer, IV (July 1829), 137-143.
- Pershing, B. H. "Paul Henkel: Frontier Missionary, Organizer and Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, VII (January 1935), 97-120. Excellent footnotes.
- "Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergymen--John Andrew Krug," Evangelical Review, XI (1859), 435-438.
- "Reminiscences of Paul Henkel," Evangelical Review, XX (July 1869), 387-392.
- "Reminiscences of Gottlieb Shober," Evangelical Review, VIII (January 1857), 404-415.
- "Reminiscences of Charles Augustus Gottlieb Storch," Evangelical Review, VIII (January 1857), 398-404.

"Reminiscences of Christian Streit," Evangelical Review, IX
(April 1857), 378-384.

"Rev. John Andrew Krug," American Lutheran Biographies.
Edited by J. C. Jennson. Milwaukee: Press of A.
Houtkamp and Son, 1890. Pp. 434-436.

Rosenmiller, Rev. D. P. "Gottlieb Shober," Annals of the
American Pulpit. Edited by William Buell Sprague. IX.
New York: R. Carter, 1857. Pp. 141-145.

Schmucker, B. M. "Luther's Small Catechism," The Lutheran
Church Review, V (April, July 1886) 87-113, 165-199.