

Part II:

An Historical Reader for the 1839 Zurich Revolution

Introduction to the Historical Reader: on the September 6, 1839, Revolution in Zurich, Switzerland

Overview

Strauß' appointment to Zurich University's Theological Faculty by the government of the Canton of Zurich triggered a coup by populist Christians that led to the deaths of fifteen people. This 'Historical Reader' provides translations of materials that are concerned with the events leading up to, on, and resulting from September 5/6, 1839. It provides official reports, formal letters pro and con of recommendation to the government in support of Strauß' appointment, responses from Strauß and the Superintendent of Schools, Scherr, pro and con street pamphlets, newspaper reports, an unusual historical account of the events signed off for its historical accuracy by all three factions of the revolution (leaders of the government, populist Christians, and soldiers), and the "Report on the Activity of the Aid Society for the Good of the Victims of 6 September 1839."

Having failed in 1837, the Liberal government, which had come to power with the first democratic election in the Canon in 1831 and founded the University of Zurich in 1833 as part of the government's educational reform from grade school through post-secondary school, was successful on its second attempt to appoint Strauß to the chair for Biblical Theology, Church History, and Dogmatics at the University of Zurich in January of 1839.

The failed appointment in 1837 had prepared the explosives and the successful appointment in 1839 lit the fuse for the populist, Christian coup that brought down the Liberal government of the Canton of Zurich on September 6, 1839.

The Zurich populist Christians took it to be not only their right to defend 'true' Christianity but also their democratic obligation to overthrow a government they viewed as threatening their religious worldview and dogma and to demonize the government's 'liberal' educational values as a threat to their traditional, social convictions.

Storming of the capitol city of the Canton of Zurich was fueled by the 'fake news' that the 'Seven Concordat'¹ Canton troops were on their way to Zurich to defend the hated Liberal government.

Xenophobia drove the populist Christians who used the metaphor of the 'northern virus' threatening the Canton in the form of the German liberals, Strauß and the progressive pedagogue, Ignaz Thomas Scherr appointed as Superintendent of Schools for life by the Canton government. Scherr had instituted a reform not only of the general school curriculum but also, specifically, of the religious instruction in the schools.

1. On March 17, 1832, the Cantons of Zurich, Bern, Luzern, Solothurn, St. Gall, Aargau, and Thurgau had agreed to a Concordat which committed them to military intervention not only upon request of the threatened Canton but also without invitation should there be a circumstance in which a Concordat member's constitution was threatened.

The 'deep pockets' funding and fueling of the populists in Zurich came from an industrialist who was angry that the Liberal government had eliminated child labor.

Among the lessons to be learned from September 6, 1839:

- a) *Civic law provides no guarantee of justice much less virtue.* Before one examines the civic law (if one does at all) for guidance in accomplishing one's goals, one has already given or withheld permission to oneself to do something. A revolution is grounded in the conviction that the legislating government is illegitimate or immoral so that maintaining its constitution would be a moral and not only a political failure. Although the self-permission to attack one's own government can occur on vague and imprecise 'moral' grounds, that decision is, nonetheless, a decision that invokes the moral culture 'above' the civic law. Obviously, the significance, reality, and discernment of this internal, moral culture is still worthy of reflection, today.
- b) *Socially constructed rules, including 'objective' religious revelations preserved in texts or preached before followers, are also no guarantee of virtue much less justice.* Such 'hypothetical' rules ("if you want to do this, then you must ...") are specific to individual cultures, communities, and institutions. Adherence to them is governed by 'honor' or the wish to achieve 'status and prestige' in the eyes of others. Hence, both their social origin and their aim of status and prestige make them relative. 'Hypothetical imperatives' are by no means 'wide,' universal, 'categorical imperatives' that 'fit together' in the unitary whole of an architectonic of lawfulness. In turn, 'categorical imperatives' are not simply an aggregate of rules applicable to diverse and various aspects of life. As with the civic law, the moral decision that gives oneself permission to do something on the basis of socially constructed rules occurs prior to one's concern with socially constructed rules themselves so that, again, it would be a valuable exercise to engage the significance, reality, and discernment of this internal moral culture, today.
- c) *The capacity to make clever, imperceptible distinctions and to weave them into 'coherent' narratives (e.g., conspiracy theorists and theories), while often taken to be an indication of 'intelligence,' is no guarantee of their 'truth.'* By employing such narratives in blind adherence to the narrative or mere fealty to a 'leader' based on their role in perpetrating the narrative in order to give oneself permission to do something (e.g., initiate a political revolution) substitutes wild speculations for moral conviction. One avoids wild speculation by embracing precisely what the conspiracy theorists deny: that there is a lawful, causal order that governs physical events as well as a lawful, causal order that governs personal and corporate agency.
- d) *Insisting that the Christian gospels are literal, historical accounts of factual events in the life of Jesus of Nazareth elevates the literary 'husks' (stories: myths, *muthoi*/μῦθοι) to the status of absolute truth and ignores, if not intentionally destroys, the significance of the stories' 'kernels' (which can be a historical fact, a philosophical/theological idea, or a symbol).* The consequence is that the theological options

to be found in the text are glossed over with a dogmatic insistence on a single message of 'salvation,' and one places on the divine throne what, in fact, are finite, anthropomorphic capacities (thought, creativity, teleological planning, compassion, will, etc.). Although exaggerating the importance of anthropocentrism by placing humanity at the center of the story of creation and salvation, this 'divinization' of humanity is neither elevating nor enriching of humanity but a crippling and impoverishing of humanity's real capacities for responsible agency.

- e) *The examination of the implications of Strauß' turn to Kantianism at the end of his life provides a host of other lessons for responsible agency.*² The core lesson, though, from September 6, 1835, is that science and religion are not adversaries but complementary and inseparable, universal (not socially relative) causal orders that govern personal and corporate decision taking with respect to 'what is' and 'what ought to be.' *What science teaches us about 'what is' and practical reason about 'what ought to be' must be engaged prior to one's consideration of the civic law, socially constructed rules, and/or populist social narratives.* To do so, though,

2. In anticipation of the suspicion that these lessons constitute merely an aggregate of themes without the grounded coherence of an architectonic, it is important to emphasize that these lessons constitute a coherent theoretical and practical architectonic accountable to sense perception. For example, the lawfulness of material conditions is the basis of all other capacities and, therefore, should be the starting point of all efforts to understand anything. The individual should treat her-/himself and the other never as a mere means but, primarily, as an end to one-/her-/himself. The three maxims of understanding: 'Think for oneself,' 'Think from the perspective of the other,' 'Be consistent (lawfully and with one's highest capacities)' contribute, as well, to the framework of 'wide' categorical imperatives for the individual to invoke in giving her-/himself permission to act. Furthermore, lawfulness is grounded in two systems of causality (nature and freedom) that are required (but do not determine in advance) for us to experience the world as we do. Here we can/must speak of a 'transcendental' metaphysics *within the limits of reason*. Reason is a set of conditions that enable understanding and responsible agency in the world rather than a static, 'divine' order of mere ideas (the *Logos*), a mechanical, material order, or the fulfilment of a set of anthropocentric wishes grounded in anthropomorphic analogies that make humanity the navel of the universe and the actual object of worship. Humanity's 'significance' is its capacity to understand and to create in ways that nature cannot, on its own, create. Humanity's significance, then, is its 'place' where nature is 'open-ended' and not a mechanically, closed causal system. Humanity's creative openness is, also, the key to a profound satisfaction that gives our lives genuine meaning in the face of the staggering 'negativity' of our world-situation. Kant contrasted his 'negative method' that consists in the 'positive' empowerment of responsible agency with Stoic indifference, Epicurean concupiscence, Cynic hardening of the self, melancholy, mysticism, drunkenness, and grace. (See 'Kant's 'Negative Method' in 45, n. 28.)

There is no better starting point for the achievement of meaning than the four examples (not exhaustive) of the 'duties owed to oneself and others' (NOT to God and country): 'don't lie,' 'don't commit suicide' out of social frustration and economic despair, 'develop one's talents,' and 'respond to the suffering of others'. All 'duties owed to oneself and others' along with the conditions and capacities of transcendental consciousness that make 'duty' possible in the first place are part of an internally coherent architectonic and not simply a random aggregate of elements grounded in speculative analogies. This methodology comes from Kant's "The Transcendental Doctrine of Method" in the *Critique of Pure Reason* B 735–884.

requires a 'religious' 'culture' that grasps the significance of a hope for efforts not driven exclusively by self-interest, which is grounded in imperceptible lawfulness.

A "Historical Reader" of Translated Materials from the 1839 Events

The materials of the "Historical Reader" address the issues and present diverse official reports from the government as well as populist documents used by the opposition as a contribution to establishing an adequate record of the events in Zurich.

If this material teaches us nothing else, we should not be surprised that Matthew 5:43–44 ("You have heard it said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy. But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you'") is no hindrance, obviously, to 'Christians' employing the "devil's deception" in their interaction with their opponents, to hating others not of one's tribe, or to killing of those opposed to one or one's group.

An individual or a group is no more dangerous than when they take their *re-figured* reading of their tradition's *pre-figured* narrative to be absolute truth. The revolution in Zurich on September 6, 1839, is a classic example of Personal Theism's elevating of human understanding to the throne of God in the belief that it must employ violence to achieve its aims. Sadly, Zurich did not learn that lesson with Huldrych Zwingli.

Organization of the Historical Reader

The Historical Reader opens with three accounts of the revolution of September 6, 1839. The first is my account that draws on wider resources than the other two, which were written by eye-witnesses. The second is from Colonel Friedrich Schulthess, who was a commander of forces on September 6th. His account, written some ten years after the events, is unusual in that its accuracy was signed off on by all three parties involved in the violent events: the government, the military, and the rebelling Christians. The third account is from 1840 and is a partisan account written by a member of the Christian opposition to Strauß' appointment and the government.

These three accounts of the events are followed by three reference letters. The first is from a supporter of Strauß' appointment, Dr., Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus from the Ruprecht Karl University of Heidelberg. Remarkable about this letter is that Paulus was the 'Rationalist' theologian who was ridiculed most vociferously by Strauß in his the *LJ*. The second letter is a letter of opposition to Strauß' appointment by Dr. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, Paulus' student. De Wette was dismissed from the University of Berlin, where he was friends with Schleiermacher, for having

a written a note of sympathy to the mother of Karl Ludwig Sands, the fraternity member who murdered August von Kotzebue, an opponent of fraternities and political reformer. At the time of his writing in opposition to Strauß' appointment to the faculty, De Wette was professor at the University of Basel, Switzerland. The irony of this letter from de Wette is that Strauß viewed him as an ally in the *LJ*. The third letter is a humorous street pamphlet in support of Strauß 'by a farmer,' which is written as if it were in opposition to his appointment.

After this material, there are six letters and street pamphlets addressing Strauß' candidacy. The three in favor are each immediately followed by a letter in response that opposes the appointment. The first letter is Strauß' own that he sent to the government on 1 March 1839.

Included, as well, is the letter to the 'Committee of Faith' from Ignaz Thomas Scherr, the Superintendent of Schools in Zurich, whose educational reforms, which attempted a restructuring religious instruction in the schools, were particularly hated by the rebellious conservative Christians.

The Historical Reader closes with the "Report on the Activity of the Aid Society for the Good of the Victims of 6 September 1839, which documents the tragic consequences of the revolution for its victims.

German originals are posted at <https://criticalidealism.org> under "Theology and Revolution."

McGaughey – On D.F. Strauß and the 1839 Revolution in Zurich¹

Overview

Perhaps no other individual theologian served as a lightening rod for the explosive energy of the theological world of the 19th century than did David Friedrich Strauß. As author of the controversial *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, he came to be seen as the representative of the liberal attack on the sacred scriptures because of his conclusion that the gospel narratives are myth. The theological right immediately initiated and applauded the dismissal of Strauß from the university in Tübingen in 1835. Conservative Christians in Germany and Switzerland were mortified with the announcement of his appointment in 1839 to the university in Zurich. Nowhere was the destructive power of religious conviction unleashed with such political consequences in the 19th century than in Zurich with this appointment. As consequential and deadly as the events surrounding Strauß' appointment and the subsequent political revolution in the canton of Zurich were, their details have not been told in English.² What follows seeks to fill that lacuna.

The Appointment of Strauß and Its Context

Strauß' successful appointment to the chair for New Testament Theology, Church History, and Dogmatics on January 26, 1839, was the second attempt³ by the Education Committee for the canton of Zurich to hire David Friedrich Strauß. In 1836, the position came open because of the death of Heinrich Christian Michael Rettig. According to Strauß' biographer, Theobald Ziegler,⁴ Strauß was nominated for the appointment already in April of 1836 by Ferdinand Hitzig, who was Professor of Old Testament Studies since the University's founding in 1833. Hitzig was the cousin of

1. This article is the result of a Fulbright research grant under the sponsorship of Prof. Ulrich Köpf, Director of the Institut für Spätmittelalter und Reformation. In particular, it is indebted to the invaluable assistance of Prof. Hans Geißer and his graduate assistant, Mr. Ernst Friedauer, at the University in Zurich.

2. No comprehensive history of the events surrounding September 6, 1839, was published before that by Friedrich Schultheß in 1906 (see Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen über die Straußische Bewegung und den 6. September 1839 in the Züricher Taschenbuch* (Zurich: 1906 <1864>): 79–80) though Schultheß wrote his account in 1864 (see *ibid.*: 80 and 127). Its importance is enhanced because it is written by a participant (he was commander of the citizen's defense force, see *ibid.*: 79–80) and because he submitted the report for approval of its accuracy to representatives of all parties involved (see *ibid.*: 81).

The present account depends primarily upon Schultheß, but it draws on newspaper reports from 1839 and at the time of the 50th anniversary of the revolution among other documents.

3. According to the *Züricher Post*, Strauß was rejected in 1837 when "the entire theological faculty" voted against the appointment (see "Die Züricher September-Revolution vom Jahre 1839" in the *Züricher Post*, September 7, 1889: 2). This is contradicted by Strauß' biographer, Theobald Ziegler, who says that Hitzig nominated him in 1837. See Theobald Ziegler, I: 264. In the second round, only Hitzig from the theological faculty supported the appointment (see Ziegler, I: 290; *Züricher Post*, September 7, 1889: 2).

4. Theobald Ziegler, I: 264 ff.

one of Strauß' closest friends from the time of his studies in Tübingen, Gustav (von⁵) Binder.⁶ Strauß himself withdrew his name in 1837 because he had reservations given the resistance to his appointment among the populous and he refused to accept a title less than was to be offered to Eduard Elwert. With Strauß' withdrawal of his name, Elwert was appointed to the chair. Eduard Elwert was a Schleiermachiian, whose pamphlet, "A Layman's Opinions of the Hegel-Strauß Christology" ("Laienworte über die Hegel-Straußische Christologie") found great resonance among Strauß' Christian opponents for its 'pietistic vituperations' against him. Elwert had to resign because of illness in 1838.⁷ This made it possible for the government to select Strauß as his replacement with Mayor Hirzel, chair of the Education Committee, breaking the tie.⁸ On January 31st the Governing Council of the canton voted 98 to 49 in favor of the Education Committee's recommendation which was followed by the approval on February 2nd of the Upper Council in a stormy session by a vote of 15 to 3.⁹

The university in Zurich only had been founded in 1833 as part of an educational reform movement initiated by the liberal government elected in 1830.¹⁰ The driving force behind this educational reform movement was Thomas Scherr, also from Württemberg as was Strauß,¹¹ who had been named director of the reform in the canton and city of Zurich by the liberal government. The strategy of Scherr and the reformers was the introduction of an entirely new curriculum replacing the drill and memory method of instruction. Included in the reform was a thorough revision of religious instruction. School instructors were carefully trained in the new pedagogy. However, they were perceived, at least out in the countryside, as blind automatons of Scherr, who personally became the symbol of all that was wrong with the new curriculum in the eyes of its opposition.¹² Strauß' appointment was meant to be the crowning accomplishment of the reform movement.

5. He was given the title 'von' in 1864 according to Wikipedia https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gustav_von_Binder [21 January 2023]).

6. Gustav Binder was Director of Academic Studies for the Württemberg monarchy at the time of Strauß' death. He eulogized Strauß at his funeral on February 11, 1874. A month after the funeral, the *Schwäbischer Merkur* published a denunciation of Binder's comments at the funeral signed by 214 people for expressing his thanks to Strauß whose accomplishments 'will never be forgotten by the youth of Germany' because "the Straussian teachings ultimately lead to the destruction of the only true foundations of state, family and morality, and consequently only play into the hands of socialism." Ziegler II: 744–745.

7. See Anton Largiadèr, *Geschichte von Stadt und Landschaft Zürich* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1945): 145.

8. See the *Züricher Post*, September 7, 1889: 2.

9. See Friedrich Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 84.

10. The liberals had come to power for the first time in the canton and city of Zurich on March 20, 1831 (see Largiadèr, *Geschichte*: 116). The University of Zurich opened on April 29, 1833. See Largiadèr, *ibid.*: 128.

11. See the *Züricher Post*, September 6, 1889: 2.

12. See the *Züricher Post*, September 6, 1889: 2.

Within months of the publication of the first volume of his work in 1835, Strauß had been fired from his position at the Protestant seminary in Tübingen and sent to his home town of Ludwigsburg to be a professor of classical languages at the Lyzeum.¹³ Needless to say, Strauß was not satisfied with a position that encouraged such a limited range of his intellectual talent, and, upon obtaining a clear answer from the king of Württemberg that no church position would be made available to him,¹⁴ he moved to Stuttgart and commenced a career as a writer – primarily of biographies.¹⁵ His supporters in Zurich attempted to provide him with the academic career appropriate to his talents.

The intention behind the appointment of Strauß in Zurich was to establish a reputation for the new university as a center of free inquiry and to attract young people to a liberal institution on the cutting edge of its day. In addition, Strauß "should protect the people and the church 'from the Pietist and Orthodox head cold threatening out of northern Germany.'¹⁶" The liberals erroneously diagnosed the extent to which the canton was infected with its own virus.

The Spark in the Tinderbox

By the time of Strauß' appointment in Zurich in 1839, it was clear to the conservatives that either the school reform movement in the canton of Zurich must be slowed down, if not stopped, or the church must itself undergo a major reform.¹⁷ Strauß' appointment became the occasion for the conservative church leadership to take the initiative against the educational reform movement in general, symbolized by Scherr, and against Strauß' appointment in particular.

