

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

MAY, 1849.

---

NO. III.

---

---

ART. XIII.—THE APOSTLES' CREED.

*II.—Its Inward Constitution and Form.*

To estimate properly the merits and claims of the *apostolical symbol*, it is not enough to be acquainted with the facts of its history outwardly considered. We need still more to understand its interior history; its rise and progress under an inward view; the idea which is developed in its constitution, and the manner in which the development is to be regarded as taking place.

In the first place, the Creed is no work of mere outward *authority*, imposed on the Church by Christ or his Apostles. It would help its credit greatly in the eyes of some, no doubt, if it could be made to appear under this view. Their idea of christianity is such as involves prevailingly, the notion of a given or fixed scheme of things to be believed and done, propounded for the use of men, on the authority of heaven, in a purely mechanical and outward way. If there were evidence that some several of the Apostles together, or even the Apostle Paul, or the Apostle John alone, had formed the Creed as it now stands, and handed it over in this shape as something finished and complete, to the keeping of the Church, it would be looked upon, of course, as at once a

of piety that goes thus virtually, by its pretensions, to sap the very foundations of the Church itself, must be in its own nature defective and insecure. Puritanism must learn to do justice to Catholicism, before it can do full justice to itself. Its proper mission will be complete, only when the two forms of thinking are brought in some way to flow together, excluding on both sides all that is found to be incompatible with the idea of such a marriage.

We know full well, and have not forgotten for one moment, in all this review, that there is a Charybdis here as well as a Scylla, which we are bound on vast peril to shun and avoid. These Letters of Kirwan lie all on one side, covering at no great depth the treacherous *rock* we have now tried to expose; at some future time, if God permit, we shall take notice of the *whirlpool*, in an article, not on Bishop Hughes, but on "Brownson's Quarterly Review."

J. W. N.

---

#### ART. XVI.—ZUINGLI NO RADICAL.

THE following extract is translated from Professor Ebrard's great work, on the History of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It forms part of a somewhat extended vindication of the general character of the Swiss Reformer, against certain injurious views which have been entertained of it, in Germany particularly, and in the bosom of the Lutheran Church. He has been held up to reproach, as a man whose zeal for the Reformation was more bent on pulling down than on building up; and who was ruled by the cold mechanical abstractions of the understanding, more a great deal than by proper power of the christian faith. It has been the fashion widely to associate with his name, the idea of a somewhat rationalistic and revolutionary tendency in religion; which is supposed also by the high Lutheran school, to have communicated itself, as a reigning permanent distinction, to the entire Reformed Church. This whole supposition Dr. Ebrard meets, as being in the case of Zuingli, no

better than a pure fiction of fancy, or theological prejudice. He insists upon it, that his theology was characterized throughout by a regard to the inward positive life of christianity, in its supernatural mystical form; and that even his sacramental doctrine itself, was based all along on the assumption of a real participation in the *very life* of Christ, as the necessary result of faith—something far deeper, of course, than the rationalistic conception of a mere moral union with him, which now so often affects to take shelter under the respectable authority of Zuingli's name. As for the notion of his being a fanatical radical, in his reformatory action, it is treated as wholly destitute of foundation. The extract here given, is intended to show, and it must be allowed indeed to do so very triumphantly, that this father of the Helvetic Reformation was, to say the least, full as conservative in his spirit as Luther, or any of the leaders of the same movement in Germany:

---

If to some of our readers the quotations now presented may perhaps seem too large and long for the end immediately in hand, we would remind them that they all go not merely to meet particular complaints against our reformer, which have no direct connection with the doctrine of the sacraments, but also at the same time to give us an insight into the fundamental character of his theology, *which is of the utmost consequence for the right understanding of his view of the Lord's supper*. We see at once, that Zuingli does not sunder faith scholastically from sanctification, but on the ground of his historical and biblical education apprehends both in their living organic union. Everywhere he opposes the *totality of what Christ does*, to the totality of what man can do without Christ, the decree of redemption through Christ to all humanly devised ways of salvation, deliverance from guilt by Christ's death to satisfaction by good works, sanctification by Christ's Spirit to the power of legal obedience. The vicarious action of Christ appears thus in the most intimate association with the vicarious passion of Christ. He makes good our shortcomings, not simply by suffering punishment in our stead, but also by *bringing to pass in us works* which we could not bring to pass of ourselves. Sanctification is taken here not as a subjective act growing out of faith, but as the immediate operation of *Christ living in us*; and the oneness which holds between the working of the *Holy Ghost* in us, and the life of

