LUTHERAN DISSENSION AND SCHISM
AT GETTYSBURG SEMINARY, 1864

By Dale A. Johnson*

LUTHERANISM in Pennsylvania passed through several
stormy periods during the nineteenth century, and the effects
of some of these can still be seen in the organizational pattern
of Pennsylvania Lutheranism today. One of the most significant
of these crises was the controversy of the 1860's which centered
around the problem of theological education and the issue of which
of two doctrinal lines Lutheranism was to follow. The roots of
this controversy went back to the 1820's, the decade which saw
the organization of the first interstate Lutheran body, the General
Synod, and the foundation of the first Lutheran seminary in Amer-
ica at Gettysburg. During the intervening period relations between
the Pennsylvania Ministerium, a loose organization of Lutheran
congregations in Pennsylvania, and Gettysburg Seminary had not
been especially cordial. Only since 1848 had the Ministerium had
any close relationship with the seminary of the General Synod, and
between 1848 and 1864 there was never any complete satisfaction
with the arrangements and relationships maintained there. With
this perspective, then, the rupture at Gettysburg in 1864 and the
subsequent founding of a new seminary in Philadelphia may be
seen as the final break in what had been a rather turbulent
association.

It is not the purpose here to record the history of the early
relationship between Gettysburg Seminary and the Pennsylvania
Ministerium. But some of this background must be sketched
in order that the conflict of the 1860's can be better understood.
The Pennsylvania Ministerium, having severed its connection with
the General Synod in 1823, maintained no affiliation with Gettys-
burg Seminary in its early years. It was not until the 1840's that
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1 This can be obtained in A. R. Wentz, History of the Gettysburg Sem-
it began to feel the need for a seminary. After failing to establish an affiliation with the seminary of the Ohio Synod at Columbus, and failing in its attempt to establish its own seminary in its own territory, the Ministerium entered into negotiations with Gettysburg Seminary. But it was several years before the Ministerium was officially represented at the seminary in the person of a designated faculty member. In 1856 Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, representing the Ministerium, accepted the position as “The German Theological Professor.” Between 1848 and 1856, however, relations between the Ministerium and the seminary grew closer with the appointment of Charles Philip Krauth, a conservative, to be a second Ministerium professor; the re-entry of the Ministerium into the General Synod in 1853; and the birth of the confessionally oriented Evangelical Review at Gettysburg.

Two immediate problems arose with the arrival of Schaeffer at Gettysburg. One was the language problem and the difficulty Schaeffer had in working with this problem. Should instruction be in both the German and English languages, and to what extent in both? Schaeffer’s position involved teaching in both the college and the seminary and included the teaching of both the German language and German-language theology. One of the greatest interests of the Pennsylvania synod was the training of men who could minister to the predominantly German congregations within the Ministerium; and yet, when Schaeffer arrived at Gettysburg, the German language was no longer taught at the seminary. He had to divide his time between teaching German in the college and theology in the seminary, the latter only to the small number of students who understood German. In 1858 Schaeffer reported to the Ministerium that his position at Gettysburg was a trying one, claiming that he could not properly discharge his duties at either the seminary or the college.

At the Synod of 1859 a committee appointed to study the German problem at the seminary formulated the following resolution:

\[\ldots\text{, whereas the present arrangements at Gettysburg are not calculated to increase the number and facilitate the studies of German students, therefore, Resolved, that}\]

\[\text{Ibid., p. 176.}\]
\[\text{G. F. Krotel, “The Beginnings of the Seminary,” in Lutheran Church Review, XVII (1898), 296.}\]
the German Professor of Theology, Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, be authorized to give the German students instructions in all the branches pertaining to the theological course.4

This resolution had been formed in response to a plan that the Board of Directors of the seminary had adopted, and which aroused a great concern in the Ministerium:

Resolved, that all the students (German and English) be required to attend all the recitations and lectures of all the professors, and that in those cases in which students cannot understand the language in which instruction is conveyed, the professor be authorized to give him a text-book in the language which he understands.5

The result of this action was, G. F. Krotel later recalled, that the majority of the German students, fearing the change to be a serious disadvantage to them, withdrew from the seminary at once. Their motives were rooted in the language difficulty and in the doctrinal differences discussed below.6