For Scherr's account of the reform, which equally provides one with the flavor of his contempt for those who misunderstood what the reform was all about, see Scherr's *Ein freies und belehrendes Sendschreiben des zürcherischen Seminardirektors an die Herrn XXIIger des sogenannten Glaubenskomite's. Allen guten Christen zur Betrachtung empfohlen von einem Freunde der Wahrheit, aus dem pädagogischen Beobachter besonders mitgetheilt* (Zürich, 1839) provided in translation below.

13. From Jörg F. Sandberger, "David Friedrich Strauß (1808–1874)" in *Theologen des Protestantismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Martin Greschat (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978): 92.

14. See Sandberger, *ibid.*: 92.

15. Among the many tragedies of Strauß' life, in addition to the catastrophe in Zurich and a destructive marriage, was the stormy relationship that he had with his theologically arch-conservative father, whose beliefs were a source of amusement for both mother and son. See Sandberger, *ibid.*: 84–5.

The darker side of this relationship with the father, Sandberger reports, is that Strauß' father, lying on his deathbed in 1841, said that he (the father), "was cursed by God because of his son's *Life of Jesus*." See Sandberger, *ibid.*: 94.

16. The *Zürcher Post*, September 7, 1889: 2.

17. See the *Zürcher Post*, September 7, 1889: 2.

Schultheß observes that, even among liberals, there were those opposed to Strauß' appointment for fear that faith would no longer be accommodating to the conceptual capabilities of the common man which would only encourage disbelief and immorality. Schultheß quotes a letter from Major Uebel, one of the officers on the government's side during the uprising, written shortly after the fateful events, that contained the commonly held opinion among even those favorably inclined to support Strauß that his work is perhaps laudable in terms of its scientific critique but he had not yet developed a definite system that portrayed his positive faith.¹⁸ Strauß was aware of this deficiency. He wrote a public letter *Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren: Bürgermeister Hirzel, Professor Orelli and Professor Hitzig in Zurich*, on March 1, 1839, to the mayor and supporters in which one can observe not only a conciliatory tone but the formulation of a constructive theology.¹⁹ The conciliatory third edition of *The Life of Jesus* (1838) should be evaluated in light of its coincidence with the possible professorship in Zurich in 1837. The thematic changes of the third edition are all reflected in the *Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren*.

Nevertheless, the shibboleth of the conservative movement became: "No salvation without the historical Jesus."²⁰ At no point, however, did Strauß or those influenced by him, deny the reality of the historical Jesus! The quarrel between the conservatives and the Straußians was not over a historical fact or whether there was anything historical about the Christian faith, but, rather, what is the relationship between historical facts and spiritual truth?

The Two Phases of the 1839 Revolution

The resistance to Strauß' appointment in 1839 and the education reform movement under the direction of Scherr involved two phases. The first phase resulted in the pensioning of Strauß before he ever came to Zurich. The second phase resulted in a bloody revolution, the fall of the liberal government, and the firing of Scherr.

Phase One: The Pensioning of Strauß

The Upper Council's decision in favor of hiring Strauß occurred on February 2, 1839. By February 13th representatives from 29 Christian congregations throughout the can-

18. See Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 83 and 83, n. 1.

19. See Strauß' *Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren: Bürgermeister Hirzel, Professor Orelli und Professor Hitzig in Zürich*, herausgegeben von dem Vereine zur Beförderung der Volksbildung (Zürich: Züricher und Furrer, 1839).

20. The *Züricher Post*, September 8, 1889: 2.

ton had met and decided upon creating an association in every congregation with two representatives to be elected from each association to form a Central Committee to coordinate the activities against Scherr's Education Committee and the call of Strauß. On February 28th an elected Central Committee from these church associations met for the first time in Zurich to develop a common strategy.²¹

A petition was generated covering the following ultimatums and grievances: 1) demanding the firing of Strauß; 2) insisting that the church councils play a role in the calling of the faculty to the university in Zurich (particularly, the petition called for the appointment of a professor decidedly of Protestant faith [*evangelischer Glaube*]²²); 3) calling for the establishment of a synod independent of the government constituted out of pastors and lay persons elected by the congregations; 4) requiring at least a third of the Education Committee to be elected by this same synod, 5) fostering and insuring of the religious dimension throughout the school curriculum from grade school through the university by a return to teaching Biblical literalism and memorization of Biblical passages, and 6) demanding revision of the education law including the dismissal of Scherr.²³

The congregation associations met on March 10, and 39,225 signatures were collected in favor of the petition with only 1,048 opposed.²⁴ During the Shrove Tuesday festival, effigies of Strauß, Hirzel, and Scherr were burned.²⁵

On March 16th the Governing Council met to discuss the situation in what was a very turbulent session. Mayor Hirzel argued that the "masses" had no business interfering in the decision process concerning academic affairs, and he reminded the session of its responsibility to preserve the peace; if necessary even with the assistance of the "Seven Concordat." In this political alliance from March 17, 1832, seven cantons (Zurich, Bern, Luzern, Solothurn, St. Gallen, Aargau and Thurgau) all agreed to mutual support in the event that one of them was threatened with a violent uprising. A key provision was that the others could intervene *without* being invited.²⁶ Despite the mayor's defense of Strauß, the Governing Council's final vote (149 to 38)²⁷ was

21. See Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 84. The government was clearly already nervous about the impact of this movement. Schultheß was named commander of a 60 man elite corps that was to protect the town hall. Another 200 men were in reserve, and troops were sent to protect the education seminar responsible for the education reforms. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 84–5.

22. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 85. : "*Evangelische Kirche*" (literally, "evangelical church") in the German speaking world refers to what the Anglo world calls the "Lutheran" church. The term "*evangelisch*" does not have necessarily the conservative, pietistic overtone that "evangelical" has in English so that I have chosen to translate "*Evangelische Kirche*" more generically as "Protestant church" and to distinguish it from the "Roman Catholic church" and to translate "*evangelischer Glaube*" as "Protestant faith" rather than to refer to a sectarian, theological orientation.

23. See the *Züricher Post*, September 8, 1889: 2.

24. See the *Züricher Post*, September 8, 1889: 2, and Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 85.

25. The *Züricher Post*, September 8, 1889: 2.

26. See Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 91, n. 1.

27. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 85.

to pension Strauß at the amount of 1000 Franken per year before he ever entered the classroom.²⁸ Sandberger reports that Strauß donated the pension to the poor.²⁹

Phase Two: The Fall of the Government and Firing of Scherr

The Central Committee of the church associations took the decision of the Governing Council to dismiss Strauß as having defused the situation, and, in the belief that interim elections would bring their side stronger representation in the Governing Council to enable implementation of the remaining ultimatums, it disbanded on March 21st.³⁰ The government, however, saw the dismissal of Strauß as having satisfied the radical faction, and it proceeded with business as usual ignoring the additional demands.

The failure of the government to address the other demands made by the church associations resulted in the Central Committee being called back into existence on April 22nd. The Committee issued a letter of August 8th to all the congregations calling for a public gathering in Kloten for the 2nd of September.³¹

The Upper Council met on August 23rd and issued a statement forbidding the gathering on September 2nd. It announced that it would press legal charges against those who persisted in attempting to call such a public protest into existence. The Central Committee's response was to insist that it was answerable only to its constituency. At the end of its letter to the congregations, the Central Committee included the rallying cry, "be manly and strong." This was taken by the government to be a call to revolt. The letter was confiscated, and legal charges were brought against the Committee's leadership.³² On August 31st the government tried to calm things down by issuing a letter explaining the intent behind its actions, but it also underscored that it had the obligation to preserve order. It announced that it had arranged for troop support and in part had called some troops to Zurich.³³

Nevertheless, 15,000 people gathered in pouring rain on September 2nd to underscore their support for the educational reforms demanded in the spring.³⁴ Four demands were formulated at this demonstration: 1) that the government rescind its charge that the Central Committee was acting in any way in violation of the constitution; 2) that the government rescind its legal charges against the Committee's leadership; 3) that the government ensure that press freedom not only be used to the advantage of the government but that the opposition have the same rights; and 4) that the right to

28. See the *Züricher Post*, September 8, 1889: 2.

29. Sandberger, "David Friedrich Strauß:" 94.

30. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 86.

31. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 86.

32. See Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 87.

33. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 88.

34. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 88–9.

petition be underscored, the government's hindrance of the Central Committee cease, and that the leaders of the Upper Council be called to accountability for its actions. Furthermore, the intention was announced to generate another petition along the lines of the March 10th version.³⁵ Finally, the Central Committee called for a peaceful, public demonstration in Zurich on September 9th, during the next session of the Upper Council, to increase the moral pressure in favor of the demanded reforms, and to insist that the government either cease its current policies or resign.³⁶

On the other side, a group of "extremist" members of the government wanted to call a public demonstration for September 6th in support of the government. They were also in favor of crushing the opposition at all costs and, therefore, advocated calling in the help of the Seven Concordat. It was decided to leave any such decision up to the Upper Council which was to meet on September 9th.³⁷

The Seven Concordat members, however, demanded an account of the situation from Zurich. The Upper Council, therefore, decided on the evening of September 5th to formulate its response to them on September 6th. The membership was divided (with several members absent) seven in favor and six opposed to seeking military assistance from the Seven Concordat. Nevertheless, those who favored involving the Seven Concordat were convinced that they would retain their majority the next day.³⁸ However, even the possibility of such outside intervention enraged the opposition who, upon hearing of the vote, now saw the honor of the canton to be at stake in addition to feeling threatened by despotism from their own government.

Already on the morning of September 5th, however, a member of the Upper Council had reported to the opposition that within 24 hours 30,000 troops from the Seven Concordat were to be on their way to Zurich to protect the government from any public threat.³⁹ The situation was ripe for an explosion. The vice-president of the Central Committee, Dr. Rahn, issued a statement to all the district presidents that the Fatherland stood under threat from foreign troops, and they should have their followers ready to march on Zurich at the signal of the ringing of the church bells. Although this order was subsequently rescinded by Dr. Rahn,⁴⁰ the president of the district of Pfäffikon, Pastor Hirzel (not to be confused with the mayor and sponsor of Strauß or the commander of troops in Zurich), a liberal who was soured by having

35. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 89.

36. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 89–90.

37. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 91.

38. Two battalions from Thurgau were already situated on the canton border ostensibly engaged in military exercises but available at any moment to respond to a call for assistance from the government in Zurich. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 92.

39. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 92.

40. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 93.

been denied a position at the university in Zurich,⁴¹ "on his own initiative and own responsibility gave the signal for the public to march on Zurich."⁴²

Pastor Hirzel had received Dr. Rahn's rescinded notice along with reports that some 800 to 1,000 "radicals" from Hinweil and Winterthur in support of the liberal government were secretly planning to take up strategic positions around the arsenals in Zurich. Pastor Hirzel feared that the news of such numbers would convince the Seven Concordat that the canton was not unified⁴³ and that the outside cantons would intervene on the side of the government.

The call to march on Zurich swept through the countryside like wildfire, and, by early morning of September 6th it was reported in Zurich that Hirzel was leading some 5,000 men towards the city.⁴⁴ Pastor Hirzel's group reached the city at 4:00 a.m. He acknowledged that a few hundred of his men were armed with firearms, but he insisted that such weapons were only for their own protection.⁴⁵ He maintained that their intent in coming at all was only to bring moral pressure on the government in support of the demands from Kloten.

About 6:00 a.m. two government representatives, Hegetschweiler and Sulzer, visited the protesters to learn about their intentions. They carried back to the government the demands of the demonstrators, which essentially were that the government not employ foreign forces to enforce its undemocratic policies.⁴⁶

The mayor decided to place troops only in defense of the arsenals and on Münster Square rather than block the bridges, even in light of the threatening assembly on the left side of the Limmat river, because September 6th was a weekly market day and there was lots of traffic on the bridges in preparation for the market.⁴⁷ The mayor's forces, greatly outnumbered, amounted to only 356 soldiers and cavalry,⁴⁸ who were given the command to use their weapons only in an emergency, and the soldiers were to withdraw into the neighboring houses should they be pressured by the crowd.⁴⁹

Given its recall of the order to march on Zurich, the Central Committee was now faced with having to choose to support Pastor Hirzel or permitting their movement

41. The *Zürcher Post*, September 10, 1889: 2. See, as well, the *Neue Zürcher-Zeitung*, September 6, 1889: 1, and Largiadèr, *Geschichte*, pp. 148–149. Hirzel was a friend from university days of Alexander Schweizer, the Schleiermachian mediating theologian on the faculty in Zurich. Schweizer himself opposed the appointment of Strauß arguing: "The Education Committee does not have the right to reform the church. A reform may perhaps be necessary, but this must occur under the auspices of the church itself. The reconciliation between faith and knowledge cannot be achieved by sweeping faith aside and leaving knowledge occupying the field alone [...]" (Largiadèr, *Geschichte*: 146).

42. Largiadèr, *Geschichte*: 148.

43. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 94.

44. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 100.

45. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 100–101.

46. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 101.

47. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 101–2.

48. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 104.

49. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 102.

to crumble. They decided to send a signal to the Seven Concordat, that Zurich was under their firm control. At 9:00 a.m. the general alarm was sounded to bring down the government.⁵⁰ At this point, two columns, four men abreast moved out from the left side of the Limmat river toward the center of the city. One column of some 600 men was led by Pastor Hirzel in the direction of the lower bridge (the *Untere Brücke*). At the head of the second column of some 1,100 men was Dr. Rahn, who crossed the Münster bridge. For the most part, both columns were armed only with scythes, pitchforks, and morning-stars. They marched singing in unison: "This is the day, that God has made; May He be honored, by all the world; May He be praised, for that which comes to us through Jesus Christ; in Heaven and on Earth!⁵¹"

After having crossed the lower bridge, Pastor Hirzel led his column down Stork Alley (*Storchen Gasse*) towards Münster Square where they were met by the cavalry whose commander ordered, "Go back, the square must remain open!⁵²" Hirzel responded, "Peace! We've only come to peacefully pursue our demands with the government. For God's sake don't initiate a civil war!⁵³" After loud cries and shoving by both sides, a shot rang out from the back rows of the demonstrators.⁵⁴ The cavalry rushed forward, and a shot startled one of their horses which turned and fell throwing its rider. Shots continued to be fired as the cavalry turned to ride back onto the square firing at the demonstrators as they retreated. The infantry withdrew into houses from which they, too, fired on Hirzel's group. Hirzel and his followers pressed forward in rage and were joined by Dr. Rahn's column. They entered the Post Alley (*Post Gasse*) in an attempt to reach the yellow arsenal rather than stop at the post office building where the government was in tumultuous session.⁵⁵ At this point the troops fired another round at the crowd before it could reach New Market Square. This time the demonstrators scattered in panic. Within five minutes no demonstrators remained on the right side of the Limmat river.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, the Upper Council had been in a rowdy session since 7:30 a.m. in their meeting hall in the post office building.⁵⁷ As the demonstrators were crossing the bridges shortly after 9:00 a.m., the only form of action they could agree upon was the rescinding of the legal charges against the Central Committee.⁵⁸ As shots rang out in the streets, they were shouting at one another about who among them was responsible

50. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 104–5.

51. "Dies ist der Tag, den Gott gemacht; Sein werd' in aller Welt gedacht; Ihn preise, was durch Jesum Christ; Im Himmel und auf Erden ist!" *Neue Züricher-Zeitung*, September 15, 1889: 1.

52. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 106.

53. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 106.

54. Schultheß is convinced that it was not intentional. See Schultheß, *ibid.*: 106.

55. Schultheß, *Ibid.*: 107.

56. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 109.

57. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 111.

58. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 111–2. Earlier, they had responded to this demand by claiming that they were powerless to intervene in an action initiated by the attorney general. See *ibid.*: 90.

for the spilling of blood. After the second round of shooting, the mayor commanded a cease fire. Representative Hegetschweiler delivered the order to the troops, and, as he turned to return to the government session, a corporal from the cavalry shot him in the face.⁵⁹ In addition to Hegetschweiler, the uprising brought fourteen deaths and another fourteen demonstrators were, in part, seriously wounded.⁶⁰

The government was no longer able to function in any reasonable fashion. One member even attempted to flee under the disguise of a woman.⁶¹ Under the circumstances, the government resigned and was replaced by a provisional government called to order by 10:45 a.m.⁶² Both this provisional government and the Central Committee called for peace.

In the interim, well-armed reinforcements for the demonstrators (circa 100 men) from parishes on the right side of the Lake of Zurich, along with some 100 men from the Pfäffikon group, entered Münster Square. They were eventually calmed by provisional government representatives only to be followed by another group of 300 men. The city witnessed such a succession of armed and angry crowds well into the night.⁶³ The next day brought further waves of groups through the city who filled New Market Square by 10:00 a.m. spilling over into Münster Square. The Central Committee greeted them there and congratulated them on their victory. In the meantime, the provisional government had taken steps to assure the Seven Concordat cantons that their intervention was not necessary.⁶⁴

The Upper Council met on September 9th, and it confirmed the new provisional government and called for new elections in fourteen days. A further action taken was the firing of Scherr.⁶⁵ They were greeted with cheers of support at the end of their session.⁶⁶

One final irony in the tragic events of September 6, 1839: the city theater, founded in 1832 not without protest from the religious right,⁶⁷ was to have performed "Romeo and Juliet" on the evening of the revolution, but for obvious reasons the performance

59. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 112.

60. Initial reports were of eight dead and twenty-eight wounded. See the *Schweizerischer Republikaner*, 73 (10 September 1839): 1. However, the more accurate statistics of fifteen dead and fourteen wounded can be drawn from the relief organization formed to assist those families who lost loved ones in the uprising. See *der Bericht über die Wirksamkeit des Hilfsvereins zum Besten der am 6. September 1839 Verunglückten* (Zurich: J.J. Ulrich, 1840), pp. 6–12, which provides biographical sketches of the victims. See, as well, the *Schluss-Bericht über die Wirksamkeit des Hilfsvereins zum Besten der am 6. September 1839 Verunglückten* (Zürich: J.J. Ulrich, 1843).

61. See "Beschreibung des 6. Herbstmonats 1839 in Zürich" in the *Neuer Züricher-Kalender auf das Schaltjahr 1840* (Zürich: Verlag S. Mann, 1840): 6.

62. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 118–9.

63. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 118–120.

64. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*: 123.

65. The *Züricher Post*, September 12, 1889: 1.

66. Schultheß, *ibid.*: 125.

67. See the *Züricher Post mit Handelszeitung und Stadtchronik*, March 25, 1906: 1.

was canceled. The diva, who was to have performed on that evening, was Agnes Schebest, later to become David Friedrich Strauß' wife in a stormy marriage that ended in a bitter separation. It was even rumored in Zurich upon hearing of their marriage that Strauß had applied to be the new director of the theater.⁶⁸

In place of the pensioned Strauß, the new government hired the orthodox theologian, Johann Peter Lange⁶⁹ as of the summer semester of 1841.⁷⁰ Four years after the revolution the liberals returned to power in Zurich, but it was not until 1850 that they were able to hire a theologian of their liking for the university. Their choice was the "freisinnige" (liberal) Alois Emanuel Biedermann. Biedermann, a Swiss, was educated in Switzerland although he spent several years studying under the Hegelian Wilhelm Vatke in Berlin. Beginning in 1869, Biedermann had yearly visits with Strauß on the Lake of Constance, and he even managed to convince Strauß to visit Zurich on one occasion.⁷¹

68. The *Züricher Post*, September 11, 1889: 2.

69. See Largiadèr, *Geschichte*: 229.

70. See Paul Schweizer, Alexander Schweizers und Alois Emanuel Biedermanns Theologie im Rahmen der Züricher Richtungsbewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1972): 293.

71. See Alois Emanuel Biedermann, *Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze*, ed. by J. Kradolfer (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1885): 50.

Schulthess – Explanatory Notes on the Strauss Movement and September 6, 1839

Lieutenant/Colonel Friedrich Schulthess^[1] (1804 – 1869)

Comments by Schulthess [Editor of the Pamphlet]

The so-called Strauß-Affair in 1839 unquestionably belongs to the most remarkable and unique movements ever to stir a republic. With the force of a hurricane, it struck a society that had become calm following the dramatic transitions in 1830,^[2] and, although without enduring political consequences, to this day these events in 1839 continue to engender a particularly psychological fascination above all with respect to the intensity of personal sentiment that swept through all levels of society at that time. The reason the story has not been written up to this point lies in this powerful, entirely base temper. All participants but particularly those in opposition to the government have suppressed even after the fact an objective portrayal of their either significant or insignificant roles in the events; and equally, the new generation feels itself in part too subjectively close to the events so that the public portrayal of the perceptions and experiences of its relatives is resisted to a certain degree.

Today after two generations, we stand more dispassionately over against these things. All the more, a calm, professional portrayal would be a meritorious and thankful accomplishment. In part, truly valuable contributions to such an enterprise must still be here and there available and accessible. Reception of such information would be desirable, and any and all sharing of such knowledge would be gratefully appreciated both by the editors and the city library.

The following pages published with the consent of the author's descendants represent one contribution and give us spirited satisfaction. Its significance rests in the combination of personal judgment, like that dominating in the first part, along with the description of the events experienced and initiated by officials that structure the second part. This report comes from the pen of Lieutenant-Colonel Friedrich Schultheß "of Weinleiter" (1804 – 1869), founder of the Schultheß bookstore who as commander of the city militia was called to be a personal participant in the events of September 6. Schultheß was the son of the choir director, Johannes Schultheß, who carefully sought

1. ^[1] Translator's comment Published as a supplement to the *Züricher Taschenbuch* (1906); written 1864. Filing No. PK345e in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich.

2. ^[2] Translator's comment 'The Canton of Zurich held its first democratic elections in 1830, and the Liberals were elected to power. They assumed office in March of 1831. See Anton Largiadèr, *Geschichte von Stadt und Landschaft Zürich* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1945): 116.

to be acknowledged as the Swiss representative of old Rationalism and embraced a Liberal perspective in his early years. The events of 1830 drove him to the Conservative side where he remained for the rest of his life. Nevertheless, he was no blind party member. In his calm way, he avoided all extremes; he especially took great pains to be carefully reserved in his comments and judgments including his scrupulously just analysis for which the submission of his notes provides the best example. As one sees from the concluding comment, these thoughts were formulated after twenty-five years or approximately at the end of 1864. The supplement is provided by the author.

In recent years whenever the 6th of September 1839 is mentioned, which still frequently occurs, regrets are always expressed that this event, although one of the most important in the history of our little free state, has not yet received a detailed and truthful portrayal from the perspective of the citizenship and military. In contrast, the religious and pedagogical sides of the movement have appeared in different books and larger publications albeit not without errors or without the distortions of party interest as one could hardly expect otherwise.

Having been encouraged by friends to undertake this task before the sickle of death takes even more than it has of those personally involved in these events, I present in what follows the results of my own memories, from my notes of interviews with those still living who were involved in one way or another, as well as from my research in official archives and of private written reports or from publications and newspapers of the day. I pursued my research and questioning until I had the feeling that I had obtained an accurate account. I then shared my work with three representatives of the three parties involved in the events: District President (*Regierungspräsident*) (currently City President [*Stadtpräsident*]) [Colonel Eduard³] Ziegler; Member of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) (currently Assistant District Attorney [*Substitut des Staatsanwalts*]) Benz; and Press Secretary (*Fürsprech*) (currently Secretary of the Central Committee [*Sekretär des Zentralkomitees*]) Spöndi. I asked them to determine whether the factual contents of my work were true and correct.

Perhaps these notes will have some value for future historians now that these individuals have examined them and that examination is taken into account.

I.

The year 1839 followed eight years of forgotten peace. Externally, relations had developed satisfactorily; internally, everyday life gave a tranquil appearance on the surface; and even in the city where the citizens politically and commercially defended earlier opinions and where still so many carried open wounds because of the changed circumstances, people accommodated themselves, above all, to the unavoidable. The

3. Addition of the editor of the "Explanation of the Strauss Movement"

sharp divisions having been ameliorated and the rapprochement over the years on the part of the party leaders had come so far that the city, without resistance to its subsequent prerogative, had waived the right to the election of a third of the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*).

The intervening years were a period of turbulent destruction but also of energetic development. There evolved a restless activity in all areas of political life, Canton and city competed in charitable works and in education, and on the northern heights of the capitol they built palace-like buildings as worthy testimonials of these purposes. In addition, the building of a Canton-wide highway system facilitated traffic like never before, the elimination of highway and bridge taxes encouraged commerce and industry, and prosperity accompanied these productive years.

The weaknesses of advancement were hidden behind a glittering facade, however. Many found it difficult to come to grips with the new circumstances not only in the city but also in the countryside. Rising taxes, as ever, were accepted only reluctantly. People complained of the arrogance of the new university-trained school-teachers and of the bureaucracy of the regional administration. Many of the highest officials of the new order took it upon themselves to ignore public decency and morals. They visited brothels openly and at every opportunity made fun of religion and faith. This went so far that one brothel was named "Café Supreme Court Justice." The most influential man could and would be accused of scandalous profiteering.

Nevertheless, a deep tranquility prevailed, and no one had the slightest idea that these abuses would contribute to a massive and universal political movement.

However, on January 26, 1839, the Education Committee took the unfortunate decision (by the deciding vote of its president, Mayor Hirzel) to name Dr. David Strauß of Ludwigsburg, author of *The Life of Jesus*, as professor to the theological faculty of the university. In this work that had brought him considerable reputation as a critic, Strauß challenged the divinity of Jesus and declared the greater part of the historical foundation of Christianity as untrue and the miracles to be myths.

It is entirely possible that the opposition to this vote would have been limited to the officials, the press, and the academics had not Hirzel announced that the choice of Strauß was the beginning of a new Reformation of the church in the Canton. For years in Zurich unrestricted research with appropriate seriousness had been practiced if without going beyond the limits of Christianity as Strauß had done. However, to Strauß' appointment and this call for Reformation of the churches must be added that Strauß' most enthusiastic supporters came from those above-named individuals who were most offensive in terms of their public morality and that the Seminar Director Scherr generated the suspicion that his ultimate goal was to displace the church through the schools, an impression encouraged by the actions and statements of several of Scherr's followers.

One can attribute primarily to these factors the powerful agitation that momentarily overwhelmed the entire population; even among those who embraced or tended

toward a Rationalist interpretation^[4] of ‘Second’ Testament miracles. Most of these Rationalists feared that the consequence of Strauß’ experiment and call to the university would not be a faith more compatible with human intellectual capacities but, rather, unfaith and the destruction of morals.⁵

These concerns were expressed by professors to the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) and again to the Upper Council (*Große Rat*) on January 31 by the Antiste or head pastor of the Zurich churches, Füßli. Following a long and in part passionate discussion of the latter because it was important to the vote of the theology professors at the university, Füßli’s report was rejected by a vote of 98 to 49. In effect this faculty vote constituted approval of Strauß’ appointment, which was sanctioned by the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) by a vote of 15 to 3.

Deeply disturbed by these developments, first, a group of acquaintances met at the initiation of Hürlimann-Landis along with his aged father, the earlier representative from Richtersweil. Then on February 13th representatives from 29 communities met in Mädensweil and determined to establish associations in all the communities of the Canton in order to determine the will of the people concerning the appointment of Strauß and to communicate that opinion to the government. This meeting of February 13th had the additional significance that its majority was constituted of older and influential men from the [Zurich] lake area who themselves were devoted to the new political order.

Already by February 24th, associations were approved by the majority of the residents in almost every community. Each association elected two representatives to the [citizens’] Central Committee which was made up of 22 representatives and which was called to Zurich for its first meeting on February 28th.

The government was deeply concerned about this pending gathering, and the police chief advised the City Council (*Stadtrat*) to undertake all necessary steps to

4. [] Translator’s comment: A “Rationalist interpretation” at the time of Strauß involved adherence to the physical laws of nature as God’s creation, which even God cannot violate without contradicting Himself, but it did not take the scriptures to be intentionally deceiving as was suggested by Hermann Samuel Reimarus in his famous “Wolfenbüttel Fragments” published by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing between 1774–1778. Rather, Rationalists like Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus, whom Strauß criticized in his *LJ*, defended a form of “accommodationism” by which understanding was relative to the age in which it occurs. Given that there was little or no understanding of physical laws at the time of Jesus of Nazareth, God was understood by human beings to be capable of exercising sovereignty over all of nature at will. The “Rationalist interpretation,” then, sought to give a “natural” account of what, otherwise, would be miracles by proposing that what were, actually, natural physical events were mis-perceived by the audience. In other words, the authors of the gospels did not engage in deception, they themselves were subject to the same misunderstanding as their audience given the limited understanding of their age.

5. Major Uebel still could write from Bern after the 6th of September 1839:..” The Plan to call Dr. Strauß as Professor of Dogmatics would have remained a mistake even if the government had had enough power to have been successful. Where there is only one position in dogmatics at a university, one cannot give it to a man whose intellectual accomplishments might be of value in the area of criticism but who had not developed a constructive faith system.”

ensure safety and security. An elite corps of 60 officers was formed and placed under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß [author of this report]. The corps was to appear at City Hall at the first command; a further 200 men were stationed on the lower bridge and if necessary the "Panner"⁶ were to be called up. However, because the members of the [citizens'] Central Committee intentionally gathered without escort, these steps were not implemented; in addition, it was determined to be superfluous to send soldiers to protect the [Scherr's pedagogical] Seminar in Küßnacht.

At its meeting, the [citizens'] Central Committee unanimously determined to submit to all the congregations a petition to the Governing Council (*Regierunsrat*), which demanded that Strauß not be brought to Zurich and that a professor of unequivocal, evangelical-Christian faith be called in his place in order to maintain Christian teaching and a Christian university.

The petition was placed before the congregations on March 10th, and the unified response was overwhelming, having been accepted by a vote of 39,225 to 1048.

In light of this almost unanimous will of the people, the majority of the government in the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) proposed in response that Strauß be pensioned. The motion was brought before the Upper Council on March 16th, and after a very stormy debate, it was approved by a vote of 149 to 38.

Following the success of this main objective and the [citizens'] Central Committee's receipt of assurances from a number of influential members of the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) that the wishes of the citizenry would be taken into account and the belief that, in light of the impending partial replacement vote for the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*), a number of members would be voted into office who enjoyed the trust of the people, the [citizens'] Central Committee dissolved on March 21st without terminating the organization of the district and community associations.

However, when with the next session of the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) none of these expectations were fulfilled, the [citizens'] Central Committee reconstituted itself on April 22nd at the behest of many. The Central Committee issued an open letter to the citizenry on August 8th in light of the recommendation of the earlier petition and in light of the increased disdainful and irritated feelings in opposition to the movement's supporters. This open letter called both for the renewal of the struggle and, especially, for the necessity of renewed emphasis on religious instruction in the schools. At the same time, it was decided to call a gathering in Kloten of the regional committees along with other interested parties.

The decisive opposition to the movement among those in the government contemplated whether or not the movement should be repressed. On August 20th members of the Governing Council (*Regierunsrat*), Weiß, Bürgi, Zehnder, Fierz, Krauer, Hoß, and Schäppi met with Dr. Keller in a secret session. This group decided that the government should attempt to bring an end to the renewed efforts of the [citizens'] Central Committee. Dr. Keller endeavored to influence Mayor Heß who continually shifted

6. All citizens and residents between twenty and sixty capable of military service.

between the parties, and in the August 23rd session Dr. Keller recommended approval to Mayor Heß of the following motion of Governing Council (*Regierunsrat*) member Weiß: "The representatives of the eleven districts immediately send by express to all of their mayors, community leaders, pastors, internal church resistance (*Stillstände*), and bureaucrats a printed decree containing the explicit order not to allow any public gathering called for by the so-called Central or any other similar Committee. Representatives of the state are empowered to commence civil proceedings against anyone allowing such a public gathering in his community."

Only the Governing Council (*Regierunsrat*) members Hegetschweiler and Escher expressed reservations against the motion.⁷ Their concerns were quickly dismissed by Mayor Heß, and the motion was passed. Mayor Hirzel and the Governing Council (*Regierunsrat*) members Ed. Sulzer, Hüni, E. Hirzel, and Hauser were absent from the session. M. Sulzer abstained from the motion.

The Central Committee immediately distributed the decree to the citizenry along with a commentary in which they protested that the decree gave a command and tasks to the communal bureaucrats whereas communities had the right to receive advice from whomever and whenever they wished.

Given the Central Committee's commentary's concluding words to "stay brave and strong," which was taken as an attempt to provoke a revolt, the publication was confiscated, and the leadership of the Committee was indicted by the state's attorney.

If one had hoped that the path of peace was to be followed and had the hope of the determined friends of the movement been limited to maintaining the mood of the populous until the replacement of the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*), these measures were entirely suited to pour oil in the fire and all the more so as zealous officials attempted to strengthen the decree of the government.

Within days the government was confronted with reactions from communities who either rejected the decree outright or who sought clarification with respect to its meaning. No one could comprehend why the government had issues such a decree particularly in light of the fact that it was these very individuals who seven years earlier on the basis of the same demands had founded the resistant Bassersdorf Association and had demanded from the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) political freedom in the widest sense for all clubs and organizations.

On August 31st (Saturday), the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) issued a new proclamation in which it attempted to calm reactions to the decree. Nonetheless, although the government affirmed the exercise of constitutional rights of all citizens, it expressed its determination to maintain law and order in the Canton. To this end, the government mobilized reserves and actually called some of them to Zurich.

The next day, September 1st (Sunday), a day of abominable weather, the Markwalder battalion of 621 soldiers was mustered to its barracks, but the troops were

7. [Regierungsrat] Ed. Sulzer was not present, and upon his return he declared several times that such actions were injurious.

so contumacious that they were released from duty already by 3:00 a.m. the next morning.

1. Likewise, the same evening and despite the despicable weather that lasted until noon of the next day, one could see the movement of the first procession of demonstrators through Zurich to Kloten. Pedestrians, horsemen, and drivers swarmed through the streets to Kloten throughout the night and into the early hours of the morning; huge groups with flags followed one after the other in quick succession. By 10:00 a.m. some 15,000 peaceful but very determined people had gathered to ratify the following which was to be turned over to the mayor by a committee constituted out of two representatives from each district:
2. The government was to rescind as entirely groundless any and all assertions against the (citizens') Central Committee and the district committees in general of guilt for instigation to rebellion contained in the decree of August 23rd.
3. The government should withdraw the indictment as illegal that was initiated by the attorney general against the narrower commission of the Central Committee for having called for insurrection.
4. The government was to have the attorney general called to account for having violated paragraph 5 of the constitution, which was concerned with freedom of the press, that paragraph 5 not be applied only to the opponents of the people but equally to all.
5. The government should permit the citizenry to exercise its right to petition without restraint, it should eliminate all restrictions in this respect placed upon the citizenry, and the government representatives should be called to account for their actions.

Furthermore, the gathering called for the establishment of church voter alliances in all communities and for the development of a new petition along the lines of the one from March 10th.

Given the distance from any large populated center and in spite of the despicable weather, this large public gathering constituted out of the middle class from the entire Canton was, on the one hand, decisively inspiring for some, but, on the other hand, it was very depressing for others with the consequence that the optimists hoped to bring about a decision of the issues quickly whereas those in despair doubted more than ever their ability to rein-in the movement on their own.

The (citizens') Central Committee intended that there should be a meeting of the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) in eight days on the 9th of September and that its party would be allowed to go *en masse* but unarmed to the city with the aim of morally forcing the Upper Council either to resign or to decisively distance itself from the current system. The government, more accurately (given that it was divided in its opinion), the more extreme and determined in the government, wanted to call its supporters together early on September 6th to come to the city. The goal was for

these supporters to morally demonstrate their support for the government and for the crushing of the movement even if it required help from the Concordat Cantons.^[8]

As a consequence, the government's response to the representatives from Kloten that follows was unsatisfying to both sides:

The Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) finds after careful examination on August 31 of its decree of August 23 that there is no evidence that the constitutionally guaranteed rights of the public to petition the government and of the freedom of the press have been violated in any fashion. Furthermore, the Governing Council would give a full report over the findings to the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) at its next meeting.

With respect to the attorney general's indictment that was initiated independently of the government and was already in the hands of the court, the Governing Council constitutionally has no power to intervene in the process of the justice system.

