

To the missionaries of the Dresden Evangelical-Lutheran Mission Society.

Reverend Messrs. Teichelmann and Schürmann.

in
Adelaide
South Australia

Beloved bretheren in the Lord!

We correctly received your letters from London on May 26th, from Plymouth on June 7th, from Rio de Janeiro on August 8th, and from Adelaide on October 24th and December 21st of the year 21 (and January 29th of the same year) at the time they were sent.

We praise the Lord our God, that he has protected you on your long sea voyage from all accidents and harm, and brought you safely and well to your destination, especially considering that one of the ships with local emigrants to North America has presumably encountered an accident, the Lutheran pastor Krauser from Prussia had to struggle with all kinds of shortages and hardships during his crossing to New York, and the missionary Schneider, who was sent by Pastor Goßner, died of an infectious fever shortly after his arrival in New South Wales, from which many fellow travelers were seriously ill. You have been guided like by a father's eyes and carried as if on angel's hands; therefore, we rightly say with David: "Praise the Lord, my soul, and all that is within me, his holy name. Praise the Lord, my soul, and forget not all the good he has done to you."

In this praiseworthy mood, we are unfortunately! painfully disturbed by the discord that has arisen among you. You have failed to uphold the supportive, forgiving love to which you are mutually committed, and as a result, you have disagreed over the aforementioned issues, which should never give rise to division and separation among you. We do not, however, want to despair of your personal Christianity or the success of the mission; but we must, in the strength of the Lord, impart to you those fatherly admonitions and corrections that seem appropriate to your situation. We will, however, share our advice and, in a separate letter, address what relates to your fraternal relationship with each other. In the present context, we will elaborate on what concerns the missionary work more closely and can be considered a partial supplement to the instruction, to be preserved together with this letter.

Firstly, you have different opinions about holding the worship service according to the prayer book of the English Episcopal Church. We just as little understand how religious freedom, which is completely unrestricted on English soil, can be limited on English ships, as we do not understand how the various religious parties on the ship allowed themselves to be subject to such a false restriction; nevertheless, according to Schürmann's and her (Schür) reports, this did indeed happen, and we must assume these circumstances in our assessment. We believe that this is a so-called intermediate case, about which the judgment of Christians, without prejudice to the firmness and purity of their faith, may differ, both in view of the many ambiguities of the Holy Scriptures and of several passages of the Lutheran Confession. It is not about whether the part of the prayer book prescribed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which does not agree with the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Table, should be used, but whether the part intended for public worship, which contains no contradictions to the Lutheran Church's confession, should be allowed. (+) (This) can therefore be prayed by a Lutheran pastor out of conscience, especially if the explanation is given in advance that this should not be regarded as a proof that one has left the Lutheran Church and joined the English one; but rather, that one only wants to show by this act that one intends to practice Christian charity and ecclesiastical tolerance. In this way, the accusation of indifference, the offense of weak consciences, and a weak position of the pastors will be avoided. Accordingly, the said action does not involve a denial of faith; but it presents itself as a * . One can indeed say: Here are people who are compelled to adhere to a certain form of worship; they can also be edified by the service of the doctor, who has been commissioned by the authorities to replace the pastor under certain circumstances; but they are nevertheless committed to their public worship, as I am an ordained servant of the Word. I want to serve them with my office, especially since I not only protect them from harsh judgments about my church, but can also contribute to their familiarity with the biblical confessions of my church.

While the gentleman is speaking, the other might say: On the one hand, the English Church has shown some arrogance by wanting to make the use of its liturgy mandatory for missionaries who belong to another church through their ordination; I cannot condone this arrogance. On the other hand, the Lutheran Church has not been respected as much as it deserves so far; I do not want to forgive it anything, but I will do my best to advocate for the recognition it deserves. Moreover, I am supposed to act in my role as a missionary of the Lutheran Church; it is therefore good that I break through as soon as possible, and under no circumstances should I create difficulties that would hinder my official appearance at the place of my assignment.

Finally, I appear indecisive, having previously hesitated to become a missionary for a bishop's missionary society, and now finding myself willing to read the prayers of the English Church (so to speak), we do not want to take sides for either one or the other, as it is a middle ground that is at issue, and we are not united in opposing any conscientious conviction; however, we must regret that disagreement has arisen among you, and all the more so as it seems to have become known to your fellow

travelers, and particularly to the Governor. We must also ask you, dear Teichelmann, to carefully examine whether you are aware of the weakness of being guided in your actions by the kindness of the Governor, to whom you felt indebted for some response; and you, Schürmann, whether you are free from the so-called 'Germanism', which feels offended when a foreign nationality emerges and inhibits legitimate expressions of affection. However, we must urge both of you to strive (to the best of your ability) to ensure that, if anyone has been upset or annoyed by your differing views, they are led through calm instruction to the conviction that in the present case it is a middle ground, in the evaluation of which not unkindness, but true Christian freedom is revealed, so that what was initially lamented as a lack of harmony may finally be recognized as a Christian direction.