Though the language problem was less central in succeeding Synod meetings, it never completely disappeared. The sentiment in the following years was for dividing the seminary rather than for attempting to correct the difficulties that still existed. At the 1861 Synod of the Ministerium a committee recommended, despite a favorable report by Schaeffer on the conditions at the seminary, the transfer of Schaeffer and the German department to Allentown (in the midst of the largest concentration of German Lutheran congregations) or to Philadelphia.7 No action was taken at that time, but the grievance remained. Beale M. Schmucker, in his address at the installation of professors of the new seminary at Philadelphia, October 3, 1864, stated as the first reason why a new seminary was founded, the need "to provide for the wants of the German portion of our Church, especially in the East." He went on to say that

... the importance of provision for the wants of our German churches does not now for the first time attract

---

4 Ibid., p. 302.
5 Ibid., p. 300.
6 Ibid., pp. 300-301.
7 Ibid., pp. 305-306.
the attention of the Synod. It has long since been felt, and many successive efforts have been made to remedy the evil. Last of all these efforts, and the one which was more fruitful in good results than any which preceded it, was the endowment of a German Professorship in the Institutions at Gettysburg. It was the hope and the anxious desire of the Synod, that its necessities might be relieved through its cooperation in these Institutions. But after a trial of this plan for ten or twelve years, the conviction has become general that some more efficient arrangements are absolutely needed to this end.8

The second immediate problem that arose with Schaeffer's presence at Gettysburg was doctrinal in character. This was the chief reason behind the formation of the new seminary, far more important than the language question. This fact was expressed in countless ways, not least of which were in the journalistic ventures of the day. The theologically conservative Lutheran and Missionary, favoring the schism, editorialized:

The principle on which the new enterprise rests is of unutterable importance—the preservation of a pure faith. . . when error coolly makes arrangements for its own perpetuation, and makes the title of Lutheran a cloak for war to the death upon Lutheranism itself, it forces honest men to cut themselves loose from all fellowship with it, and this necessity the Synod of Pennsylvania seems to regard as forced upon it.9

From the opposite side the group supporting Gettysburg Seminary and protesting against the split made statements such as: “The institution that is to be warmed into life by the breath of slander and defamation, is founded upon a falsehood, and must wilt under the malediction of heaven.”10

The controversy over the confessional basis of the church had affected Gettysburg before Schaeffer came in 1856, but it did not take on serious proportions until that date. Much of the problem over languages and Schaeffer's role in the seminary was due to the differing approaches to the Lutheran confessions by

8 Beale M. Schmucker, “Address at Installation of Professors of the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church,” in Evangelical Quarterly Review, XVI (1865), 428.
9 Lutheran and Missionary, June 30, 1864.
10 Lutheran Observer, September 30, 1864.
Schaeffer and S. S. Schmucker, the president of the seminary. No doubt there would have been only minor difficulties over the language question had not Schaeffer been concerned that the students were being taught an un-Lutheran position with regard to the confessions and had he not been anxious to teach an opposing view against Schmucker. Schaeffer had by this time taken a far stricter confessional approach than Schmucker held; in an 1853 report to the Ministerium he had urged allegiance to the entire Book of Concord of 1580. He insisted on the equality of all the historic Lutheran confessional statements and expressed his dissatisfaction with the resolution passed by the Ministerium, which acknowledged the authority of all the confessions but gave priority to the Augsburg Confession and to Luther's Small Catechism.

Schmucker was the leader of the so-called "American Lutheran" group, which did not want to bind itself strictly to the Lutheran confessions. This group held that there were errors in the Augsburg Confession and that the soundest confessional basis for Lutheranism in America was the acceptance of only the "fundamental doctrines" (very seldom, if ever, clearly defined) contained in this confession. The ensuing controversy between the two professors soon had a wide audience; and though most of the members of the Ministerium were not willing to require so complete a confessional adherence as Schaeffer demanded, they were by the late 1850's definitely opposed to Schmucker's position of latitude and moving in Schaeffer's direction.