As a consequence of an earlier complaint, the Governing Council has already requested a report from the attorney general with respect to paragraph 5 of the constitution.

Finally, the Governing Council finds that the authorities have already received the necessary instructions with respect to the carrying out of the decree of August 23 in light of the clarification of August 31.

During the session of the Governing Council, the representatives from the Diet in Bern, Neuhaus and Steinhauer, were given admittance. They asked for clarification of the situation from the two Canton representatives, Hegetschweiler and Zehnder. In light of the circumstances, they offered the assistance of troops in accordance with the Seven Concordat agreement.⁹

The Governing Council was unable to come to a decision with respect to this offer of assistance, and the issue was postponed to the next day. The session the next day brought the same division in the house with several members threatening to resign were Concordat troops called into the Canton. Finally, the decision was taken to submit everything to the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*) on September 9th.

On September 4th, at the preparatory gathering of radicals on the Platte in Zurich, more precise preparations for the gathering to occur on the morning of September 6th in Zurich [were made], [and] testimony of mistrust of the government's ability, determination, and power to pursue energetic measures [were discussed].

In the meantime, representatives from all of the six Concordat Cantons had demanded clarification concerning the strength of the movement as well as, and above all, over the available forces and effectiveness of the Canton's troops. Their concerns and offer of help were reviewed by a session of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*)

8. [] Translator's note: See next footnote for clarification.

9. On March 17, 1832, the Cantons of Zurich, Bern, Luzern, Solothurn. St. Gall, Aargau, and Thurgau had agreed to a Concordat which committed them to military intervention not only upon request of the threatened Canton but also without invitation should there be a circumstance in which a Concordat member's constitution was threatened.

on the evening of September 5th, but any decision was deferred until the afternoon of September 6th. Seven members of the Governing Council were inclined to accept the offer of help, six were opposed, one in a surprise move demanded that the government resign on constitutional grounds, and several members were absent. Nonetheless, those inclined to accept the offer of help had every reason to hope that they could achieve a majority because most of those absent were of their persuasion.

The public was quickly informed of the government's discussion going on behind closed doors, and the possibility of an outside intervention into the situation raised tempers even more. Even the most temperate now reacted with condemnation, and one heard emphatic determination that under no circumstances should any intercession in the internal church and school affairs of the Canton by Protestant and Roman Catholic Concordat members be tolerated. Alone the honor of the Canton of Zurich demanded that any such despotism be repulsed. We were informed that a group of people were engaged in making military preparations among able-bodied men for such an eventuality on September 4th. Their intention was to create a battalion of no more than 400 men.

In light of all this, the news was explosive when Ed. Sulzer, member of the Governing Council, ordered the Regional Treasurer (*Domainekassier*) Steffan to come to him and told him: "Tell your friends, above all [Oberamtmann] Escher from Mädenschweil, that their plans are threatened by a plot; for within twenty-four hours a 30,000 man Concordat force will be on the march toward Zurich, Füsli has gone to Bern, and Nordorf will bring forces from Basel." Sulzer went first to the vice-president of the (citizen's) Central Committee, Dr. Rahn-Escher, but when he couldn't find him, he went to other friends of the movement. The news spread through the city like wildfire. The hot-heads wanted to rush to the cathedral, but that was decisively forbidden by the city president (*Stadtpräsident*)¹⁰

In the meantime, Dr. Rahn[-Escher] was found. That very morning, he sent the following to all the presidents of the district committees:

"The enemy threatens to allow an invasion of our Fatherland by foreign troops. Neuhaus has sought assistance from Bern, and Basel is arming. I implore you to be prepared to be ready to mount an assault at the sound of the church bells. The majority should come to Zurich, but some should stay at home to guard the hearth."

Zurich, 5 September 1839.

Rahn-Escher

When it became clear by mid-day that an intervention was by no means a given for either the government or the Concordat members, Dr. Rahn rescinded the above order. However, although the first order reached Pfäffikon by 2:00 p.m., the second

10. The city president declared that he did not want to waiver from his commitment to maintain peace and order and would get personally involved only when the security of the city was at stake.

order did not arrive until late evening. At that point, the local militia was already on the march toward Zurich.

The president of the district committee in Pfäffikon was its Pastor, Dr. Bernhard Hirzel, a talented man of 31 years trained in Near-Eastern languages, who joined the movement with his characteristic fire. He was entertaining friends from families out of Zurich when the wire from Dr. Rahn-Escher arrived. He shared the news with his guests and then withdrew to his room where, according to his own account, he made the following observations:

"Already on the evening of [September] 4th, I received news from several sources of a gathering of radicals from the eastern part of the Canton in Hinweil and of the collection of signatures. Both activities had as their goal to march Thursday night on Zurich to take the arsenal and to inspire courage in the radical majority of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) to take all necessary disciplinary action. About 11:00 a.m. on September 5th, I received word from a personal emissary that similar preparations were being made in Winterthur although not for Thursday night but for next Monday, namely: given the assumption that the masses would come unarmed to Zurich as they did to Kloten, one should gather with concealed weapons near the arsenal in order to demonstrate who was in charge. Deeply moved by this news that was contradictory with respect to its timing but consistent with respect to its goals, I withdrew for personal contemplation until about 2:00 p.m. when the above mentioned dispatch from the Central Committee arrived.

"This report was incorrect with respect to its indication of success, but the goal of those sent (Neuhaus, Pfyffer, Baumgartner) was only too true. Furthermore, it was based on an intentionally deceptive untruth perpetrated by Weiß, a member of the Upper Council, in order to encourage fear. What was to be done? I calculated that the projected gathering of radicals in Winterthur to be between 800 to 1,000 close to a city of curious, unemployed citizens that could swell their ranks. Naturally, the radical press of the Cantons constituting the seven Concordat Cantons would exaggerate those numbers threefold if not sevenfold in order to make credible that the inhabitants of the Canton of Zurich were dramatically split. What in the name of God was to be done? – A decision had to be taken, and the one to land the first blow would be the winner! Delaying the decision until Monday would have resulted in a horrible bloodletting. The Canton is united; all that is missing is the start. Success is certain; equally certain, the ruin of the initiative. These and a thousand other thoughts flooded my mind. – For three hours I examined myself and my intentions before God – and I let church bells sound the assault."

Hirzel was properly informed. While he was in his room in Pfäffikon still meditating, the radicals were preparing to march that night to Zurich. Rumors were flying that the extremists among them (along with a group of students) had the intention of taking the arsenal during the night. Mayor Heß secretly informed the director of the arsenal, Colonel Hirzel [Translator's note: not Pastor Hirzel from Pfäffikon], that he should be on the watch, and that evening even before anything was known

of Pfäffikon, the president of the arsenal committee, Fierz, also a member of the Governing Council, repeated the warning with the specificity that, according to the many rumors, the arsenal was to be captured that night. Were Pastor Hirzel able to unite his profession with his conscience to take this fateful step, the moment could not be more appropriate.

At about 7:00 p.m. friends from Hirzel's parsonage in Pfäffikon brought the first news to the (citizens') Central Committee in Zurich that Pastor Hirzel had taken the decision in the moment of their departure to have all the church bells in the district sound the assault. Immediately the members of the (citizens') Central Committee who were present (president Hürlimann-Landis was tranquilly at home in Richtersweil) ordered the actuary Spöndli to have Hirzel return to Pfäffikon because he had not been called to Zurich. Around 9:00 p.m. Spöndli learned in Fluntern that the entire countryside was in an uproar. He sent messages by express to all of the community committees involved entreating them to be calm. At about the same time both the government and the (citizens') Central Committee received the definite news of the revolution. The Central Committee immediately requested of the communities on the Lake not to be seduced by rumors of revolt until the bells in New Cathedral (*Neumünster*) were rung.

The only troops in Zurich were those of the military school whose numbers according to the paymaster was as follows:

1. Fortification Pioneer Unit:	4 Officers, 7 Non-Commissioned Officers	Total 37
	and Cadets, 1 Drummer, 25 Soldiers	
2. Dragoons	8 Officers, 8 Non-Commissioned Officers	
	5 Drummers, and 13 Soldiers	" 34
3. Marksmen:	2 Officers, 2 Non-Commissioned Officers	
	2 Drummers, 18 Soldiers	" 27
4. Infantry	3 Chief Instructors, 17 Master Trainers	" 20
Cadets 1st Class: 7 Officers,	" 33	
26 Cadets		
Cadets 2nd Class: 6 Officers,	" 29	
23 Cadets		
1. Academy Company:	7 Officers, 10 Non-Commissioned Officers	
	17 Drummers, 62 Soldiers	" 96
2. Academy Company:	5 Officers, 10 Non-Commissioned Officers	
	18 Drummers, 55 Soldiers	" 88
		363

to which must be added the chief instructors of the infantry, Lieutenant-Colonel Sulzberger, and of the cavalry, Major Uebel.

In the name of the ruling mayor, the president of the War Council and member of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*), Weiß, gave the command of these 363 men to Colonel S. Hirzel, director of the arsenal. At the insistence of Colonel Hirzel, Weiß then gave him the following orders that were approved shortly afterwards by the government:

Artillery Inspector Colonel Hirzel is hereby commissioned and empowered to employ any and all necessary military powers to protect the citizenry, its property, as well as all constitutionally elected officials.

Signed:

The President of the War Council: Weiß, [Regierungsrat]

Colonel Hirzel activated for service the Artillery-Lieutenant Colonel v. Orelli and the Infantry-Lieutenant Colonels Markwalder und Brunner and established the following regulations:

1. He requested and received from the President of the city of Zurich 40 to 50 men from the city militia and from the rural police 15 to 18 men to be divided among the three arsenals for their defense to the extent necessary, and he armed them from the arsenal.
2. He activated the Dragoons and called them to the barracks courtyard, but he did not disturb the people.
3. He met with the city president and described to him the steps taken on his part and the further necessary security measures he intended to implement.
4. He rejected the help of the congregated students who had gathered first at the Goat Market and then on the New Market.¹¹

Here is perhaps the point to observe just what a difficult situation in which this high officer was placed in order to understand his preparations. If we are right, his thoughts must have been something like the following:

My responsibility was to protect above all the arsenals and then the citizenry, property, and the government first a) against the extreme radical party who were set upon a surprise attack and b) perhaps also against the on-coming local militia; and finally, the government, against the local militia.

I do not know who and how many were going to be involved in the surprise attack and whether and from which members of the divided government they were supported. It is therefore certainly best that I call into service those field-officers who might be leaders of such an uprising, that I keep them as well as the troops under my observation, and that I assign weak detachments of the city militia who were not considered dangerous along with some members of the city police to the protection of the arsenals. By such a strategy I maintain the compounded advantage of secure

11. Editors Comment: The barracks were in Thalacker street where today stand the street numbers 21 and 23. "New Market" was the name of what is today called the Parade Grounds. For what follows, consult the accompanying city plan.

support against the extreme, radical party as well as the likelihood that the local militia would not seize the arsenals as long as they know, or see, that the civil militia was defending them. On the basis of this logic, I can employ the entire military school for the protection of the entrances to the arsenals as well as the immediate vicinity surrounding them.

Immediately upon the arrival of the report that the local militia was underway, the city President permitted the command for 150 armed citizens to come to the town hall, and he gave to Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß the responsibility for their organization. In addition, he asked that the following positions be manned:

20 men were to be placed under Captain Meyer-Finsler in the yellow, large arsenal
 16 men under the command of Captain Grob in the Löwenhof
 18 men under the command of Captain Eyger in the Exercise yard
 20 men under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Hirzel-Blarer near Falken¹²
 12 men under [Aidemajor] Assistant Major Fäßli at the Kronenporte
 25 men under Lieutenant-Colonel Rahn went to protect Drs. Rahn and Spöndli in Hirslanden in order to negotiate with the expected local militia coming over Mytikon
 20 men were to remain at the town hall
 131 Total

After midnight another 300 men were called up to active duty. Between 3:00 and 4:00 a.m., at the request of the President of the War Council (Councilman Weiß of the Governing Council [*Regierungsrat*]), the War Council, Mayor Heß, and Councilman Ed. Sulzer of the Governing Council [*Regierungsrat*] were given a clear and open briefing by City President Ziegler and Chief of Police (*Stadtpolizeipräsident*), Sysi, concerning the position taken by city officials. This position was as follows:

The measures taken by city officials are meant solely to maintain peace, order, and security; the evidence for which is that they have forbidden the ringing of church bells and that they were about to decide to place security officers in front of houses of well-known persons. However, in order not to attract the gathering opposition to these very houses, this decision was changed to having patrols regularly pass by such locations. City President Ziegler added that this was a true report of what city officials had done and sought to accomplish. All were instructed to allow the local militia and its followers to pass unhindered and not to join them. Nevertheless, the possibility could not be denied that given the mood in the city, some might choose to join them.

When after this public pronouncement the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) decided to make available to the civil militia an additional 500 men¹³ (some of whom were already in the arsenals and available for the civil militia), one can account for the

12. Editor's comment: corner house Thalgaße and Neuenhoffstraße.

13. 462 soldiers were taken from the arsenal, and 482 were returned, an increase of 20 from the local militia.

decision because of the huge mistrust of the city and because the Governing Council saw in the civil militia protection for persons and property that would be reassuring for themselves and their supporters. The Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) was not deluded in this respect.¹⁴

As these transactions were occurring, the news arrived that Pastor Hirzel refused to return home, his column was made up of some 5,000 men and already by Schwamendingen. In addition, it was learned that he had warned other districts; but it was not clear whether or not these other districts were to follow his example or to follow the command of the (citizens') Central Committee.

Colonel Hirzel stationed a strong contingent from the military school on the upper and lower bridges as well as at positions in the park in front of the Ship Crown near the Wollishofer bridge, the Selnaufsteg, in Thalaker street, in the Fröschengraben, and at the Peterhofstatt. The Dragoons [cavalry] he stationed on Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square").

Shortly after 4:00 a.m. the news arrived that the local militia had reached the Oberstraß and had taken up positions near the Linde. There were a few hundred armed with weapons among them, but Pastor Hirzel explained that they were armed only for their own protection. Their intention was only to participate in a moral demonstration against the government.

At 4:30 a.m. two members of the Central Committee went to the Oberstraß under protection from a detachment of the civil militia. The Councilmen Hegetschweiler and M. Sulzer of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) appeared in the Oberstraß at 6:00 a.m. with the aim of asking what the goal and intentions of the uprising were. The officers of the civil militia presented arms; their example was followed by the local militia who received the delegation with all the signs of respect.

After a short discussion of the leaders with the members of the (citizens') Central Committee present, they [Hegetschweiler and Sulzer] were given the following to bring to the government:

It is the respectful but resolute desire of the people:

1. that the directions of the Kloten gathering be acknowledged;
2. that the people wanted assurance that the government was not seeking to secure internal order by accepting outside interference;
3. that the government annul its participation in the Seven Concordat because it was an un-republican conspiracy of the governments against their citizenry.

14. It is inexplicable how Councilman Weiß in his text appearing after the 6th of September could come to the incorrect assumption that in addition to the high command of the military school, Colonel Hirzel had also taken over command in the city of the civil militia. – It is easier to understand how Major Übel came to hold this erroneous belief. – On the basis of this error, one can explain some of the false judgments in the two texts.

The two representatives of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) promised to have an answer as soon as possible, and they returned to the city. The people scattered for the most part; many went into the city to eat, others just to see what was going on. They were to gather again at the same place in two hours.

With the coming of daybreak, it was clear that the bridges were not to be blockaded without hindering traffic to the weekly market. Colonel Hirzel decided to draw his circle of defense narrower by concentrating on the arsenals and their entrances. He so informed the government along with the comment that he could give them protection only in the Löwenhof in Arsenal Alley.

This second and last positioning of troops was as follows:

1 School Company in front of the Waag to defend the entrance to the Arsenal Alley¹⁵ from the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"); this involved a strong chain of sentinels from Wiser'schen House¹⁶ up to the entrance of Post Office Street (*Poststraße*).

1 Cavalry unit at the entrance to In Gassen ("In the Alley") from the Storchengasse ("Storck Alley") and on the square behind St. Peters under Lieutenant-Colonel Markwalder.

2 units of cadets at the front entrance to the Yellow Arsenal towards the Neumarkt ("New Market") with a strong chain of sentinels from the corner of the Hotel Baur up to the Fröschengraben.

1 unit marksmen for the defense of the Zeughausgasse ("Arsenal Alley") on the side of the Neumarkt ("New Market").

1 unit of cadets, the chief instructor and armed fife and drum members as reserves in the In Gassen ("In the Alley") and to watch the entrances to the university buildings.

The commanders of the troops received instructions to use weapons only in the most extreme emergency and, in the case that the troops were in danger of being trampled by the crowd, they should withdraw into the nearest buildings. The cavalry was instructed in such a situation to join the troops at the Yellow Arsenal.

Outside of these other troop deployments, about 20 artillery forces were ordered into the exercise yard to set up canons behind the doors of the upper wings to defend the entrances. All remaining defenses as possible were placed in the wing along the Fröschengraben, and, in the remaining wings, nails were provisionally driven into the doors and two trustworthy workers were instructed in the case of emergency to nail them shut.

Returning at 7:30 a.m. from a recognizance ride out to the Krone¹⁷ and Oberdorf, the Supreme Commander confirmed the existing deployment and declared that especially on the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") there should be absolutely no

15. Editor's Comment: today "Waaggasse."

16. Editor's Comment: today hardware store Pestalozzi and Co.

17. Editor's Comment: today Haus zum Rechberg.

restriction on free movement from the Storchengasse and the bridge to the Postgasse. Only the line already occupied by sentinels from the Miser'schen House up to the William'schen House¹⁸ in the Postgasse was to be held as long as possible. The commander of the cavalry was given the order to continue sending patrols out to the Krone in order, periodically, to remain informed enough of the size of the on-coming crowd.