(Secondly), a disagreement has arisen among you as to whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used at the (by you administered) Holy Communion. In external matters, however, the Lord has granted his church freedom to make such arrangements as were required by the circumstances at the time. Thus, even in the apostolic era, instead of the (leavened) Easter bread, which the Lord himself took at the institution of the Holy Communion, leavened bread was used in the proclamation of the death of Jesus Christ. Acts 2:46, 20:20, 11:1 Cor. 11:26 - 28. This practice continued generally until the ninth century, but then it was included among the points on which the Western and Eastern churches separated, with the Eastern church retaining leavened bread and the Western church introducing unleavened bread with regard to the institution ceremony. At the Reformation, the Reformed church in this regard aligned with the Greek church, while the Lutheran church maintained the practice of the Roman Catholic church. Although we must concede to these undeniable historical testimonies that leavened bread is just as permissible at the Holy Communion as unleavened bread, we cannot agree that you deviate from the use of the unleavened bread customary in our church.

Firstly, because it would be regrettable to deviate from the practice of the entire Lutheran Church over an insignificant, indifferent institution. Secondly, due to the division that would undoubtedly arise in both South Australia and Europe; for Pastor Kavel, who emigrated with his congregation for the sake of the Lutheran confession, would most likely take offense at this, and the members of our society, who are committed to maintaining the Lutheran Church in accordance with its doctrine and practice, would withdraw from us dissatisfied. Furthermore, there would be great danger associated with this. Presumably, reformed people are to be introduced out of consideration for the leavened bread; but consider the far-reaching principle that separates the Reformed Church from the Lutheran one.

While the Reformed Church completely ignores or even declares the development of the Church of Christ as reprehensible, wanting to accept only what is literally contained in the Holy Scriptures, the Lutheran Church adheres to the historical viewpoint and thus accepts everything that has proven to be beneficial and useful in the Church over time. You are aware of the far-reaching consequences of this

principle; you know that some, particularly the most consistent Reformed communities, reject dogmatic expressions (and even less the important doctrines they refer to) such as the Holy Trinity, original sin, etc., because they do not appear in the Scriptures; they have abolished the main aspect of the apostolic-Christian Church and the practice of infant baptism common in the first centuries of Christianity for the same reason, and they want nothing to do with a beneficial church constitution that unites individual communities into a common whole, to the point that the Quakers even disdain the use of the sacraments of Mark and the holy sacraments.

If you were to adhere to a principle now, you would be accepting the principle itself and could gradually be driven to its extreme limits. In the end, the institution in question would become completely useless. The issue between the Lutheran and Reformed churches is not so much about external church customs, but rather about profound doctrinal differences. As long as these are not reconciled, giving way in that regard leads to nothing; but how difficult it is to find agreement in doctrine, history has shown at various times, and especially in our days. Nevertheless, we must ask you, dear brothers, not to make the aforementioned change, but to administer the Lord's good according to the practice of the Lutheran church in Europe, as prescribed by the agendas handed to you and especially the Altenburg Agenda recommended in your instruction.

If you are criticized by the Reformed for the unleavened bread and other customs introduced in the Lutheran Church during the Holy Communion, such as the cross, the candles, the celebration with singing, the recognition, etc., you must remain aware of the good reasons why our church stands apart from the Reformed one.

Thirdly, they have differing opinions on the legitimate claims of the English to the land and soil of South Australia, which we regret all the more, as the Governor has been informed of this and has commented on it accordingly. From a secular point of view, dear brothers, we cannot delve into this matter, which is deeply rooted in international and national law, as well as in today's political discussions. If you want very brief and general hints, please refer to page 22 of our 18-year report and page 11 of the mission news. However, from a biblical point of view, we believe we must tell you the following.