The confessional concern thus became the battle cry of those who were interested in founding a new seminary. At the installation of the professors of the new institution, Beale Schmucker, who was S. S. Schmucker's son, but who opposed his father's views, declared that the chief reason which had rendered such a schism necessary was to provide for our Church and Ministry [those]... who believe and teach the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as

---

33 Cf. the statement of President Welden of the Ministerium in 1859, in Krotel, "Beginnings of the Seminary," *Lutheran Church Review*, XVII (1898), 298.
set forth in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. . . . Upon these confessions, this Seminary is unreservedly based. . . . We do not believe that the Confessions of the Lutheran Church are merely substantially correct, or correct with reference to truths necessary to be believed in order to the soul's salvation alone; we believe that they are in entire accordance with the teachings of the divine word.\(^\text{14}\)

He went on to point out that the new seminary opposed those who saw some parts of the confessions as inconsistent with the Word of God and who disapproved of the Lutheran order of worship as tending to formality, an obvious attack against his father and the "American Lutheran" school.

In this way the issue between the two groups was correctly drawn. It was quite simply stated from the other side in an editorial in the *Lutheran Observer* of September 16, 1864, which argued that differences of opinion on the confessions should be allowed and stated that the new seminary did not provide for this in its demand for rigid adherence to all parts of all the confessions. If extraneous issues were introduced from time to time in the crucial period from 1860 to 1864, it was nevertheless this question which was the most significant and heated.

But the issue which directly precipitated the formation of a new seminary only indirectly involved the situation at Gettysburg. It arose at the convention of the General Synod at York, Pennsylvania, on May 5, 1864, over the question of the admission of the Franckean Synod to the General Synod. The Franckean Synod of New York had been formed in a break with the Hartwick Synod in 1837. It abandoned the Augsburg Confession and became more similar to the frontier Protestantism of its day, adopting revival methods and eliminating liturgical worship. In 1860 the conservative *Evangelical Review* said of the Franckean Synod that it

\[\text{has cut itself off from the rest of the Lutheran Church by tacitly, if not formally and publicly, abandoning the Augsburg Confession. . . . They may be properly ranked as one of the few sects to which Lutheranism has given birth, and}\]

it is difficult to say how much or how little of the original element they have retained in their present organization.15

In 1864 the Franckean Synod applied for admission to the General Synod. While immediate debate arose, the question involved was not a new one. In 1859, in a similar issue, the Melanchthon Synod, a body which had not professed a great fondness for the Augsburg Confession, had been admitted to the General Synod. It was admitted by way of a compromise, on condition that its implied charges against the Augsburg Confession be dropped.16 One of the more cryptic comments on the admission of the Melanchthon Synod unwittingly posed the problem for the future:

It was distinctly admitted upon all hands that no Lutheran Synod can be received into the General Synod without acknowledging its adherence to the Augsburg Confession. The only question was in what sense, or what extent the Augsburg Confession was to be received.17

The 1864 issue was not exactly the same as that which involved the Melanchthon Synod, but it showed that the conservatives would go no further than this compromise. When the Franckean Synod applied for admission, the General Synod passed a resolution that the Synod should be received "as soon as they shall give formal expression to their adoption of the Augsburg Confession as received by the General Synod."18 This action was according to the policy of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. But the next day the subject was reopened by the Franckean delegates; and following an extended debate, a new resolution was passed (97 to 40) which admitted the Synod:

Resolved, that the Franckean Synod be received into connection with the General Synod, with the understanding that, at its next meeting, it declare in an official man-

18 Quoted in Krotel, "Beginnings of the Seminary," Lutheran Church Review, XVII (1898), 309.
Krotel wrote of the delegates from the Ministerium, “We fought against it with our might, but it was in vain.”

The split came at this point. Incensed by the action of the General Synod in admitting the Franckean Synod, the delegates from the Ministerium drafted a paper that was presented by Dr. Schaeffer. It announced that

Inasmuch as the Pennsylvania Synod at the time of its re-union with the General Synod had resolved that, if the General Synod should violate its Constitution and require assent to any thing in conflict with the old and long established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, their delegates be required to protest against such action, to withdraw from its sessions and to report to Synod, and as they regarded the admission of the Franckean Synod as a direct violation of the Constitution of the General Synod, they were compelled to retire and to report to the body they represented.