The commander of the government's troops having in this manner ensured the security of the arsenals through a concentrated placement of personnel, it was the task of the city officials to station some strong detachments in the city center next to the positions at the public entrances to the city with enough strength in an emergency to engage any possible threat. Along with those deployed after midnight, by 8:00 a.m. the civil militia had grown to 386 men who had taken the following positions:

- 80 men were at the Schmidstube under Lieutenant-Colonel Landolt,
- 84 men were at the Wegggen under Lieutenant-Colonel Bürkli, who at 9:00 a.m. deployed
- 24 men under Lieutenant-Colonel Rüscher at the Badergasse
- 20 men in the Yellow Arsenal under Lieutenant-Colonel F. Meyer
- 16 men in the Löwenhof under Captain Grob
- 18 men in the exercise yard under Captain Enger
- 20 men in the Falken under Captain Fäsi-Usteri
- 12 men by the former Kronenporte ("Crown Entrance") under military aide Fäsl
- 20 men under Captain Meyer-Finsler in the lower Hirschengraben to defend the city magistrate's office
- 86 men as reserves by City Hall under Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß
- 356 Total

Like the Supreme Commander of the military school, the Supreme Commander of the civil militia had no idea that the point was to allow the militarily organized and mustered land militia to march into the city because no new volunteers (*posse comitatus*) had joined them, the armed and by all appearances mal-tempered and seedy persons encamped in the Oberstraß were portrayed as wretched, and their numbers were much smaller than was earlier thought. One began to doubt the entire operation and to see it as a failure.

In fact, the (citizens') Central Committee that was meeting in the Zimmerleuten found itself in a difficult and embarrassing situation. One could not and did not want to extend the uprising to other communities, but one also did not want to abandon the people out of the region of Pfäffikon, which was all that could be expected if they were left by themselves. Yes, one feared that the entire cause of the movement in this

18. Editor's Comment: today Bank Kugler and Co.

case was lost and that the intervention of the Concordat Cantons was certain.¹⁹ In addition, with the arrival of Hürlimann-Landis, the view began to dominate that, as the situation now stood, there was no other choice but either to lose everything in a criminal proceeding or to call up the people from the entire Canton in order to put moral pressure on the government to resign. – The decision was taken to have the land militia in the Oberstraße enter the city in an orderly fashion, to station itself on the embankment²⁰, and from there to wait for new volunteers (*posse comitatus*). The church bells in the Neumünster ("New Cathedral") should be rung as a signal that all on the lake and in the surrounding communities should rise up. However, the Community President (*Gemeindspräsident*) who was a member of the (citizens') Central Committee declined to support this strategy and withheld his approval for a long time until the urgency of the situation forced him to comply.

This decision to enter the city was either held so secret or it was carried out too quickly that the news of its happening arrived at the two Supreme Commanders almost simultaneously with its occurrence. The church bells in the Neumünster ("New Cathedral") began to ring a few minutes before 9:00 a.m. and from there the gruesome sound spread. At the same time one saw two long, four-man wide columns marching and singing hymns. One column crossed over the lower bridge towards the Storchengasse; the other marched along the embankment up towards the Münsterbrücke ("Cathedral Bridge").

The first column under pastor Hirzel consisted of some 600 men led by some 20 marksmen. Behind them was Hirzel with other leaders of the region followed by some 150 armed infantry and civilians with their hunting guns. The remainder carried staffs, cudgels, and swords with several carrying lances and maces. The second column under Dr. Rahn consisted of some 1,100 men without guns. The remaining [who had come to Zurich in the night with these forces] did not join in the march. With pomp and circumstance but wearing the very work clothes they had been wearing when the church bells called them from their fields and factories, wretched in appearance, the columns moved through the streets of the city. Not a few hearts were racing as they contemplated what the next hours would bring.

The first column proceeded in this manner up to the point where the Storchengasse entered the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). At that point the cavalry rode up to them and blocked the entire width of the entrance to the square. Major Uebel, who had just been briefed by a patrol that had observed the moving columns, took it for granted that the instructions to allow for free movement across the Münsterhof

19. One member from the designated delegation to the City President explained this incessantly. He would take no part in the insurrection as long as the government had not taken any hostile action against the people and had not thereby threatened the security of the city.

20. Only with the march into the city did an older, experienced, higher officer offer the advice that two columns should be made in order to march over both bridges onto the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). (Editor's Comment: The embankments at that time consisted of only the City Hall embankment, the Sonnen-embankment, and the Stadthaus-embankment.

("Cathedral Square") did not apply to an armed and militarily organized group of men. Colonel Markwalder at the entrance of In Gassen street, however, allowed the column to pass, and he called to them: "Go back! The square must remain open!" Pastor Hirzel who was now at the head of the column called back: "Peace! We come only to engage the government in peaceful negotiations. For God's sake, don't begin a civil war!" This kind of exchange, lost in the turmoil and incapable of reconstruction, passed back and forth during which the two groups became intermingled. What is certainly the case is that neither leader of the two groups wanted to be the first to make use of their people and that both tried to restrain in word and deed their respective sides. Then, from the back of the crowd a shot rang out; most probably unintentionally because it went up into the air. At this, the cavalry pushed forward, and one rider with drawn sword pushed his horse into Pastor Hirzel. A marksman fired, and the horse turned and fell with its rider, though as it turned out neither the horse nor the rider was injured. This was followed by shots and shoving from both the cavalry and the crowd. Some of the horses were slightly injured, and one man from Pfäffikon was seriously wounded. The cavalry then turned and rode back, stopping twice on the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") in order to retrieve fallen comrades and with some firing their pistols back toward the crowd, they crossed the square and rode into the Neumarkt ("New Market Square") to the entrance to Thalacker street where they regathered and took position.

The infantry at the Waag withdrew too quickly at the very beginning of the skirmish. Some went into the Haus zur Waag, some onto the balcony on the other side of the street from the Vögeli bakery, and some withdrew into the Zeughausgasse ("Arsenal Street"). From these positions they fired on the armed group from Pastor Hirzel as they pushed forward toward the Zeughausgasse ("Arsenal Street"). Seven of Pastor Hirzel's following were killed or wounded. The second column of demonstrators under Dr. Rahn met up with Hirzel's column in the Postgasse, and they all withdrew in a rather orderly fashion back to Oberdorf and See ("Lake") streets.

Furious about, in their opinion, the insidious attack on the part of the government troops – because they neither knew nor believed otherwise than that the Fraumünsterplatz was open – the overwhelming number (a small group through the Kappeler-gäßchen) plunged down the Postgasse past the Hotel Baur towards the Yellow (large) Arsenal that they believed was being held by the civil militia. Meanwhile, as we learned above, there was only a defensive guard of 20 men there. Accompanied by a frightful clamor and with weapons held high in defiance, the hoard stormed toward the guard consisting of cadets.

Colonel Hirzel, who received word of the approach of the land militia while in his apartment in the exercise yard arsenal where he had gone for a half hour rest

not thinking any advance of this kind would happen,²¹ rushed to the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). However, the cavalry was already involved in the skirmish with the crowd, and the infantry was in the buildings so that no orders could be given or heard. He quickly returned to the Yellow (large) Arsenal to join the cadets in anticipation of the confrontation.²² As the crowd rounded the west wing of the Hotel Baur toward In Gassen street, he called along with the other officers for them to turn back. The crowd in blind rage pressed onward irresistibly, entirely ignoring these repeated and intensified commands to stop and despite the readiness of the troops to fire. After the crowd pressed 8 to 10 steps onward, the soldiers fired in self-defense. Because they fired without being commanded to do so, many intentionally wanted to avoid shooting anyone but only to startle them. This explains why there were only seven dead and wounded despite the short distance fired and the thickness of the crowd. The shots were enough to cause the crowd to retreat in terror. It scattered. The cavalry rushed forward and shot into the Neumarkt ("New Market") and the Postgasse bringing down nine protesters.²³ The crowd, throwing away their staffs, etc., retreated rapidly in all directions so that in five minutes there were none on this side of the Limmat river except a few stragglers in Kratz street who could not find their way out. Pastor Hirzel, Hürlimann, Dr. Rahn, Spöndlin and others sought their reconstitution at the Stadelhofen.²⁴

Hardly were the last shots fired when the church bells of the city began to ring. The City President (*Stadtpräsident*) thought it in the interest of security and of property to re-establish peace and order. He ordered Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß to have the reserves at City Hall leave the shops and to follow him while the detachments at the Weggen und the Schmidstube received the command to return to the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") and those stationed at the Falken were to go to City Hall.

Battle drummers now led some 60 men to the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") where the square was empty with the exception of a few dead and seriously wounded near the Waag. The City President (*Stadtpräsident*) proceeded alone to the platoon of infantrymen at the entrance into In Gassen street. The civil militia detail stationed at the Weggen commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Nüscherer stood on the other side at the Badergasse street. Both detachments were combat ready. The City President

21. Similarly, and under the same logic and at the same time, the adjunct to the City President had taken an hour break.

22. At the time of the attack, the fortification sappers and marksmen loaned from Winegg were on the right wing, in the center were some 50 cadets, and on the left wing was a mixture of marksmen and infantrymen.

23. The troops suffered no casualties in the skirmish. The cavalry had a few contusions because of the falling of horses and blows from hand weapons.

24. Hürlimann-Landis remained throughout the skirmish remarkably calm. He said to friends he met at the Stadelhofen: "We had a skirmish, unfortunately a few dead; the people are a little shocked; I will gather them together outside the city, and we will march again."

commanded Lieutenant-Colonel Markwalder to stop all shooting. His detail, however, had not fired.

The reserves moved from Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") through Postgasse street toward the Neumarkt ("New Market") just as Hegetschweiler, Councilman of the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) was shot [see account below]. At the very moment as they spilled out of the narrow opening onto the Neumarkt ("New Market"), the gate of the eastern wing of the military exercise yard was opened exposing a canon under the command of the artillery Lieutenant-Colonel von Orilli that placed the platoon of civil militia in a vulnerable position. Not knowing whether or not this officer viewed the forward movement of the civil militia as threatening, Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß commanded the civil militia to step back a few feet in order to be protected by the corner of the Hotel Baur and in order to wait for re-enforcements from Weggen and the Schmidstube.²⁵ As these re-enforcements arrived and the civil militia had grown to some 260 men, Weibel Brändli brought an open order from the ruling mayor to Colonel Hirzel commanding that no one was to be on the streets and giving the task of ensuring the curfew to Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß. The order read:

"Colonel Hirzel is hereby empowered to turn over the arsenal to the civil militia.

F. Heß, Governing Mayor"

Schultheß, who was on his way down In Gassen street, met Colonel Hirzel coming from the exercise yard. Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß had taken other defensive steps and he passed those on to Hirzel. Hirzel read them and answered: "By all means ensure that it happens quickly."

The civil militia in the arsenals having received re-enforcements took over the defenses of the same. The troops withdrew to their barracks, but they already encountered in Thalacker street the land militia coming in from Außersihl. Saluting one another, they passed by one another. Once in the barracks, they first began to set up barricades. Then they contemplated marching as an entirety to Dietikon on the border of the Canton. However, they soon received the command from the newly constituted provisional government to disband and for as many as possible to change into civilian clothes and to go home.

During all of these events and as of 7:30 a.m., the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) was in session in the post office building nearby. The first order of business was a report by Councilmen Hegetschweiler and M. Sulzer from their mission. They had met some 2,000 men of whom some 200 were armed in the Obersträß where they were received with all respect. Through their leader, Pastor Hirzel, they communicated their desires (already mentioned above). – Following this report, the Governing Council spent some one-and-a-half hours discussing how to answer. Councilman Hegetschweiler spoke openly and clearly against any intervention. By so doing, one could maintain

25. At this point, the cavalry had stationed themselves between the exercise yard and Fröschengraben street. Colonel Hirzel expected a new and stronger attack and believed he needed the cannon in order to ensure victory.

the peace. Escher called, once again, for the resignation of the government, because the split between the government and the people was too great. Despite the feeling of powerlessness, they remained undecided one way or the other and took no measures for an energetic defense. Finally, they decided to draw up a proclamation stating that neither foreign troops had been summoned nor were they on their way and that the Governing Council (*Regierungsrat*) had turned over responsibility for the entire situation to the Upper Council (*Großen Rat*).

As the bells in the surrounding countryside rang out their call to revolt and the crowd began to enter the city, the members of the government continued to fight with one another. In that very moment as one member cried out, "We cannot and must not withhold our intervention," news arrived that the crowd was on the bridges. Immediately, a proclamation was approved and in a flash it was decided to rescind the indictment against the Committees. Then, shots rang out from Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). When one member yelled that canons should be used, other council members blamed one another for the disaster. The populous streamed past the building on their way to the Neumarkt ("New Market"). Shots were fired, the rataplan of horse hooves could be heard, as well as the flight of the armed volunteers (*posse comitatus*) from the countryside (*Landstürme*) – all in a matter of minutes. Councilmen jumped out of their seats, several rushed down to the Post courtyard and rooms there; it was impossible anymore to contemplate anything like an ordered assembly. At that point, the incumbent mayor gave Colonel Hirzel the command to cease fire. When no one volunteered to bring the order to him, Councilmember Hegetschweiler stepped forward. Holding the order high over his head, he rushed around the Hotel Baur to the yellow Arsenal, first, to hand them to a Cavalry officer at the west corner who, in turn, brought it to Colonel Hirzel's assistant. As he intended to return to the Post courtyard, Hegetschweiler was shot in the face by a cavalry corporal's shotgun blast, killing the noble-minded man on the spot. What followed was even greater confusion and demoralization in the government, the advance of the civil militia, the ordering of the civil militia to surrender the Arsenal, and the dissolution of the government.

There has been great debate over the whole scenario:

1. If and to what degree Major Uebel overstepped his authority and, thereby, brought about the spilling of blood.
2. If the situation might have been mastered and the government remained in power had the military school advanced to the Limmat bridge immediately after the populous fled and the Cavalry had pursued them to the edge of the city.

The first question can hardly be adequately determined, otherwise, then by looking more carefully at the circumstances and the agents involved.

Colonel Hirzel, who is among the most recognized officers in the Canton and Switzerland, a man of great life experience and a mild, sympathetic character, had to have viewed the undertaking of the responsibility given to him by a government that was so internally fragmented to be one of the most difficult duties of his commission

and of his military rank. Even the incumbent mayor ventured only confidential communications (see above), and he by no means respected several of the government's council members apart from their political and religious convictions. Such a military and political task in which, as in this case, one can find at least as much moral propriety on the one as on the other side of the conflict and in which one is opposed to his own people, his fellow citizens and friends, this brave officer undertook only with innermost reluctance; but once he was committed to it, he carried it out in good faith albeit with a proportioned forbearance.

We see Hirzel functioning in this fashion from the evening of the 5th with his preparations in the arsenals. We see the same, for sure, when it came to taking over the citizens' defense divisions, with the gendarmes, and the concentrated deployment of his troops, which was characterized by its insight and experience of the officers. Admittedly, one could have perhaps significantly strengthened the position with artificial means like breast plates, but doing so could have suggested an uncertainty that is more damaging, especially in such situations. On the other hand, Hirzel, in order to avoid the spilling of blood, took care that no weapons without necessity and without his command should be deployed. These orders accord with the instructions that he gave (see above) – that one use weapons only in extreme emergency. All the officers adhered to this command, for example, the positions down at Schlüsselgasse and St. Peter's streets, as well as, Lieutenant Colonel Markwalder at the entrance to In Gassen street both had to pass directly by Pastor Hirzel's column. It was another matter, though, with Major Uebel on the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square").

Uebel, a younger, well-educated, and honorable officer, who had left the Prussian army at the beginning of the 1830s and for some time managed the instruction of our cavalry with insight and skill, was a soldier by class and career. As someone new to our situation, he could hardly do otherwise than to regard his task from a purely military perspective and, thereby, as a consequence easily ignore patiently allowing to wait with the implementation of military procedures. When even Uebel had not viewed the advancing populous as common rebels, which he did, especially because the head of the crowd and a substantial number of those approaching were armed, he could see from that point of view that in order to be able to maintain with 28 cavalry and some 60 infantry the line from Miser's house to the corner of the Postgasse he could not allow what he at the time erroneously took to be 2000 persons simply to pour out into the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). If one acknowledges that he in fact violated the literal content of the order given to him, a military perspective could not for that reason question his decision. His commanding officer, who had not considered this circumstance, would himself not have questioned him.²⁶

26. The words that he cried out as he charged with his men were admittedly somewhat too offensive: "Now, let's do this!"

With regard to the second question:

To a remote observer, the populous appeared totally disheartened immediately after the second skirmish, and the military school appeared to be the decisive victor (having attacked admirably). However, closer investigation of the reports from the leaders and officers as well as consequent events require crucial modifications of this set of conclusions.

First, with respect to the populous, shortly following the skirmish and before the civic guard had intervened and the government's resignation, their leaders were successful at gathering together a part of those fleeing outside of Stadelhofen and at convincing them to advance once more as soon as reinforcements arrived from around Lake Zurich. Second, the core half of the populous was not dissuaded from advancing even in light of the announcement of the lost skirmish and the victory of the government's troops. As, for example, the armed volunteers (*posse comitatus*) from Außersihl, as well as the armed infantry from Erlenbach, Rüßnacht, and Herrliberg; he Richterschweiler (400 men strong) without weapons, were already on the march to Zurich but turned back after receiving the report of the skirmish, armed themselves, and arrived in the evening along with the some 800 men from Mädensschweilern, so, as well, Horgen, Meilen, Männedorf, Stäfa, Uster, etc.

Had the government not dissolved, and had the citizens' guard left everything as it was, the troops of volunteers (*posse comitatus*) and thirty to 40 students would have been by evening perhaps strengthened by 500 to 600 men, but then they would have faced at least 1,500 well-armed, among them some 400 marksmen, 1,000 poorly-armed and a few thousand unarmed opponents most of whom were frighteningly rancorous over the spilled blood and the assassination of Hegetschweiler. Despite this numerical superiority, a force of about 600 men with weapons and some cavalry, which the opponent didn't have, stationed in a good position could defend itself for some time. However, these conditions didn't exist. That group who had engaged the skirmish at the yellow arsenal was in shock, as is usually the case with young troops; many of the cavalry were dispersed, the reserves in Gassen street were at the most dangerous point in time no longer to be found in that they were scattered and hidden away in the farthest corners of the arsenals and nearby houses.²⁷ However, if we assume that they had all regrouped, that the victory had brought with it élan, consciousness that they must defend their lives, even were the faint of heart inspired, there would have been, nonetheless, no prospect of their being able to hold on for long. The situation of the arsenals, surrounded on three sides by narrow alleys was so unfavorable: Nowhere was there place for a row of soldiers as there was on the side towards the Neumarkt ("New Market").