*Christ himself* in us, is thus apprehended in its deepest depth. With Zwingli accordingly, faith is not distinguished from sanctification, good works, the communion of the Holy Ghost, and the *mystical union*, but is regarded as the *totality of the new life*, which of itself involves all these from the start.

This will be very important for us hereafter. For the present we remark only how far Zwingli had entered into the true idea of Christian freedom. We see, that his opposition towards particular abuses proceeded not at all from the mere legal application of certain legally construed passages of Scripture, but from the most free and inward principle of faith. Allowing, however, the *ground* of this opposition to have been good, it is still asked whether the *manner* of it is not to be blamed as radical. Did he not mercilessly sweep away all that was old, even where it was free from harm?

Before we enter here upon the actual state of facts, it seems necessary first of all to clear out a whole Augean stable of prejudices and fables which busy *mythology* has contrived to throw around this part of the reformer's labors. To the Lutheran theologians, rather than to the Roman, belongs the credit of having vented their spleen upon him in the way of these ingenious imaginations; what one relates as dreadful, is made still a little worse in the hands of the next; and so the tattle runs through the polemical tradition, till it gains at last the show of well accredited history. What, did not Zwingli abolish everything! Not simply altars and images, but church music also, organs, ringing of bells, nay, the bells themselves, possibly even the steeple along? Is not the stale ory still in circulation, that he presented a petition to the Council for the suppression of church music, singing it himself, as he did so, to show practically the absurdity of using song in prayer—is not this flat story in circulation, we say, even in books and quite respectable theological journals, some of which we could easily name? Is it not the general impression that, while Luther retained all the old forms, and removed only what was doctrinally offensive, Zwingli made a clean sweep of the whole, and, then, constructed a poor scheme of his own in its place?

Against all this, at the outset, speaks the entire spirit of the good city, which Schiller has styled, not without reason, "the

*old Zurich.*" What is new in Zurich springs from 1830, or, at farthest, from 1790. It is questionable, if any German imperial city (Nuremberg even scarcely excepted) has retained its ancient manners, institutions, and usages, with so little change, for any like time, as Zurich. The small, narrow streets, whose hurdle-work still shows plainly, by towers, citadels, and remains of walls and trenches, the three several enlargements the city has gone through in the course of history, threw open the outermost ring of their gates and barricades, only a few years since, for free intercourse with the country. The old democratic usages prevailed universally down to 1830; and are still, at least, half in force. Even since the old corporations have lost their importance politically, they still continue to stand, as social fraternities, proud of their old guild houses, which, under different names, are familiar to every child. In a city, whose spirit has cleaved for centuries with such attachment throughout to what is old, it is not so easy a matter to make any such clean sweep as is here supposed. If now, however, we compare the Zuinglian changes with those of Luther and Calvin, we reach the surprising result, that, so far as *the principle and spirit* of the changes are concerned, Zuingli stands throughout on the side of Luther against Calvin. Calvin created entirely new forms; Zuingli, like Luther, retained all the old, and set aside only what gave offence. Only in *result*, not in principle, does he differ from Luther; in this namely that the images as such seemed to him doctrinal stumbling-blocks, while Luther made a more nice distinction between their edifying use as works of art, and their misuse as objects of idolatry.