A total of twenty-eight persons signed the protest against the admission of the Franckean Synod, ten from the Ministerium and eighteen others from nine other synods. These delegates cited three reasons why they objected to the admission of the Franckean Synod before that synod had made a definite statement concerning the confessions: (1) that the Franckean Synod had shown no relationship at all with the Augsburg Confession; (2) that the General Synod was forbidden “to introduce such alterations . . . as might . . . burden the consciences of the brethren in Christ”—and this action would do that; and (3) that while the General Synod had certain conditions for membership, the Franckean Synod was admitted without compliance with these conditions.

19 Quoted in “Our General Synod” (summary of the 1864 convention), in Evangelical Quarterly Review, XV (1864), 394.
22 Lutheran Observer, May 20, 1864.
23 “Our General Synod,” Evangelical Quarterly Review, XV (1864), 394.
Those who approved the admission of the Franckean Synod did so because of what they felt to be the good faith of its delegates and what they thought would be the comparative informality of its acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession. It is easy to see that those who were concerned over the exact position of the General Synod on its confessional basis would have opposed the resolution of admittance, while those who wanted to allow for individual interpretations and a broad understanding of the confessions would have approved it. The Lutheran Observer affirmed the more liberal position:

We all stand on the Augsburg Confession, with the qualifications and moral restrictions defined in the accompanying resolutions, so that we are true Lutherans—conservative Lutherans—without hyper-orthodoxy and exclusivism on the one hand, or radicalism on the other.2

It was precisely this view that the confessionally oriented Pennsylvania Ministerium could not accept. Henceforth there was no turning back. The delegates from the Ministerium withdrew from the rest of the General Synod meetings, and the efforts to establish a new seminary moved relentlessly ahead. A simple chronology of the movement would include the following important dates:

May 25, 1864—a resolution to establish a seminary was passed by the Ministerium. Resolutions declaring that the seminary should be unreservedly based on all the Lutheran confessions, that it should be located in Philadelphia, and that instruction should be in English and German, were adopted.25

July 26—A special meeting at Allentown elected the professors and directors. A committee recommended that three regular professors be appointed, one to have charge of the English Department, one for the German Department, and one to cover both languages. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer was elected as the first regular professor, Dr. W. J. Mann as German Professor, and Dr. Charles

21 Luther Observer, May 20, 1864.
Porterfield Krauth as English Professor. C. W. Schaeffer and G. F. Krotel were elected as Assistant Professors.26

August 25—The Board of Directors was organized.

October 4—The professors were installed.27

But we must go back a few months to recall the other important event which is often cited as one of the motivations for the schism. Throughout the period immediately preceding the events of 1864, there had been little love lost between S. S. Schmucker and the conservatives. He and his group had been criticized at the seminary, in the periodicals, and in general discussions by those who based their Lutheranism more strictly on the confessions. But in the February 26, 1864, issue of the Lutheran Observer came the notice of Schmucker's intended resignation at the end of the current academic year. His reasons for resigning were partly because of age, but mostly because he felt that his influence was declining and that the tide was turning against him. He felt that a younger man would be better able to carry on. In his resignation letter to the Board of Directors of August 9, 1864, he wrote:

I have also, after having looked at the state of the Church for several years, thought the present as favorable a time as would soon be offered, to elect a successor who would carry on the work to which my life has been devoted, in the same liberal spirit in which this institution was founded and has been thus far conducted: granting liberty of opinion in regard to those non-fundamental points on which the churches of the General Synod claim and exercise this right.28

The question immediately arose as to Schmucker's successor; speculation was widespread. For with the growing concern of the Pennsylvania Ministerium for the confessional basis of the seminary and with the growing desire within that body to begin a new seminary, the opportunity presented itself to heal the breach

26 Lutheran and Missionary, August 4, 1864.
by electing a conservative to Schmucker's professorship. In this way the Ministerium and the rest of the conservative element in the church might be satisfied, and a new seminary rendered unnecessary. The name of Charles Porterfield Krauth, son of the Gettysburg professor, was prominently mentioned. The vigorous editor of the *Lutheran and Missionary*, a leader of the conservative wing, and generally recognized as a profound theologian, Krauth had much to recommend him. But the partisanship with which he had conducted his newspaper and the strictness with which he had promoted the conservative cause had aroused considerable hostilities against him. It was soon apparent that the seminary would not make such a drastic change in the viewpoints of its professors, in spite of the fact that Krauth was the choice of the Ministerium.