What would have happened, had part of the populous positioned themselves in the houses between Hotel Baur and Baker Mögeli and others in the houses along

27. Colonel Hirzel said to a friend: "Of all the disappointments of the day, this experience hurt him the most."

Storchengasse and from there had fired down on the detachments of the military school, who would have been exposed without any protection, or, on the opposite side, had another part of the populous stormed the entrances with axes, etc., and broken into the exercise yard arsenal in Bärengasse and the Thalhouse? With the first shots, the cavalry would have withdrawn, the infantry and artillery would have drawn back inside the arsenals: a vigorous shooting exchange from window to window would have developed until a fire had broken out and the troops in the street would have dispersed in chaos where they, otherwise, would have had the upper hand. However, even without a fire in the buildings, the troops would have been jammed into the arsenals, cut-off and without food supplies because all the entrances to the neighboring houses close by could be made unusable. Even with a force of some 900, it would have been impossible to re-take an enclosed housing complex like the northwest side of Poststrasse from Hotel Baur to the Williams' house, from Waag over Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") to In Gasse and both rows of houses of In Gasse down to St. Peter's Church. No experienced officer would hand over to the opposition such control because what is hidden away in houses isn't accessible.

We have to negate the second question; the consequence of a more extended defense could not have been victory but only the spilling of much blood and creation of great destruction.

A third question would be: What could have been done had the government kept its head and heart?

Even if more out of self-defense as open attack, when a partially armed mob advances against a government in session in order to force physical or moral concessions, it is engaged in revolution. Pastor Hirzel was very clear about that; he knew that his own religious convictions and possibly his very life were in jeopardy, but he was also clear that the cause which he chose to serve was so just and so threatened that he decided to put his life on the line. However, he overlooked that, precisely by his intrepid action, the very cause itself could have been lost; he calculated with too great a certainty that the other districts would follow his example and summons; and he took too little into account that the far larger portion of those who joined him had no desire to cause a revolution but only wanted to defend a particular faith in church and school. He entirely overlooked how a revolution would increase the legal position of his opponents. What would have happened, had the government with daybreak on the 6th [of September], after it had learned that the armed volunteers (*posse comitatus*) from the countryside with only about 2,000, of whom only a few hundred were poorly armed, had advanced to Oberstrasse, had given the order to leave 60 to protect the arsenals and to advance against the populous in order to disperse them?

A platoon of infantry in the Old Strasse, four platoons in the New Strasse with two light artilleries and cavalry, two platoons of infantry and artillery on the right in the New Strasse and in the vineyards, a platoon further to the right below the forest and ready to outflank, four platoons in reserve in the New Strasse: not even a wild shot would have been necessary much less the commanding of the cavalry to

Schwamendingen – by 7:30 a.m. everything would have been over without blood, the military school would have been back in Zurich and the efforts of the government opposition under Hirzel would have been compromised. Both he and his cause would have been lost because, with the revolution, thousands both in and outside of the Canton turned their backs to the cause.

We return now to our account of events:²⁸

After the arsenals were occupied by the civic guard and the troops withdrew, the former occupied the troops' positions. Already prior to 10:45 a.m., reserves had gathered before the town hall where a provisional government had formed itself constituted out of former government councilmen: The ruling mayor Heß, councilmen Meyer von Knonau, M. Sulzer, Ed. Sulzer and joined by Hürlimann-Landis, T. von Muralt and Escher-Schulthess. They along with the [citizens'] Central Committee announced the new government's existence to the public by publications which admonished order and restraint.

Around 10:45 a.m., the city's Police Director Sysi rushed to the town hall to tell Mr. Ziegler that he should come to Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") as quickly as possible because new armed volunteers (*posse comitatus*) were approaching over the bridges with the intent of storming the barracks. Because Mr. Zeigler was upstairs, his adjunct rushed ahead of him and met a column at the Meise under the leadership of Procurator Spöndli, who at that very moment was entering Münsterhof. In contrast to the armed volunteers (*posse comitatus*) from Pfäffikon, these approximately 100, well-dressed, burly men from the lower parishes of the right bank of the Lake of Zurich, the majority of whom carried carbines and ammunition pouches, were entirely organized militarily, marching in double rows along with a few hundred men from the district of Pfäffikon behind them, who had joined their ranks. Their leader and followers were terribly outraged over the spilling of blood.²⁹ Schultheß told their leader what Sysi had already said that the troops had withdrawn and pleaded with them to abstain from their intent. In his agitation, Spöndli hardly heard him,³⁰ and the column surged forward rapidly. Although Schultheß tried continuously, but unsuccessfully, to convince him otherwise and having arrived at the Arch, Schultheß tried one last means. He commanded as loud as he could: "Column stop!" With the exception of those at the front, the men hadn't seen who had given the command, and they stopped in their tracks. At this moment, Councilmen Ziegler and Sysi arrived and, along with Schultheß, they were finally able to convince Spöndli and his men to

28. Remark of the Editor: To page 24 should be added that the question who had fired the unfortunate shot that killed Councilman Hegetschweiler was given diverse answers.

29. Those in front wanted to shoot toward the "Haus zur Waag" [from where the infantry had fired in the skirmish, trans.] whereby Spöndli struck them with his staff and grabbed the wildest of them by the throat.

30. Shortly afterward, Spöndli maintained against Schultheß that he had barely any memory of this encounter, his agitation was so great.

refrain from their undertaking and to march by the barracks that had been vacated already by the troops.

Right behind this column came a second that consisted of some 300 men. From noon until into the night, there was one influx after another of such groups so that the city was filled with armed and unarmed men.³¹ One heard threats to demolish the Haus zur Waag from which the infantry had fired that morning, to free those imprisoned for the fire in Uster, to destroy the Guillotine, and to drive off the Gendarmes from the main guardhouse and city hall. It was pressingly necessary, on the one hand, to take further protective measures, and, on the other hand, to place the people under military orders. To accomplish that end, the provisional government appointed the City President, Lieutenant-Colonel Ziegler.

First, the Haus zur Waag was occupied by a 30-man civic guard along with 30 infantry men armed with muskets from Herrliberg under the command of Captain Fäsi-Usteri, who performed his duty admirably. The police in the prison were strengthened by 18 civic guards under Lieutenant W. Meyer, and 50 men from Enge und Außersihl under Captain Ullmer were stationed in the barracks where the crowds were quartered. Those who arrived after this point in time until 4:00 p.m. were dispatched to the New Market (*Neumarkt*) under the command of 20 subordinate officers of the civic guard.

The City President's intent was to arm those without weapons with guns from the arsenal, to organize them into three to four battalions under officers from the civic guard, and to station them in the churches. At 3:00 p.m., therefore, four officers who were to be given these commands were invited to City Hall. The City President disclosed to them the goal and the necessity of these measures and tried to convince them to assume the command.

How it must have surprised him when immediately one officer refused vehemently. He had serious reservations about commanding such men who were little more than a rabble. One should leave the task to those who had called them together in the first place. When it came to the civic guard, he would assume any and all command, but with the others he asked to be spared the responsibility. Two other, merited and from service in the civic guard distinguished, staff officers were unable to overcome their resistance to assuming the command and quietly but emphatically entreated to be left with the civic guard; only Lieutenant-Colonel Landolt was silent. Then, the City Present demonstrated his great character. He answered: "Gentlemen, I can't force you. You are, more importantly, older officers than I; however, the measures are absolutely necessary, and if no one supports my decision, then I will command alone." The officers held to their position, and in their place Lieutenant-Colonel Heinrich v. Orelli, bank official W. Meyer, and Captain Rasp. Fösi were called, who along with Lieutenant-Colonel Handolt assumed the responsibility.

31. By evening there were 4,000 to 4,500 men.

Given the task of dividing up the groups, Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß was confronted at 4:00 p.m. on the Neumarkt ("New Market") with a mass gathering of colorful confusion of whom many had consumed too much alcohol. However, with only a few exceptions, they were obedient and willing so that Schultheß along with the help of two officers quickly divided them into four battalions, led them to the arsenal where they were given arms and ammunition, and then were stationed in the four largest churches.

The first battalion under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Landolt consisted of 340 men primarily from Wädenschweil and Richterschweil was placed in the Großmünster ("Great Cathedral"); the second battalion under Lieutenant-Colonel Heinrich v. Orelli consisted of 380 men from Maur, Egg, Greisensee, Grüningen, etc., was stationed in St. Peter's; the third battalion under the bank official W. Meyer had 136 men from the lower right Lake parishes was stationed in the Evangelist Church where there were already some 60 unarmed men; the fourth battalion under Captain Rasp. Fösi consisted of some 400 men from various communities was stationed in Frauenmünster.

Everyone remained good and obedient with the exception of the unarmed men from Wehntal of whom many had drunk too much wine and had come to the city out of curiosity and other reasons; until midnight, they made life difficult for their commanders.

The civic guard occupied the following positions through the night:

I. Small City

[Old Town Left of the Limmat River]

- 124 men at the Weggen, under Lieutenant-Colonel Bürli
- 25 men at City Hall under Captain Diggelmann,
- 28 men at the Löwenhof Arsenal under Captain Grob
- 32 men at the Yellow Arsenal under Lieutenant-Colonel J. Meyer
- 41 men in the Exercise yard Arsenal under Captain Gyger
- 24 men at the Post Office under?
- 20 men at the Grainery Office under Lieutenant-Colonel Nüscherer
- 18 men at the Prison under Lieutenant W. Meyer
- 12 men at the Bleicherweg Bridge under Lieutenant C. Brunner
- 18 men in the outside Thalacker under Lieutenant L. Siber
- 18 men in the Music Hall under Lieutenant Eßlinger
- 30 men at the Waag along with 30 from Herrliberg under Captain Fäsi-Usteri

Total 390

II. Large City

[Old Town Right of the Limmat River]

- 36 men at the Canon (*Chorherrenstift*) under Lieutenant-Colonel Weiß
- 18 men at the Schmidstube under Captain J.J. Meyer
- 20 men at City Hall under the Guard House under Major Füßli

20 men at the Falken under?
 17 men at the Kronenporte under Captain P. Heß
 36 men at the Neumühle unter Captain W. Ziegler
36 men at the Gun Club under Captain Frei

Total 183

In toto: 573 Men

The night passed without incident, interrupted only with the cries of the numerous sentries and patrols of the civic guard. The next morning brought new arrivals of the armed, unarmed, and curious. It was impossible to imagine that the Neumarkt ("New Market") could contain the crowd of people planned to occur at 10:00 a.m. so that a second gathering occurred at the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). The [citizens'] Central Committee, surrounded by the armed infantry from Richterschweil, congratulated the gathering for its victory and called for allegiance to the provisional government as well as for obedience and rejection of revenge. The unarmed men were dismissed immediately whereas the armed, with the exception of those guarding the Waag, were dismissed that evening.³²

The provisional government immediately undertook the required steps to neutralize the attempt on the part of the envoys for the Canton Concordat, namely those from Bern, Luzern, St. Gallen, and Aargau to intervene in the Canton and to move them to Bern. The government mobilized two battalions of infantry and an artillery company, part of whom moved into position already by 7:00 p.m., and it gave the supreme command, which included command over these troops, to Lieutenant-Colonel Ziegler. His staff consisted of the following:

Chief of Staff: Lieutenant-Colonel Schultheß

First Adjunct and Commander of City Squares: Captain Fäsi-Usteri

Second Adjunct: Staff Captain Guyer

Third Adjunct: Artillery Captain Reinacher.

In the night from the 7th to the 8th, there remained in service 475 men of the civic guard; only a [limited; trans.] number of officials who had elderly and ill parents took advantage of the offer to go home. Between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m. the civic guard still consisted of 350 men, who by 8:00 p.m. gradually were reduced to 70.³³

The discipline and dedication of this civic guard was from beginning to the very end generally excellent. The greater number remained at their posts from Thursday night until Tuesday noon, and the commander of the guards at City Hall could correctly report on the 9th: "The squad consistently willed to do everything, but this

32. It should not be overlooked that of the 631 weapons that were distributed on the evening of 6. September without audit, which couldn't have been done otherwise, to the rebels from the countryside (*posse comitatus*), all were returned with the exception of three or four.

The expense for the landsturm cost the city fl. 1343, 32 ß, 9 hlr.

33. Expenses for maintaining the civic guard cost the city fl. 1899, 16 ß, 6 hlr.

will was soon stronger than the force necessary for the adequate fulfilment of the guard duty expected of them.” Trust in the supreme commander and obedience to the officers was absolute to the point that under the most difficult of circumstances they were not only able to restore and then maintain peace and order but also able to ensure the safety of persons and possessions of even the most hated. Not even an attempt at much less any injury of anyone occurred. The flight of a number of radicals, partly in comical costumes, proved to be completely unnecessary and premature.

The engagement of troops brought with it the surfacing again of party hatreds fueled by followers of the former government and a part of the officers. It took great determination on the part of the supreme commander to avoid any mutiny. Anxious and naïve rumors of the approaching troops of the Canton Concordat from Aargau and supporters of the old government from Regensberg spread so that the troops and civic guard had to be armed for several nights.

The meeting of the Upper Council of September 9th brought a welcome conclusion to this tense and tiring situation. In spite of the warning of the President, 137 council members gathered in the Großmünster ("Great Cathedral") – 75 were absent. Following a short discussion and affixing of two counter motions, the Upper Council decided the following unanimously with the exception of one vote:

1. The City Council constituted on September 6th as possessing the attribute of the Governing Council ("*Regierungsrat*") and cantonal Governing Council ("*eidgenössisches Staatsrat*") was confirmed and charged with performing all of the tasks of the same according to the provisions of the Constitution and, further, to legislate laws until the Governing Council can be thoroughly organized.
2. The current Upper Council ("*Große Rat*") disbanded itself; the Governing Council is charged with immediately arranging for a constitutional election of the members of the Upper Council in order that the Council can assume its duties at the latest within 14 days.

The Upper Council was greeted with multitudinous cheers when it ended its session.

A member of the dissolved government tried to divert discussion when it came to the accusation of bloodletting. The government had not given the order to shoot. Tremendously angered, Hirzel wanted to respond, but he was restrained by those on his side with the promise that reparation should come in a different fashion. As the session ended, he remained in the church leaning on a column in deep contemplation with tears streaming down his furrowed cheeks giving those friends standing around him confirmation of the horrible wound that had shaken his innermost being.³⁴

34. According to the protocol of the Upper Council, one of the members of the Governing Council said: "... I speak as member of the dissolved government and state unequivocally that it was never the intention of the Governing Council that casualties should occur. No order to that end was given although it was the duty of the commanding officers to prevent the raid. On the contrary, there was only one person in the Governing Council who voiced the clear opinion that one should deploy neither

Given the task by the provisional government, he [Hirzel, trans.] generated a report on the commands and delegated powers of the dissolved Governing Council in which he presented his own orders and instructions as well as a clear portrayal of the ensuing two, bloody confrontations with the populous, and it exonerated the self-same Mr. Hirzel so completely that on September 13th the government gave him the command of the Canton's troops. However, for the sake of others the report was never published [see the "Attachment" at the end of this report, trans.], and the honest Hirzel to his death never got over the slight.

As he assumed the command from the previous Chief of Staff on the evening of September 12th, he said with tears in his eyes:

"View me with regret; I am a compromised man."

To describe the consequences of September 6th is beyond the designated task given to me. Today, after 25 years, little remains to be seen and felt; the politically democratic, and religiously tattering events have not been able to withstand the trajectory of time. Nonetheless, from the events the good endures that the openly displayed immorality and the previous ridicule of religion and church have not returned.

foreign nor domestic troops but follow the will of the people as soon as they had clearly expressed their will."

In his "Posting to the Revolution of 6. September 1839," pages 63/64, Councilman Weiß contradicted this assertion:

"Unanimously and with gratitude my directive (from the afternoon of the 5th of September) was praised and ratified and, as a consequence, embraced as the directive of the Upper Council. Its most vigorous endorsement came especially from Messrs. Ed. Sulzer and ..., and it was even said to me, I should notify Lieutenant-Colonel Hirzel that he had extended authority ... The vote of Mr. ... in the Upper Council on 9. September agitated me all the more according to which it would be, was generally, and was in fact believed that the government had no role in the military preparations and thereby either I or Lieutenant-Colonel Hirzel (or both of us) had been compromised to the highest degree.

Addition by the Editor: In this case, the person involved spoke who as one of the few leaders of the dissolved government had participated in the meeting of September 9th whereas others, such as Keller, Ulrich, Füssli, Hirzel, Weiß, Fierz, etc., were absent, and in his later memoirs stated as follows: ... "Dr. Bluntschli, leader of the political opposition of the dissolved government, ... said among other things that the government had even given the order to fire on the peacefully advancing populous. I am disgusted by such distortion of the facts. I write, especially, to repudiate this last accusation. To be sure, I say, the government had commissioned and designated authority on the morning of September 6th to Lieutenant-Colonel Hirzel that the barracked military should maintain order and security; needless to say – although not expressly stated – to stop the busses by the utilization of weapons; but the express command to fire on the approaching populous was never given."

The "N.Z.Z." ["Neue Züricher Zeitung," trans.], Nr. 108 wrote concerning the vote: ... "it was never the intent (of the government) to take steps that would lead to the spilling of the blood of citizens. No one gave that command; even the commanders only did their duty ...".

Attachment [never published, according to Schulteß' report, see above, page 374]: Report from Lieutenant-Colonel Sal. Hirzel on his Orders from the 5th to the 6th of September [1839]

To the
Honorable Governing Council of the State of Zurich

Mr. Mayor!

Honorable Gentlemen!

As commander of troops from the evening of September 5th until the catastrophe that occurred on the following day of September 6th, you asked me, yesterday, to generate a comprehensive report on the events of these days.

Already on the afternoon of the 5th, some confidential signals were sent to me by a high-ranking individual³⁵ that I should remain on alert because of the arsenal; however, without informing me more precisely just what danger threatened. I had correctly guessed, as I was confirmed the next night.

Thereupon, I initiated immediately the most necessary preparations in the case of an ambush of the main arsenals with the aid of some trustworthy arsenal workers and requested a few confidential friends immediately to go there in the event of need.

Late that evening, Councilman Fierz told me that, according to several reports from multiple townships, it was aimed to occupy the arsenal that night, and he cautioned me to be alert and to inform him and Councilman Weiß of events.