It is regarded as an essential difference, that Luther retained the existing church organization; provosts, chapters, and archdeacons, parish priests, and deacons, all remained in their place; while Calvin proclaimed all ministers equal, and brought in with violent novelty the presbyterial and synodical system. We inquire not here which is best; we say simply, that Zuingli took the course of Luther. The cathedral chapter of Zurich, with its canons or prebendaries, stood till within a few years past, and the number of the members has not even yet died out; while the distinction between priest and deacon continues to this day in all its old legal force. The archdeacon too, or "chief

helper," has not become strange to the Reformed church of the Zuinglian type.—Another small, but characteristic, difference, is, that Luther retained in the Lord's prayer the old and more hard form: "*Vater unser*," which the Calvinistic Reformed church of German tongue changed, (after Luther's own translation of the Bible however,) into "*Unser Vater*." Zuingli allowed, as Luther, the old *Vater unser* to keep its place, and it remained there in the Zurich church service till near the close of the last century.—Calvin set aside baptismal fonts; Luther and Zuingli allowed them to stand, and in Zurich, where all the children are baptized in public service, they are still in use every week.—Calvin abolished private baptism in extreme cases by midwives; Zuingli, and Luther, did not; the Zuinglian Reformed church, moreover, was more consistent with it, than the Lutheran, as not permitting the baptism to be repeated in case the child lived.—Another small but significant difference between the Calvinistic Reformed church and the Lutheran, is shown in regard to the renting of church sittings, a practice set aside by the first, while it is retained by the last; here again Zuingli stands on Luther's side. The Calvinistic church eschews crosses in grave yards, which with the Lutheran and Zuinglian are in general use. In observing christening-days as family festivals, instead of birth-days, the Zuinglian church is even nearer to the Roman than the Lutheran itself.—Let us look now; in full, to the Liturgy! Calvin constructed a new liturgy, on a new plan, the greatness of which, with all its simplicity, we have no wish to dispute. Zuingli, in his work *De canone Missae*, has followed the mass service, part for part, word for word, leaving out merely, or changing, all passages referring to the sacrifice of the mass and the worship of saints, so as to form a sacramental liturgy that was afterwards subjected, indeed, to various contractions on account of its undue length, but which still rests throughout on the old foundation, and breathes the spirit of antiquity; and which continues in use to this day. While the eucharistic liturgies of Calvinistic type consist of a simple didactic address, which is followed by a common extended prayer, and then by the distribution of the elements, the Zuinglian form, on the contrary, is made up of a number of smaller parts. It commences with the

ancient *introitus*, the translated *Dignum et justum est &c.*; then 1 Cor. 11, is read; after which the minister says (with the whole congregation originally), "*Glory be to God!*" Next follows a long responsory, now generally repeated by two ministers alternately. 'Then the familiar response between pastor and people: "*The Lord be with you—'and with thy spirit;*" then a lesson from the sixth chapter of John; after another brief responsory, the Creed; then a short exhortation; the Lord's prayer; a prayer taken from the old mass service; the reading of the words of institution; the distribution of the elements; the 117th psalm, a closing prayer, and the benediction. In the same way, Zuingli retained the old baptismal service, with proper pruning. We find mention made of the chrisom cloth, on even to near the end of the 16th century.

But he put away the bells? These still swing in their places, and Zurich possesses verily a magnificent chime.—But they were not used for years; Zuingli would not suffer them to ring? Not for storms, true; otherwise bell ringing, in all its ancient classification, from the sound made at the beginning *and close* of divine service, on through eleven o'clock, noon and vesper chimes, down to the "coffee bell" at three o'clock in the afternoon, has been religiously observed, in defiance of the Nurembergers, through all centuries. Strange stories, indeed, are told of the love of the Zurichers for bells. On one occasion, (if we mistake not, 1712,) they are said to have brought off from a war with St. Gall, as *spolia opima*, a huge bell, transporting it in triumph to Zurich, with a team of forty-six horses!—But the clerical garments were abolished by Zuingli? The chasuble, (mass dress,) true. In other respects, the ministers until within a few years since, never appeared at regular church service, or at funerals even, and in family visitation, otherwise than in gown and cap, and with the large white ruff.—Has not Zurich, however, a synodical government? The Church, as of old, is divided into deaneries, which have their deans and camerarii, and stand under the direction of the consistory or church senate, with the antistes at its head. Once a year, the clergy in general, convene in a synod, over which the same antistes presides, and which corresponds in its character more with the medieval councils than with