At the meeting of the General Synod in May, 1864, the question of Schmucker's successor was heatedly discussed. The delegates from the Ministerium were asked about what they thought of J. A. Brown. Krotel recorded many years after:

> We frankly told him that, while we had a high opinion of the scholarship, ability, and conservatism of Dr. Brown, the men of our Synod had but one choice, Dr. Krauth. It is hardly necessary to state that Dr. Brown became Dr. Schmucker's successor and that the Lord had another chair in store for Dr. Krauth.²⁹

Brown had had experience in both pastorate and teaching situations, and his prominence in the church was due to his concerted attack on Schmucker's Definite Synodical Platform of 1856, a summary of "American Lutheran" doctrines. He had even brought charges of impeachment against Schmucker which, ironically enough, were dismissed partly because of the efforts of the junior Krauth. But Brown was less of a conservative on the matter of confessional subscription than Krauth, and so he was acceptable to both wings of the church: to the conservatives because of his opposition to the Definite Platform, to the liberals because he refused to give categorical assent to all the doctrines within the confessions. No doubt to some people the impossibility of electing

²⁹Krotel, "Beginnings of the Seminary," *Lutheran Church Review*, XVII (1898), 211.
Krauth to the seminary faculty was another reason for leaving and forming a new seminary. But others held that the disappointment in the election of Brown was not a factor in the split. The admission of the Franckeian Synod in May, noted Jacobs, allowed for no possible compromise. The plans for the new seminary were undertaken in late May, and the professors were elected in July. Brown was not elected until August (and because Krauth had been elected to the faculty of the new seminary, his name was withdrawn from consideration for the Gettysburg post). H. E. Jacobs wrote: “The protest was against the action at York, not against that which was yet to be taken at Gettysburg.”

Jacobs, as well as others, regarded Brown’s election as a repudiation of Schmucker and the whole liberal wing of “American Lutherans.” In this vein the Lutheran and Missionary complimented Brown a number of times for his many abilities. The battle, however, was not ended so easily as that. Perhaps to the surprise of many, Brown defended Schmucker and took his place with the liberals. “Dr. K.,” he wrote, “may prefer the narrow, exclusive, local, peculiar Lutheranism; I prefer the more liberal, general, catholic Lutheranism that is based on a symbol of the church universally recognized by her as such.” It was Brown’s contention that many of the Lutheran confessions held by conservatives in this country were rejected by Lutherans in other countries. On the doctrinal positions of the two schools, he stated: “I believe that the doctrinal position of the Seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg to be more consistent, more specific, and better guarded against unsound teaching than that of the Seminary at Philadelphia.”

He went on to declare that in distinctly enumerating the errors to which it was opposed, Gettysburg had a more solid basis than did the new seminary.

The editorial columns of the rival Lutheran newspapers were filled with discussion of the confessional positions of the two schools. At least eight articles comparing and contrasting the

---

30 As it seemed to be for Krotel.
32 Ibid., p. 452.
33 Lutheran Observer, February 17, 1865.
34 Lutheran Observer, February 24, 1865.
35 In a letter to Lutheran and Missionary, January 26, 1865.
DISSENSION AND SCHISM AT GETTYSBURG

Confessional positions of Gettysburg and Philadelphia were written by Brown for the Lutheran Observer in the first few months of 1865. Krauth entered the dispute eagerly; and even though he constantly expressed sorrow at the split of the seminaries, he was vigorous in his attack against Gettysburg. He declared that the new seminary was needed

for the sake of pure doctrine. There is no theological seminary in the United States in which are fully taught in the English language, the doctrines of the Reformation, as our church then held, and now holds and confesses them... we might more safely send our sons to Princeton or Andover to imbue them with just ideas of Lutheran doctrine, and with love for it, than we can send them to any Institution of our Church within our reach in which doctrinal theology is taught in English. . . . Have we seminaries enough? We reply: We have a great many, too many, of the wrong kind.36