The English once took possession of South Australia (de facto, whether legally or not); therefore, it is unwise for you to delve into this matter. It is also extremely dangerous to do so, as you will subject yourself to numerous inconveniences and disturbances in your missionary work due to criticism of the English's actions, and even complete prohibition of it and possible expulsion from the colony. As for the natives, who may be incited to anger and revenge by your remarks, they should not grant me, as the weaker party, any favors for free. At the same time, a request was made that Mr. Angas open a credit of 100 Levier Sterling in the Adelaide bank on our behalf. Finally, there was a conclusion, which was blatantly implied, that the salary of 100 Levier Sterling offered by Mr. Angas would date from before your departure

from London. The wish was expressed that this salary should be paid to you in quarterly installments. We assume that Mr. Angas will consider our requests, even though we received no explicit assurance from him, but only a few words from his clerk, to which you attached your first letter from London. However, from your letter from Plymouth, dear Teichelmann, we see that the requested opening of the credit cannot be guaranteed with certainty, so we once again requested Mr. Angas for this favor and immediately deposited 50 Levier Sterling. In the letter from a clerk, which indicated the receipt of the bills, it was explicitly stated that the credit had indeed been opened. After some time, we transferred another 25 Levier, and following Brother Teichelmann's first letter from Australia on October 24th of last year, 100 Levier were remitted again. In the letter instructing us to send the latter sum, we requested Mr. Angas for clarification about the refusal of your salary by the bank and added the following notes, which we have already provided in essence, verbatim:

„In CC

From this complete explanation, you must clearly see that we are not at all to blame for this unfortunate circumstance; but neither should Mr. Angas be held responsible. In the detailed reply letter he sent us, he expresses his utmost surprise that you were denied the expected sum of money; since his instruction was issued in the usual form and neither the bank nor anyone else said anything about it. He believes that there must have been some mistake on your part when presenting the instruction, but he intends to inquire about it in detail from the bank. However, an unfounded concession was made by you at the bank, but the main blame should probably lie with Mr. Stephens. Brother Teichelmann writes: "The first thing we did the following morning was to go to the bank to hand in our letters and get money. Mr. McLaren, the bank manager, was just on Kangaroo Island, so we authorized the cashier to open the letters. But how surprised we were when we heard that we couldn't get a penny before the end of a quarter. The cashier was kind enough to let us read the letter ourselves, and we found that only 100 pounds were to be paid to both of us, with the remark that they were to be paid quarterly; an extract from Mr. P. Wermelskirch's letter to Mr. Angas stated exactly the same thing. But, said the cashier, salaries are never paid in advance, so the only option is for me to pay you the sum of 25 pounds each after the end of a quarter, and I'm not authorized to exceed this amount. This was already clear to us;

CC"

From this narrative, it follows that Mr. Angas did not specify the first payment date, but not, as Brother Teichelmann suggests in his letter of December, that he instructed payment "three months after sight". Otherwise, there would have been no room for the cashier's conclusion, which is explicitly stated. We would ask you to pay attention to this point; likewise, you must ensure that the cashier's conclusion is completely unfounded. The missionaries of the London Jewish Society receive their salaries "prae numerando", and probably also the messengers of all other missionary societies; for it is unforeseeable how they would otherwise survive the first quarter of the year, unless they possess private assets, which is unlikely in the case of the

fewest. However, this incorrect assumption has caused you financial difficulties; if you had refuted it with the likelihood that you would not be left without subsistence means for an entire quarter, and with the vague wording of Mr. Angas's letters, the cashier would have been inclined to immediately pay you 25 Levier, especially since he later accepted a bill of exchange (+) (for 50 Levier) not issued by the Governor, which, incidentally, was honored by Mr. Angas. You yourselves, dear brothers, have contributed to your financial difficulties; this would probably not have been the case if you had not formed a prejudice against Mr. Angas before your first meeting with him and had not been clouded by emotions rather than calmly considering all circumstances. But let's not dwell on this, as we have already addressed it in a separate letter; here, however, we would like to point out that by (approximately) mid-October, 400 Liver must be in your hands, 200 from us, 100 from Mr. Angas, and 100 from the local Englishmen. These will suffice until we hear from you again.

~~Brother Schürmann has calculated his travel expenses from Dresden to London, but we are still awaiting proof from Brother Teichelmann. Also, the later travel expenses, namely the 14 levers specially designed by Brother Teichelmann, have not yet been verified. We mention this not because we doubt their legitimacy, but because order in financial matters is an urgent necessity.~~

As for Schürmann's proposal for the future that we should move directly to the Bank of Adelaide, we cannot comment on it. The bank would not honor the letters of credit issued by us until they had received reassuring information about our solvency; if this happened, the repayment could only take place either by the bank moving against us, or by us making payments in London. However, this procedure would be cumbersome (because the bank would first have to inquire about us), and would be embarrassing for Mr. Angas, who is the chairman of the bank, as you can see from the enclosure; because the officials in Australia would inquire about us with him, and in the desired case, they would not deviate from the method that is currently in place, where the bank would want us to repay the sums it is to disburse to Mr. Angas. Under these circumstances, it seems most appropriate to us that we continue to avail ourselves of Mr. Angas's kind mediation and provide him with the necessary sums for transfer to the bank in Adelaide. You can rest assured that further complications are unlikely to arise, but if they do happen,

[no further communication was found]