the Calvinistic synods. By the antistes, besides, an episcopal element has place in the system.—But the church psalmody? the church psalmody? why did Zuingli abolish the church psalmody? *What* church psalmody, we ask. The chorals, perhaps? Nothing of this sort was abolished by Zuingli, nor could be indeed—since the Zurichers, as well as the Nurembergers, “hang no one till he is first caught.” The chanted offices of the convents and the Latin sing-song of the mass, Zuingli did set aside. Luther, it is known, did the same thing; even the pope wished this reform, and would have actually accomplished it, had not Palestrina appeared with his new school.\* The light in which the psalmody of that time was regarded, is briefly and aptly represented by the Tetrapolitan Confession, (cap. 21,) as follows: (*Cantiones et preces*) *a prima patrum consuetudine usuque degenerasse abunde constat.* An endless ringing of Latin psalms to trivial melodies, street ballads often, suited not the purposes of christian worship. Not long since we read, where we would not have expected it, that Zuingli threw overboard the glorious creations of medieval art. It was forgotten here, that the music, as well as painting, which we admire as old, springs not from the middle ages, but is of the age of the Reformation or later. Palestrina, Durante, Orlando Lasso, Lotti, composed their immortal hymns after Zuingli’s time. So with the painters; Raphael (†1520) was Zuingli’s contemporary, Durer his friend and secret adherent; Corregio, (†1534,) Kranach, (†1553,) Holbein, (†1554,) Michael Angelo, (†1564,) Titian, (†1576,) Rubens, (†1640,) Murillo, (†1685,) all belong, with their main labors at least, to the person after his death. So the Nuremberg proverb, that no one is hanged before being caught, may be applied also to the hanging of Raphael’s and Durer’s pictures, and with slight alteration also to the church psalmody. The true state of the case is, that Zuingli abolished nothing save what Luther would also have abolished, the Latin singing, namely, of the clergy; but that Luther was able, sooner than Zuingli, to substitute something new in place of the old which was set aside, namely, the choral singing of the congregation. In this, the last

\* See Thibaut’s work on the Purity of Music.



is indeed very clear of fault. Luther was a poet; Zwingli made some verses also, it is true, but poet he was not. Thus Saxony acquired a church psalmody *sooner* than Switzerland. This "sooner," however, is all that can be made of the matter. As soon as such psalmody made its way into Switzerland, it was laid hold of with earnest, we might say even voracious desire. As early as 12 Aug. 1526, Oecolampadius informed his friend Zwingli with enthusiasm, how his congregation had of their own accord begun to sing German psalms in the church.\* We see how far the Swiss reformers were from any opposition to congregational singing as such. In a short time it became universal throughout Reformed Switzerland; and so it continues, in the highest style of choral psalmody, to this day.

The only case then which remains at last, is that of the *images*. Here, too, we boldly undertake our Zwingli's vindication.

Professor Ebrard then goes into a historical review of the way, in which the reformation in Zurich was carried forward in regard to this subject. The question, whether pictures, as works of Christian art, might not be used, for exciting devotional feeling, in public worship, was not one, he says, upon which any decision was called for in Switzerland at this time. The whole concern was in regard to images only, which had been previously the *object of superstitious veneration*. What Zwingli says in opposition to images, is said against them always in such view. Luther contended against image abolitionists, who made a sin of images legalistically as such, and thought that everything was done, when they were outwardly demolished; the great matter he saw, was to have them expelled from the heart; the idol and the work of art must be properly distinguished. Zwingli, on the other hand, contended with such as defended, not only the images, but image worship itself; in a situation too, where the images had already become a shibboleth between Popery and the Reformation. Here it was necessary to insist upon it as a part of *Christian freedom*, that the Church has a right to remove images. In such spirit, the opposition to them went forward in Zurich. It was neither rash nor radical, but considerate and sober throughout; showing all due regard to the prejudices of the weak; advancing not a step outwardly, for which full room was not made previously in the way of inward preparation. About the end of Sept. 1523, a certain *Nicholas*

\* Without doubt Luther's "*Psalmlieder*" as published by Wolf Koepphel, in Strassburg, 1526.