Krauth even wrote an article in the Lutheran and Missionary as late as December 1, 1864, in which he attacked Schmucker and his influence at Gettysburg—comments which the Lutheran Observer objected to because Schmucker had resigned in August. The attack later was directed more specifically at Brown, over the latter's understanding of baptism.37 The controversy on the respective merits of the two seminaries continued. Perhaps in reply to the Lutheran and Missionary article of August 11, an article appeared in the more liberal Lutheran Observer, declaring:

The churches belonging to the General Synod will have no need of ministers that will be manufactured at this new seminary. The Seminary and its fostering Synod will, of course, dissolve their connexion with the General Synod. For with what grace or consistency can they retain their present ecclesiastical relation, whilst their hand is thrust at the very heart of the General Synod?

. . . And all the talk about Libraries, Lectures, and preaching in great cities is mere twaddle. As to the announced curriculum of study, it is really ludicrous to anyone who has any personal knowledge of the internal workings of theological seminaries.

36 Lutheran and Missionary, August 11, 1864.
37 December 16, 1864.
38 Cf. Krauth's article in the Lutheran and Missionary, March 9, 1865.
We should as soon think of sending a child to a Catholic Academy in preference to a Protestant college, as to advise our son aspiring to the ministry to go to the new Seminary rather than to Gettysburg. . . . We have no need of ministers fashioned after the effete theological system and extreme symbolism of this abnormal Seminary. We want living men now, and not antedeluvian petrifactions or theological automatons.\textsuperscript{80}

The direct invitation to the Pennsylvania Ministerium to leave the General Synod was issued after some further incidents, in 1866. But we have to go back to Gettysburg Seminary to record the effects of the Ministerium’s actions in 1864 on the seminary itself. A considerable amount of the hostility that arose between the two institutions was due to the position of Dr. Schaeffer. He had been elected in July, 1864, as the first regular professor of the new seminary. But after his election he wrote to the Gettysburg Directors, stating that he would remain at Gettysburg and “would continue his labors in the institution without interruption.”\textsuperscript{40} Schaeffer intended to stay at Gettysburg at least through the winter, because he thought it would take some time for the new seminary to begin operations. Nonetheless, three weeks later he yielded to pressures from Philadelphia, and he left Gettysburg to be installed as professor in the new seminary. He took with him all of the German students; some of the English students withdrew as well. The size of the seminary student body was cut by half.

Schaeffer’s withdrawal aroused great resentment among those who were loyal to Gettysburg. No doubt he would have left eventually; his support came from the Ministerium. But his departure seemed especially odious because of Schaeffer’s first statement that he would stay. In April, 1865, the Directors adopted a strong resolution declaring that Dr. Schaeffer had broken his word and violated his solemn pledge and expressing their “most decided disapprobation of a course so eminently reprehensible.”\textsuperscript{91}

The resolution was sent to Schaeffer, to the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia seminary, and to the Pennsylvania Ministerium.

\textsuperscript{80}\textit{Lutheran Observer}, September 23, 1864. This article was reprinted without note or comment in the \textit{Lutheran and Missionary}, September 29, 1864.

\textsuperscript{81}Quoted in Wentz, \textit{History of the Gettysburg Seminary}, p. 189.

\textsuperscript{91}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 189.
By this time it was a matter of personal pride and face-saving rather than a theological issue, and so the columns of the *Lutheran and Missionary* following the publication of this resolution were filled with a defense of Schaeffer’s actions and a criticism of the hostility of the Gettysburg supporters.