At approximately 9:30 p.m., Councilman Weiß came to me in the field office, and, after he briefly had informed me that according to confidential information that he had just received, in many townships in the district of Pfäffikon the call to arms had been raised and that great numbers of men would move toward the city, he gave me in the name of the mayor command over those troops in the military school and issued to me at my request the following written orders:

"Mr. Lieutenant-Colonel Artillery Inspector Hirzel is hereby commissioned and authorized to take all necessary and apparent military measures in order to protect and secure the citizens and their possessions as well as the constitutionally authorized officials."

Signed:

President of the War Council:

Weiß, Councilman [Regierungsrat, trans.]

Because I had received communications about the activities in the Pfäffikon district from a side with whom I otherwise had no contact, I believed it all the more important to proceed with care and took it prudent to inform in this respect the Chief of Police (with whom I had written contact already after receiving the report from Councilman

35. Mayor Heß; his name is provided by him himself in the column of the original text.

Fierz to keep a mindful eye on the arsenals during the night) as well as for the City President and a few others who had joined me yet before midnight.

As time passed one grew more concerned about the arsenals; however, I didn't think it was appropriate to occupy them with troops from the military school, but because the few friends and arsenal workers who were in them could not have defended them against a determined attack, I asked the Chief of Police to give me five or six gendarmes for each of the three main buildings. I asked the City President, as well, for 40 to 50 trustworthy citizens whom, under the commission that I had received from the President of the War Council, I armed from the arsenal and posted in the Löwenhof, the large arsenal, and in the field office.

Shortly after midnight, I went to the main police station, where I found Councilmen Weiß and Hegetschweiler and heard things that indicated clearly the difficulty of my position and task. I was offered the help in a very meddlesome manner by students gathered at the Widder, which motivated me, first, once more to check on the arsenals and then to go to City Hall in order to speak with the City President about his sense and intent of what security measures were to be taken.

I had hardly arrived when I observed that some 100 students had been stationed under the Linden next to Tiefenhof. I promptly went there, but they were gone. I learned that they had gone to the barracks.

After returning to the police station, I arranged for the Chief of Police and the above named two Councilmembers to go to the field office where they found the students who had returned from the barracks. After a brief coaxing, the students dispersed, and from that point on, as far as I could tell, they at no point regrouped en masse.

Immediately after I was given the commission as Commander in Chief, I gave the command for the troops in the military school to muster in anticipation of further orders but to remain in their rooms and keep calm. I also moved the cavalry from Platzschoppen to the barrack yard.

As with daybreak various reports were received concerning the approach of large crowds and that the civic guard in no small number were with them, in agreement with Councilman Weiß and the City President, I ordered that the lower and upper bridges be occupied by strong units of the military school and positions to be taken at the Landanlage in front of the Schiffschopf, at the Willishofer-bridge, at Selnausteg, Thalacker, the Fröschengraben, und Peterhofstatt from which measures I then informed the gathered Governing Council in the court house by a staff officer.

With the ever more complete gathering of the civic guard over time, I ordered all the troops of the military school to return to their original positions, in order to defend the arsenals over which I personally took responsibility, and I informed not only City President Ziegler but also Councilman Fierz on behalf of the Governing Council of this decision, both of whom approved.

This final positioning of the troops was as follows:

- 1 school company of about 40 men before the Waag to defend Arsenal-Alley from Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square")
- 1 cavalry unit of about 24 men to the left next to the company named above
- 1 school company at the entrance to In Gassen from the side of Storchengasse and on the square behind St. Peter's
- 2 units of cadets in front of the large arsenal
- 1 unit of marksmen to defend Arsenalgasse on the side of the Neumarkt ("New Market")
- 1 unit of cadets, the drill instructor, and armed Spielleute [minstrels?; trans.] as reserves In Gassen and to watch the entrances to the university buildings.

The stationing of a post at Schlüsselgasse by the unit behind St. Peter's was a military mistake, contrary to my orders, and I became aware of it only as the troops were drawn back.

True to my intent not to place troops in the arsenals themselves, I left them occupied for the duration by weak units of the civic guard. Given that the field office was separate from the positioning of the troops, the doors of the arsenals were well blocked, the ordinance as far as possible were placed in the wings along the Fröschengraben, nails were provisionally placed in the touch holes and two trustworthy workers were charged with nailing them up if necessary; finally, behind the doors of the entrances of the upper wings were placed canons.

After all of these preparations had been made, I rode back in the accompaniment of some cavalry at 7:00 p.m. up to the Krone and over the Graben and the Oberdorf in order both to check on the positions of the civic guards and to make myself visible to the already numerous civilian peasantry circulating in the streets of the Large City [see page 30; trans.] that, in the case of an eventual disturbance I would be recognized and my voice, raised to hinder any calamity, would be obeyed.

Having returned to the troops, I repeated to the commanders my instructions with respect to the decision solely to defend the arsenals, which essentially consisted of only in the most extreme necessity to use weapons; should the danger arise of being crushed by the crowd they should retreat into the closest houses.

I especially explained once again at the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") that the free circulation on the square from Storchengasse to the bridges after the Postgasse was in no way to be restricted, and only the already existing line of sentinels from the Senior Civil Servant Miser to the corner house of the Postgasse was to be maintained as long as possible. I commanded the leader of the cavalry to continue patrolling up to the Krone in order to remain continuously informed of the arrival of the crowd's sizeable numbers.

Before I turn to the tragic events what occurred shortly after, I must here add the personal comment that I had constructed an entirely incorrect notion concerning

the manner with which the crowd would come into the city. I thought, namely, that they would arrive in much smaller groups and would move back and forth as they had during the afternoon in far greater numbers through the streets. In fact, I couldn't have imagined what, in fact, turned out to be the case, that they would advance peacefully in great, disciplined numbers under designated leadership on the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") and Neumarkt ("New Market"). Had a single person been able or wanted to say with what leadership the arrival of the crowds was to be accompanied, I would have so taken measures that even more could have hindered the disaster. However, I received no advice and no closer instructions.

In my erroneous opinion with respect to how the situation would develop, I expected that any possible disarray would occur only in the evening, but shortly I was informed that the crowd was arriving in great numbers. After I had been impressed with how the military calmly interacted with the crowds at the Large Arsenal, I rushed to Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"). However, I was already too late in that the cavalry had already advanced into the crowd. The infantry had withdrawn, as well, into the houses.

Given that there was no time to investigate why this had all occurred or to issue contrary orders, I quickly returned to the troops in front of the Large Arsenal in order to take the necessary precautions to protect it and, namely also, to ensure the increased security of the field office in light of the actual circumstances. However, in light of the rapid development of events, even this goal was entirely impossible to achieve.

Shortly thereupon, the cavalry followed me down the Zeughausgasse ("Arsenal Alley") and rushed on to the Neumarkt ("New Market") where they later in part and as individuals intruded into the crowd.

Soon afterwards, a tightly compact crowd with raised clubs and other weapons under frightful cries streamed around the corner of Hotel Baur towards the few defenders of the Large Arsenal. My shouts and those of others had no impact. As this crowd advanced eight, at the most ten, steps, self-defense commanded opening fire.

The shots, which easily could have been far more murderous, had the consequence that the advancing crowd rapidly withdrew, and the infantry refrained from shooting as of this point onward.

Constantly concerned about the field office, I was able finally to get inside with some men, given that the entrance through the garden gate should have prevented.

At that point, the cavalry was also able to regroup at Windeck.

My intention was that weapons were to be deployed in the night for the defense of the arsenals, and, in order to prevent any other or hasty use of the armaments by me or anyone else, I ordered trustworthy workers already in the course of the evening to hide the loading equipment and detonators for them.

After the above mentioned events, entirely unexpected as they were highly lamentable (even from most of the troops deeply disturbing), I felt that I had to make preparations should there occur a new attack overnight on my small, miserable troop by deploying some ordinance; to which end the doors in the upper field office wing

behind which the ordinance was placed were opened toward the square and ordinance was deployed from the Large Arsenal next to the Venetian Arsenal.

These steps having barely been taken, I received concomitantly and by hand two written and extremely welcome orders by Mayor Heß to prevent any further firing of weapons. Shortly afterwards, I received the command to turn over the arsenals to the civic guard. As a consequence, I immediately called back the troops to their barracks. Later, I ordered through Lieutenant-Colonel Hirzel-Blarer and Dr. Escher their dispersal and as many as possible to leave the barracks in civilian clothes.

For my part, I arranged for the defense of the civic guard in the field office with the aim of their being in a good defensive position in order to facilitate accommodation between them and any possible intrusion of the crowd. I left them at 12:00 midnight.

Looking back on the short but bloody event, it appears in agreement with public opinion to be unquestionable that, had the cavalry under my instructions stopped and conducted itself with more calm and self-control, perhaps no use of weapons would have occurred.

In defense of the cavalry leaders, may the following be emphasized:

1. that, because the returning of the cavalry patrol was enmeshed in the rabble just as it entered the Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square"), and, as a consequence, the troops stationed there were completely surprised, a rather quick decision was necessary;
2. It could be the case, according to rumor, that someone misused my name to give the commandant of the cavalry the order to keep the Münsterhof completely clean;
3. I have since been told that the cavalrymen were exhorted and incited by bystanders to act rashly and violently.

Once they had ridden into the square, it was natural that, under the circumstances, some time was required before the cavalry could be brought to its senses.

In my opinion, no allegations can be brought against the other troop units and their commanders. The immediate retreat into the houses on Münsterhof ("Cathedral Square") without real necessity was, granted, a mistake that could have led to unfortunate consequences. However, it is equally excusable due to the surprise and, apparently at least, partial dismay of the squad. Finally, that shots were fired at the crowd in front of the Large Arsenal should not be surprising because it was delayed as far as possible and was unavoidably in self-defense.

I can justify the frequently discussed and rebuked deployment of cannon not only by what subsequently occurred, but also – regardless of whatever horrible consequences would have transpired had they actually been used – I am completely exonerated of any responsibility by the oral command that I received to withhold fire from the responsible authorities in that moment as the massive crowd arrived.

Messrs. President, honorable Councilmen, this is the truthful report requested of me, which I believe enables me to ignore a multitude of unconfirmed or distorted tales of errors in judgment by individuals because it would be impossible for me in my

present position and because of the absence of many staff officers under my command to clarify them.

For my part, I have at this time no one to accuse.

While I am able to submit it to you with calm conscience, my actions in the so highly difficult position in which I found myself from the evening of the 5th to noon of the 6th and in which to escape my sense of duty and the, unfortunately, false hope of avoiding harm, does not permit me [to judge³⁶], I ask you to approve the document with my complete and highest respect.

S. Hirzel, Lieutenant-Colonel

36. The bracketed words are absent in the original.

The New Zurich-Calendar for the Leap Year 1840:

Description of 6 September 1839 in Zurich

On January 26, 1839, the entire Canton of Zurich was in an uproar when the unbelievable happened. The Education Council named Dr. Strauß Professor of Dogmatics (in Doctrinal Theology) and Church History at the University in Zurich as the consequence of the vote by the mayor, Melchior Hirzel because it was no longer opposed by the judicious author (d. December 26, 1836) of the *A Layman's Judgment [on Dr. Strauß' Life of Jesu and Views in Opposition to His Call to the University of Zurich]*.¹ – Then, what father or mother would not cringe over sending a son to an institution where the number one professor of theology declares the New Testament to be a myth (legend, fable); who denies, on the one hand, the divinity of Christ, our Savior who was crucified for our sins and rose from the dead, and then admits, on the other hand, that, perhaps a Jesus existed at some point who proclaimed salvation, but he was no more than any other a man This author [Strauß] who himself said in his book (Vol2, page 740): "whoever shares his conviction either has to elevate the congregation to his point of view or, because he will necessarily fail in this respect, must scrupulously adhere to the imaginations of the congregation (hence, Strauß permits and teaches lying and hypocrisy!); or should he fail in this respect, he should resign from the ministry."

However, the Lord protects his church and chooses individuals as his agents who create a society that above all calls itself a Christian society and has positive Christianity as its goal.

In Mädenschwil [a former monastery (trans.)], representatives from 29 congregations came together from all over the Canton to voice emphatically their strong objections to Dr. Strauß' professorship They found it advisable to have each congregation elect twelve men (to be called the Congregation Committee) who, in turn, would select from among themselves two members to serve on the District Committee who would pass on their resolutions to the Central Committee who, then, would receive instructions from the Central Committee. Without exception, every congregation in the Canton committed itself to the Central Committee in a deliberated seriousness and manner that indicated the importance of the situation and brought at all times honor to the people. Followers of Strauß also wrote, sold, and distributed many pamphlets, and Mayor Hirzel published a new, truly Straußian, newspaper called "The Friend of the People. Despite its friendliness, however, it was nothing but smoke and

1. Hans Georg Naegeli, Laienworte über Dr. Strauss Leben Jesu, und Ansichten gegen dessen Verufung auf die Universität Zürich (1839).

mirrors. A Straußian Club was formed, but it accomplished nothing. Opposition from the Faith Committee increased steadily. Everywhere, truly pious men were elected whom one could trust to pursue the good cause.

Then, on March 2nd, the Central Committee distributed an open letter to all the Congregation Committees that contained a statement to the Upper Council of the Canton and asked each Congregation Committee to accept or reject it.

The gratifying result of this referendum was that some 40,000 persons voted for the statement with approximately 1,000 in opposition although several congregations (for example, Winterthur) were not included. On March 4th the Canton's Governing Council sent the following petition to the Upper Council: The Professor of Theology chair is to be filled anew, and Strauß is to be removed. The Education Council agreed to pay Strauß a pension of 1,000 Franks a year. The Governing Council approved the pension.

However, the 40,000 voters were not satisfied with these decisions because they brought no assurance to the church or schools. Long standing opinions concerning the schools were raised anew. The Education Seminar's Director Scherr had been unable to win the confidence of the people. His students were required to absorb too quickly a massive amount of scholarship that distracted them from proper concentration on their profession and frequently came in conflict with pastors. Many of them called themselves Straußians, and that increased the aversion to Scherr's new teaching. The Central Committee had shut down, but the wave of protest against Scherr resulted in its reactivation. Messrs. Dr. Rahn-Eicher, vice-president, and Supervisor Spöndli, actuary, called for a People's Assembly in Kloten on September 2nd.

The Meeting in Kloten

In incalculable groups, some 20,000 men, surged toward the meeting place in the early morning hours despite the frequently drenching rain. The Central Committee had gathered there several days earlier. They were entirely surprised by the participation of so many, and, as a consequence, their spirits were raised. Mr. Hürlimann-Landis gave his greeting from the "Wild Man" Guesthouse balcony to those who had come from near and far (some as much as seven and eight hours). He explained the cause and the goal of the gathering to be the ignoring of the will of the people by the authorities.

Then, the Committee asked whether it should continue in office. After a loud cry of affirmation and with the ringing of church bells, the Committee and as many as were able to find seats moved to the church. After an hour of deliberation, Mr. Bind-schädler from Männedorf stepped out onto the balcony and shared with the crowd the speech that had been delivered by Mr. Hürlimann-Landis in the church. Thereupon,

the Committee's actuary and proctor, Mr. Spöndli, delivered to incessant cheering the resolution to be sent to the Governing Council, which was immediately brought to Mayor Heß by twenty-two representatives. Merz read a resolution concerned with the organization of Christian congregation clubs in which well-meaning persons could gather to be able to find encouragement in standing up to the enemy cabal. Finally, Pastor Meyer from Glattfelden read the petition that contained the unaddressed wishes from the spring. In a moving speech, Dr. Rahn closed the gathering whereupon Mr. Hürliemann-Landis dismissed the crowd.

As the twenty-two representatives under the leadership of the old, senior civil servant Eicher of Mädenschweil brought the resolution to Mayor Heß, he offered a calming response. The Governing Council assembled shortly afterward, came to an unsatisfactory assessment that was then shared with those representatives from the public gathering who had remained in the Casino. They were not a little shocked. Nonetheless, they brought the decision along with their commentary back to the Central Committee.

The Governing Council called for its convening on September 9th.

A slew of rumors again stirred up the people. One heard that foreign troops were to be called to the Canton, one spoke of gatherings of radicals in Hin[...]il and Winterthur and that they were to occupy the armory in the night of the 5th to 6th of September in order to demonstrate who was in control. Not infrequently, one spoke of the guillotine. In all of these rumors the people saw their holiest interests violated and ridiculed by their government's representatives. Dr. Rahn sent the following to all the presidents of the Regional Committees:

"The enemy threatens to have our Fatherland overrun by foreign troops. Neuhaus musters Bern, and Basel is calling up arms. I ask you to stand ready so that when the church bells ring you are prepared for the attack. A good portion of you should come to Zurich, and another should remain at home to protect the hearth." Zurich, the 5th of September 1839, Rahn-Escher.

Preservation of the highest interests was called for against the hubris of individuals and the interference on the part of foreigners, and the longer one waited, the greater and intractable the fight could be.

On the evening of the 5th, out of Pfäffikon came some 600 men, mostly without weapons because one didn't want to use of arms to force the government to accomplish the aims of the people. There followed 300 to 400 men each from Rußikon, Bauma, and Hittnau. After naming a leader, they advanced orderly. As they passed through each village, their numbers grew. In Volkentschweil, men from Metzikon, Sternenberg, Fischenthal, and other communities from the region of Hinweil swelled their numbers so that, according to eye witnesses, some 3,000 men or so had come together. Calmly yet determined, this group marched onward without clamor, outcry, or spoken word with the solemn stillness broken only as they neared villages either by spooky ringing of church bells or the voices of thousands singing pious hymns from the bottom of hearts. A letter from the Central Committee that arrived in

Dübendorf called for retreat, but the people demanded loudly to be led forward. As a consequence, the procession approached ever nearer to Zurich. Arriving in Oberstraß at the Guesthouse zur Linden, they stopped. Shortly afterwards, two representatives of the Governing Council, Messrs. Hegetschweiler and M Suler, arrived to hear the demands of the people Dr Rahn-Escher arrived, as well, and it was agreed to present the following requests to the Governing Council:

1. The fulfilling of all of the wishes articulated in Kloten.
2. The explicit declaration that the Governing Council had no intention either now or in the future to call for the intervention in the internal affairs of the Canton by foreign troops.
3. The annulment of the Seven-Concordat Agreement.

The Messrs. Representatives declared their intent to do everything possible that these wishes be fulfilled and headed back with the assurance that the Governing Council would give its answer as soon as possible.