*Hottinger* took it upon himself to break down a crucifix, in one of the suburbs of Zurich; for which he was thrown into the prison, with Zuingli's approbation. A woman in Luzerne had set up an image, in fulfilment of a vow, which soon became a resort for many pilgrims; on her conversion to the Protestant faith, she burned it with her own hand; whereupon she was fined, and required to restore it again to its place. In this judgment Myconius directed her to acquiesce as just, she had no right to destroy thus what was no longer her own. The anti-image spirit was excited, not by Zuingli, but by *Ludwig Hetzer's* tract: "The Judgment of God, our Spouse: how to treat all idols and images, as drawn from the holy scriptures;" a work, of which three editions, in the year 1523, were at once sold. Great commotion followed. A commission was appointed to investigate the question. A second conference took place, Oct. 26, 27, and 28, 1523, in the presence of 350 ministers and 450 laymen; the result of which was a resolution, that no change should be made at that time, in regard either to images or the mass. Zuingli was directed to write on the subject, for the instruction of the people. This was done, and with good effect. The next year, a third disputation was held. Still no action was taken against the images; they were allowed to keep their place a whole year longer, in accommodation to the prejudices of such as were still unprepared for their removal.

Finally, on Easter, 12. April, 1525, the Christian Lord's supper was celebrated in room of the mass—a solemnity of which *Gerdesius* has left us an impressive account; and as a preparatory step, the images were removed. The three city ministers, with certain members of the council and the necessary workmen, went from church to church, and with closed doors took them all down, and brought them away to the Water church. The clear trash among them was afterwards burnt; the better pictures are preserved to this day in the Water church, (now the city library). There is to be seen a coronation of Mary; there are the patron saints, Felix, and Regula, all stiff productions belonging to the transition period from the Byzantine over to the old German school; there again are some naked figures of martyrs, tortured with thorns, shocking to look upon; above all, however, there is that wonderful saint, the smith Erhardt or Eligius, who cut off the legs of the horses, he was called to shoe, and having shod them in such style, restored them sound to their place, (a miracle, to which the coat of Treves is nothing!)—articles all, that must tend much, in truth, to the edification of Evangelical

worshippers! We may understand from this, why it came so little in Zuingli's way to take his estimate of images, from the side of their artistic worth, their adaptation to produce feeling. If these pictures have any importance, it is only for the study of the history of art; and for this a library is altogether the most suitable place.

I must ask the indulgence of my readers, who have been carried along with me in this digression. It is not, however, my fault. So long as Zuingli remains as good as unknown, so long as he is absolutely misknown, so long as a caricature, a fanatical enthusiast and a man of mere dry understanding withal, is made to pass for him in the brain of the German theological public, so long also must it be a pure impossibility to apprehend the sacramental controversy between Luther and Zuingli in its true meaning and significance. It would be hard, indeed, to find the apprehension of a doctrine more intimately blended with the entire man, and his whole sense of Christianity, than just here in the case of Zuingli.

---

#### ART. XVII.—THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

*The "Person of Christ," according to the Older Theologians of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Heinrich Schmid. Translated from the German and Latin by Chas. P. Krauth, Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Winchester, Va.*

[The title of the entire work from which this chapter is translated, is, "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche. Erlangen. 1843." It is designed to present the doctrines of the Lutheran Church as they were held when her faith was purest. Under each head, there is a summary statement of the doctrine of the church, by the author, and in the notes ample citations are made from the standards and standard authors of the church,