Finally, the attitudes of each seminary towards the other, once the split had materialized, should be noted. In Philadelphia many different (and rather unimportant) reasons were cited as additional proof of why a seminary should be established there. The connection with the past was made when the claim was put forth that Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, the first great leader of Lutheranism in America, had wanted the Lutheran seminary to be located in Philadelphia. Now the new seminary was actually the true upholder of the vision of Muhlenberg! What they claimed about Muhlenberg was perhaps true; but it was certainly overstating the case to declare, as H. E. Jacobs did in 1914, “Never had the project of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg vanished from the minds of his successors.” Another reason cited was that the close proximity of Philadelphia to Lutheran centers would be able to draw many students who would otherwise not have gone to Gettysburg. This may also have been true, but it hardly seemed to be a factor when the Pennsylvania Ministerium was seeking to establish relations with the seminary of the Ohio Synod at Columbus in 1842. Again, Jacobs cited the need for a decided expansion of the curriculum of the Gettysburg seminary; he declared that “the program in view was one which the other institution [Gettysburg] could not have carried out.” But this argument could hardly be used as a reason for the new seminary or as a justification for the division, especially since Gettysburg considerably expanded its program and enlarged its faculty between the years 1865-1867.

The Gettysburg people often objected to the other seminary because they said that a large city would present more temptations to a theological student than a small town. Rather than ignoring this kind of argument, the *Lutheran and Missionary* simply reversed it and even went one better: “a city,” it noted,

---


Ibid., p. 452.
"is more free than a small town from the temptations peculiar to theological students. . . . One of the temptations which has been most dangerous to theological students, is that of premature engagement to marry." The feeling expressed here was that the latter temptation was actually greater in a small town where the students would know the townspeople more closely! There was also the usual nebulous appeal to "spirit" in the declaration that "there is theological life and energy there [at Gettysburg], but we want a different place and different surroundings. Even if we had five or ten professors there, we would still feel . . . that the Institution would flourish more elsewhere."

At Gettysburg the general attitude towards the new seminary was one of scorn. The seminary could not be started, the money could not be raised—so went the attack. The Lutheran Observer charged the people proposing a new institution with the succinct phrase, "Concentrate or decline." A year later, at Brown's formal inauguration as seminary professor, A. H. Lochman, the president of the Board of Directors, declared concerning the division:

I hesitate not in saying, that no advantage which can possibly be gained by it, can over-balance the evil which must necessarily grow out of it. It will divide our means and efforts, which combined could furnish an Institution almost equal to any in the land. It will place our Church in an unfavorable light before the community as antagonistic with itself. It will foment dissensions.

Referring to the loss of students, Lochman stated: "The idea of a large city has pleased the fancy of some young men, who perhaps had never been in a city before." As to Gettysburg's position on the confessional issue, Lochman said that there was no change:

We stand upon the same basis upon which we have always stood. . . . The same doctrines are here taught; we revere the same Confession, as containing the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion, and the distinctive doctrines of our Church.

---

44 Lutheran and Missionary, September 22, 1864.
46 Lutheran Observer, August 5, 1864.
47 This and the following two quotations are taken from Lochman's "Address at Inauguration of New Professor at Gettysburg," August 8, 1865, printed in the Evangelical Quarterly Review, XVI (1865), 550-557.
Brown echoed somewhat similar sentiments in his inaugural address:

I desire to stand where the Board of this Seminary has always stood, on the basis of a broad, liberal, but genuine Lutheranism. . . . This is broad enough and firm enough, liberal enough and reliable enough for me. . . . If any reform and change should ever be needed, . . . [I expect] to work constitutionally from within, and not schismatically from without.\(^4\)

But in outlining a “theology for our time,” he acknowledged at least a change of emphasis from his predecessor; the new theology must be “conservatively Lutheran” as well as “evangelically liberal.” Brown’s work in his new post marked the beginning of a period of reconstruction and a new enthusiasm for the seminary.

As each seminary centered more of its attention on its own concerns and less on its rival, each grew and prospered. The seminary split, though, was unfortunate, for the actual difference in the approaches to the confessions was less between the two schools than it had been when the Pennsylvania Ministerium had cooperated with Gettysburg Seminary. It was also unfortunate that the Franckean Synod episode had been forced upon the seminary situation. Hostilities between the two seminaries continued for a number of years. And even though the rival factions buried their differences in a merger in 1918, which formed the United Lutheran Church in America, attempts made at several times since that date to merge the two seminaries have failed. They have continued as separate institutions, just over one hundred miles apart, each training men for the ministry in the same church body.

\(^{4}\) J. A. Brown, “Inaugural Address,” Evangelical Quarterly Review, XVI (1865), 558-559.