Altenburg on February 1, 1838,
an oral examination of the two pupils of the Dresden Missionary Society,

Gottlieb Teichelmann from Dahme
Klamor Schürmann from Schledehausen near Osnabrück,

took place in the Ducal Consistory from 9 to 12:30 am.

Mr. Große conducted the examination on the dogma of "baptism", Mr. D. Hesekiel on "the spiritual office and the requirements thereof", and Mr. Sachse on "the general symbols of the Christian Church and the specific ones of the Protestant-Lutheran Church".

The examinees were able to translate the cited passages from the Old and New Testaments from the original texts into Latin, which was particularly easy in Hebrew, and also demonstrated a more thorough knowledge of the history of the older and newer churches and dogmas, which they extended to

Ad Acta... on February 13, 1838,

W. G.

all circumstances were covered, as well as a familiarity with the history of symbolic books. However, they were less clear on the definitions of dogmatic terms, at least they only partially specified them with certainty; and they expressed themselves inadequately on the subjects of practical theology. The examination was partly conducted in German, as the examinees were not proficient enough in Latin to express themselves fluently. However, Schürmann showed greater proficiency in Latin than Teichelmann, and seemed to surpass him in both knowledge and intellectual strength.

On the same day

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, both examinees delivered a portion of the sermon they had prepared on a given text in the Barthol Church to demonstrate their public speaking skills.

Teichelmann's voice was sonorous, his pronunciation clear, and his delivery was confident, but his sermon lacked liveliness... and the action could have been more varied.

Schürmann's voice was strong and loud, his pronunciation clear, but his delivery was uncertain and hesitant, likely due to the limited preparation time. A more detailed evaluation of both sermons is provided by... D. Hesekiel.

February 2nd

In the morning, the examinees were assigned a written work to be completed in the Consistorial Room on the passage from Philippians 2:5-11, which they were to address from an exegetical and dogmatic perspective and explain its application in Christian catechetical instruction.

Both works did not match the performance they demonstrated during the oral examination, but Schürmann paid more attention to the original text in his exegetical treatment of the passage than Teichelmann. However, both failed to adequately apply the passage in their work.

In the afternoon

The examinees conducted a catechetical demonstration with some schoolboys. Teichelmann was assigned the first commandment. He demonstrated skill in questioning, clarity in explanation, and warmth in delivery. However, the necessary illustration through examples and the presentation of the context in which duties to God arise were lacking.
Schürmann catechized on the third commandment. He showed skill in questioning, clarity in explanation, and logical connection of individual thoughts; but further illustration through examples and application of the subject matter to life would have been desirable.

When Teichelmann approached his catechization in a more developmental manner, Schürmann dealt with his subject in a more examinatory way. Based on the success of the examinations described in more detail above, the verdict was made that Teichelmann "passed the examinations in a satisfactory manner" and Schürmann "passed the examinations in an especially satisfactory manner".
See the report.
[Signatures]
H. Große,
Dr. Hesekiel,
Sachse.

According to the text in the first part, our Lord's teaching is described as the path to happiness = the sinner's reunion with God, communion with God, although the statement "I am the way" points to his entire hope. However, the glory of the teaching is not comprehensively and convincingly demonstrated with the two concepts of God's worthiness and the satisfaction of all spiritual needs.

The second part generally correctly captures the two aspects of living faith: listening? and acting; but the whole is not sufficient and convincing enough...

The text is generally underutilized, especially the description of the struggle of life in it is not considered. The language is simple and largely... but the higher momentum of the thoughts is lacking everywhere due to a lack of deep penetration into the subjects. The external presentation should be more lively and elevated, especially the action was monotonous.

Regarding H. Schürmann's sermon

The introduction lacks an opening prayer and a biblical blessing wish, without which no Christian presentation should be, otherwise... the idea of the predestination to salvation and the human's inability to achieve it by his own strength is simply and naturally developed, and the scriptural passages are appropriately cited. However, the transition to the topic is too lengthy. [Greek characters] Verse 6 is with regard to Verse 20 not be taken as the *justification* achieved by the Savior (in the Pauline sense)

but more generally as *justitia probitas, sinceritas anomi*, the glory of a determined change of mindset.

The theme itself is also too far from the text in its expression. It would fit better in countless places of the holy scriptures than here. Perhaps it would have been more appropriate to express the same as: "How the proper use of the gospel depends on its beginning".

The description of the proper use of the gospel is too brief. Obviously, the Lord attached the greatest importance to this. On the other hand, the improper use is more appropriately presented. The second main part is also appropriately developed from the text, or at least linked to it. The language is pure, lively, sometimes powerful. There was too much uncertainty and monotony in the presentation, probably due to the incomplete preparation caused by the shortness of time. The organ is good.

Dr. Hesekiel.