The people dispersed in all directions in search of food and drink and gathered back together in two hours. They demanded from the city to be given space for them to camp out and by means of representatives be able to ask for a speedy decision from the Governing Council. Thereupon, the procession, divided into groups of four with twenty marksmen in front followed by other armed men behind them with the remainder, some 2,000, armed only with sticks, many poorly clothed, but all well-disciplined, broke out in the following song:

This is the day the Lord has made,
His will be done throughout the world,
Praise Him, what was done by Jesus Christ,
In heaven and on earth.
The people awaited You,
Until the time is fulfilled,
Then God sent from His throne
Salvation to the World, You, His Son.

The strong notes echoed powerfully through all the streets and surely, as well, in many hearts.

On the town hall square, the armed men joined Pastor Hirzel and moved over the Lower Bridge. The unarmed men under Dr. Rahn-Escher went to Münster bridge in order to gather on St. Mary's square to rest. It was about 8:30 p.m.

God is my song! He is the God of the strong
Noble is His name and great are His works
And all of heaven is His domain.

The crowd separated singing this song. However, as the armed men arrived at the point where the Storchengasse entered StMary's square, Pastor Hirzel heard the approaching cavalry and stepped before his marksmen and implored them, in the name of God, in the case of an attack not to return fire until two of them, even if he is one, lay dead on the ground. The cavalry burst onto the square with waved swords.

Pastor Hirzel stepped forward and cried out to Major Uebel: "We have not come belligerently but to continue our discussions with the Governing Council; I swear to you by God, don't start a civil war!" There was no response but also no charge by the cavalry. Rather, Major Uebel and his dragoons took a few steps back. A discussion could have avoided the spilling of blood.

However, the dragoons surged a second time, were met with the same response from Pastor Hirzel, and they pulled back again without a verbal response. A third time the cavalry surged with raised swords, this time much closer to the demonstrators. A shot was fired into the air (according to one witness from the left side of the dragoons; according to another from a house, still another says from a cavalryman, another that shots came from both sides), and in that moment a dragoon spurred his horse forward and charged Pastor Hirzel. A marksman behind Hirzel saw this, and he fired in response. The horse fell with its rider. Shots were exchanged, the cavalry retreated toward Münster-bridge where the other column of demonstrators, those without weapons, arrived from the upper bridge onto the square singing:

No sparrow falls, Lord, without Your will;
Should I not silence my heart with the consolation,
That Your grace preserves my life

The cavalry turned against these new arrivals. A fight ensued, and someone called to Pastor Hirzel: "OK, then! Charge, in God's name!" Just how little the crowd wanted blood, however, is confirmed by the fact that Hirzel led his people past the fallen dragoon and his horse without touching a hair on his head.

Following the delivery of a few blows, the cavalry retreated at a gallop so that most of them came to a halt outside of town. However, the demonstrators were then met with a more dangerous enemy. As one half of the people entered Postal Street in order to block the return of the cavalry, the other half, most of whom were armed, turned in the direction of the Venetian Armory in an attempt to gain weapons for the demonstrators. A shower of deadly fire came down on them from windows of several of the surrounding houses, as the residents themselves reported. The demonstrators, nonetheless, believed that they would soon be victorious because they were told from trustworthy sources that the arsenal was in the hands of the city, which was no more in support of the Governing Council than the assembled demonstrators. Unfortunately, though, this rumor was false. Arriving at the arsenal only to be greeted by fire from the houses above and without the proper implements to force open the door, the armed demonstrators retreated quickly but orderly – at first, over the upper bridge, in part to escape from the assassin's fire from the windows above; in part, in order to rejoin the other half of their comrades who were mostly unarmed but engaged in battle in the Postal Alley with the infantry behind whom was a canon loaded with grape shot. The result was that the smaller group from Pfäffikon, consisting of all the armed demonstrators, retreated to Riesbach in order to wait for their brothers from around the Lake of Zurich whereas the unarmed demonstrators fled the city in all directions

Right at this moment, in the midst of his efforts to save the lives of his brothers, State Councilor Hegetschweiler lost his own life whether by accident or intent is unclear but, in any event, at the hands of troops of the government. He was wounded by shot- This man of the people, who in the truest sense of the word had worked for the interests of the people, which made clear not only with his penetrating insight but also with his honor-filled heart that the prevailing eccentric tendency in whatever respect, also in the public lives of despised public officials, can only result in ruining the whole state. His life as his death will be eternally remembered by the people of Zurich.

As the Pfäffikon group was withdrawing, the alarm bells rang out in the city. We need to examine more closely their role in the decisive day's events. On Thursday evening at some point between 10:00 and 11:00 p.m., the dispatch arrived from Zurich that the region of Pfäffikon had sounded the alarm. In Zurich some 300 to 400 men immediately signed up not so much to defend the present government from the people but more to protect persons and possessions. The leader of this civic guard was the head commanding officer, Ziegler. Of these recruits, some 40 were posted at the armory along with government troops by the Governing Council following the recruits' indication of their preference of assignment. The above misunderstanding arose over the city's or the Canton's control of the armory, as a consequence. Generally, the intention was that there was to be no question of a conflict, and this was strengthened when it was learned that at daybreak the armed volunteers from Pfäffikon had stationed themselves calmly and in an orderly fashion outside of the city and had already established contact with the Governing Council. Even the approach of the volunteers had not disturbed anyone because it was known that they were merely concerned strategically to locate themselves in order to conduct negotiations with the government and, for the most part, were unarmed. It was all the more a surprise when the news of a skirmish having begun between the people and government troops reached the convened officials at city hall. Immediately, the commanding officer, Ziegler, called his staff together and made it officially clear to the officers that he himself would fire on them with the very first shots against the people. The advancement of the city's troops and the sounding of the general alarm moved the Governing Council to place the armory entirely under the control of the city.

At this very moment, the Governing Council took flight: some went behind, others above, and still others below the building. Only four members remained as the fighting broke out. The troops retreated from the demonstrators, and Colonel Sulzberger, their fearless leader, demonstrated his true colors as he tried to take flight dressed as a noble woman with veil and corset but was recognized and brought back. However, he was not harmed other than that he was dismissed.

At 11:00 a.m. residents arrived from both sides of the Lake of Zurich from Küßnach, Ehrlibach, and Herrliberg having been informed of the tragedy experienced by their brothers from Pfäffikon. These new arrivals were all well-armed, with fierce looks, and filled with courage in the face of death. Following much misunderstanding,

the news of the departure from the region of Pfäffikon arrived only later in these lake communities. However, when it arrived, everyone was united, young and old, rich and poor, that they would go to the aid of, and risk their lives for, their brothers, God, and country. The countryside and lake were covered with troops rushing to bring assistance. Thank God that they were not greeted with more resistance because it would have brought far more bloodshed.

In addition, droves and droves of volunteers arrived from the remaining parts of the Canton, especially from the region of Uster, so that in a few hours a huge gathering of people, courageous in heart and with weapons of all kinds had gathered without, now, any government. Who wanted to take into his hands the reins of this massive group with all of its responsibility, especially the burning hate of the hunted party? Yet, driven by the wish to avoid any further disaster, Heß, Muralt, Mayer von Kuonau, M. F. Sulzer, F. Sulzer, Hürlimann-Landis, and Escher-Schultheß took on the perilous task of assuming the leadership of this public situation. They deserve eternal thanks not only from the Canton of Zurich but also from all of Switzerland for their devotion to, and love of, the fatherland. Only strangers by origin or heart could fail to recognize and defame them.

They won this thanks: The joy with which these thousands unequivocally accepted their leadership; the peace that has been preserved ever since; the happy hope with which the entire Canton looked toward a better future is the best proof of how sacred the people viewed the situation for which it had risked everything.

Let us now turn our grave attention to the wounded and death of September 6th.

They had followed the call of the Lord to protect the sacredness of the fatherland and left their homes behind but were not to return with their comrades. They fell in the grim, bloody fight: some, to suffer through to renewed health; others, to find their home immediately in heaven. The wounded were brought to the Canton hospital, and the dead were brought to the Predigerkirche in which all evening until midnight their Christian brothers sang spiritual hymns of comfort. In order to learn for themselves to live with, and to inculcate, a sacred fear of the horrible consequences of civil warfare, many thousand wanted to view the bodies of those sad victims who had fallen for their faith.

We are all indebted to the fallen, the dead and the living, to make known that from the drafted reports of the government and pastors about many individuals – with but one exception – the universal testimony to their piety, integrity, industriousness, and quiet, domestically inculcated purpose. By far the most came from poor, extremely meagre circumstances who had to struggle by means of strenuous effort to acquire the daily bread to sustain themselves, their wives and children, and not a few, also, older parents and siblings.

The Wounded

1. Heinrich Kreis from Altikon, the last ten years from Myla
2. Heinrich Meier v Bäretschweil, born 17 April 1814, weaver; married and father of one child
3. Hans Jakob Lattmann of Bauma, born 27 March 1814; married but died without a child
4. Johannes Kägi from Bauma, born 23 May 1816, pamphlet printer; married, father of one child
5. Hans Jakob Spärri from Fischenthal, born 14 October 1819, cotton weaver
6. Hans Rudolf Müller from Hittnau, 59 years hold (he defended himself with his stick against the attack of the military and received three wounds on his head and a bayonet stab in the stomach)
7. Georg Weber from Ausliko, parish of Pfäffikon, father of two children
8. Conrad Boller from Pfäffikon, father of one and of four stepchildren
9. Johannes Gubler from Pfäffikon; bachelor
10. Heinrich Keller from Turbenthal, born 11 March 1798; married, father of a son
11. Johannes Würgler from Uster, resident of Hottingen, born 8 April 1787; father of six grown children of whom four are married
12. Heinrich Bär from Weißlingen, born 19 October 1814, pamphlet printer; bachelor.

Wounded among those in the crowd: the student Wirz, woodworker Nüscheler, student Freuler, and carpenter apprentice Hoffmann.

Deceased

1. Hans Jakob Kägli from Bauma, 56 years old; left behind his wife and two children
2. Hans Jakob Jucker also from Bauma, 53 years and six months old; left behind his wife and three children of whom two were infants
3. Hans Rudolf Spärri from Allweisen, parish of Bauma, 21 years and six months old, left one child behind
4. Heinrich Tobler from Hinterbalm, parish Pfäffikon(Unknown; rumored to be from Gossau
5. Hans Jakob Weber from Vorderbalm, parish Pfäffikon, left behind three children
6. Hans Jakob Boßhard from Auslikon, parish Pfäffikon; left behind an emotionally disturbed wife and a 14 year-old child
7. Bartholomäus Diener from Herisau, Canton Appenzell, 27 years old, the last three years from Zettel; he supported his 80 year-old, extremely poor Father
8. Konrad Marthaler from Oberhasli, parish Niederhasli, 34 years old, served in Hegnau, joined voluntarily the civic troops; bachelor

9. Hans Heinrich Egli from Metzikon, 20 years and eight months old; bachelor, pamphlet printer; left behind poor, gloomy parents whose only consolation was his sister
10. Heinrich Schnurrenberger from Sternenbergr (died on the 12th), 20 years old; bachelor, the single, dedicated and childish naïve and deeply loved son of his aggrieved parents. Remarkable is the particular, official declaration of how he, four weeks before his death, anticipated his horrible fate. On a Sunday evening, his departing, weighty words as he left the home of one his closes relatives where the disastrous developments of the day were discussed were: "I feel that I don't have long to live. There is going to be war, and I will die in this struggle! Care for my father and mother!" He spoke gravely and anxiously concerned although normally he was so cheerful given that he rarely had cause to have such thoughts.
11. Jakob Diggelmann from Pfäffikon, twenty years old; bachelor (died on the 16th)
12. Jakob Dietliker from Pfäffikon, resident of Kempten, parish Wetzikon, 28 years old, carpenter; left behind his wife and three children
13. Heinrich Müller from Hittnau, amputated and died on the 29th; left behind his 54 year old wife, three grown sons and two daughters; as the case with others, he said at the time of his death: he dies joyously because he dies for a just cause.

The first nine were buried on Sunday, the 8th, the tenth on Saturday, the 14th, the two following on Friday the 20th, and the last on Sunday, the 22nd of September. The services were officiated by the second pastor of the pastoral community, deacon Pestalozzi, who had faithfully comforted the wounded with the gospel.

Thursday, September 12th, the most beloved sacrifice brought through these events, Governing Council member, Johannes Hegetschweiler (born in Rifferschweil), whose massive head wound prevented his regaining consciousness so that he died on the 9th, was carried to the grave from the Post Office building that he had left with full awareness to deliver the message of reconciliation. The crowds were huge that accompanied the procession to the grave: relatives, his physician colleagues, the provisional government, the city council of Zurich, professors from the university and Canton schools, several governmental envoys, representatives of various committees, the civic guard of Zurich and several other communities, everyone dressed in black, and thousands from city and countryside accompanied the coffin to the graveyard in which also were laid to rest long ago; Lavater, Usteri, Schultheß, Escher from Linth, archivist Hirzle, and Dr Römer. Even the military remaining in the city gave their honors to the passing deceased. In St. Peters, Deacon Fäsi delivered a eulogy and passionate hymns of mourning accompanied the blessed departed on his way home. Hegetschweiler's name and the grave remembrance by all of this man killed in action remains a blessing to our Father land! Those left behind have united themselves in friendship by helpfully accepting Christian hearts and hands. May your ashes rest in peace!

Listen, the bells toll their muffled sound
And proclaim the coming struggle and storm,
Gruesome echoes ring out from every church tower!
Alas! Today death and life hold forth.
Crusading – great Father – crusading be victorious,
Or die having succumbed in the fight.

Pastor Hirzel draws nigh,
(With the bold people of Pfäffikon,)
He proclaims God and His Son,
God's Spirit induced him,
To stand at their helm,
To fight with them for the most Sacred.

The crowds grow ever greater,
Ever larger gather the soldiers for the fight,
All have taken up arms;
On ships they come to land,
In order to fight for sacred Right,
Surging forward God's servants come.
Rounds follow upon rounds! The fighters' daggers rattle;
This hour came too early –
Brothers fall on top of brothers,
And the bullets ring out in the air.
Many faithful found their deaths,
Many groaned under their horrendous wounds.
Hegetschweiler, without any weapon,
Courageously pressed through the crowd,
Was gravely wounded by a shot
Peace was his good aim
Where they fought bravely for their Sacred Heart,
He fell! – Now he has slipped away.

Paulus – On Theological Academic Freedom and the Election of Instructors for Universities

Sent to All Those
In the Free Canton of Zurich,
Who would also like to test
The Conscientiously, Examined Convictions
Of A Liberal Foreigner

From
A Councilman of the Grand Ducal Baden Privy Church Council and Professor
For Theology and Philosophy,
Dr., Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus,
in Heidelberg

Zurich,
Printed and Published by Orell, Füßli, and Company
1839

Translator's Summary of Paulus' Themes

1. Justice is above the law
2. Academic freedom rejects prescribing in advance that which is permitted to be found.
3. "Theory" is not the enemy of "praxis."
4. What "is to be learned requires truths that are not concretely empirical."
5. Academic theology demands time from church leaders to convert the mental exercise and conviction of the university into church teaching.
6. "That which is presented to [... persons] without adequate reasons by means of merely the authority of old names and models can't have any resonance in those unbiased, ruthless minds [of students] and should all the less be presented to people only to be recited blindly."
7. "[...] the content of the teaching of early Christianity is not dependent on these [questionable New Testament] stories."
8. "Nothing [...] is heartedly more necessary as inward religiosity." "The word itself [religiosity] suggests a thoughtful mental attitude, a reflectiveness. Out of this

- reflectiveness with respect to humanity and God comes the desire for a closeness and harmony with God as the certainly good, perfect spirit.”
9. Against sexism and slavery: "The oppressed feminine sex would be elevated to human dignity, and the slaves who were innumerable and as horribly despairing would be treated as 'Fellow brothers before God' and allowed to expect for themselves to be among the fellow redeemed."
 10. Reconciliation with the godhead and united for Christ's Kingdom of God is what it means to become a religious Christian. Building a faith committed to divine reconciliation, the Christian Kingdom of God would emerge and every honest person's welfare secured.
 11. Understanding cannot be strong-armed by a certainty that cannot be understood differently.
 12. "When it comes to spiritual things, what is less adequate than a majority vote?"
 13. "Vehemence is never a sign of a certain faith."
 14. "Who made us judges over those who think differently from us?"
 15. "[...] those should be trusted who are able to have thought things through having bracketed self-interest."

The Text

"Should we believe religion and Christianity for the sake of the persons or the sake of the thing [*Sache*] because of its essential substance?" This, succinctly stated, is the question that, unexpectedly and with vehemence has been thrown down before you as a gauntlet, O staid, free, but for that reason easily agitated, Swiss citizens!

More accurately understood, this is the universal question of our time. Reputation of the person? Or the content of truth? Which is the best possible self-examined conviction? Which is correct?

One places the person and the thing over against one another. This is a fundamental error, but one committed all too easily. One separates the thing from the person. One forgets that persons are *the means*; the thing should be and remain *the goal* of everyone. One shouldn't oppose the secondary aims of persons with the attainment of the primary aim of the thing. Persons are united for and by the thing. However, the thing should be primary. This is in general the solution to the conflict.

We want to consider the question, for the moment, generally. What should hold true?

What is to be obeyed, when it comes to the decisive action of a government by a great, legislating Council of a free state from the carefully advised, more knowledgeable authority? The will of the people? Or the truth-in-itself? That is it, which is reflected in clear, impartial minds worthy of truth that in any case occurs only by means of calm, multifaceted, clear observation of an object and all the opposing

reasons involved. That which the honest and considered person can say with full consciousness: Good! This is what is correct, the best possible!

Many outside of government oppose the persons in power and, therefore, reject what they have carefully considered and chosen as the best possible for everyone because the government didn't respect something as excellent (and recognized even by the opposition) to be acceptable and most worthy not only for the (properly named) *hoch-Schule* ["higher-"School or university; trans.] but also for the spirit of the whole of that which externally is no little respected but not in common with the scrutinizing, observing, republican Canton.

Others want some other persons because one could have more influence on them or because the legislators do something, as the case with all finite persons, that they don't like; but something perhaps, were it not difficult and frequently hindered, could be achieved more quickly and would flourish.

Other persons would prefer to be the rulers. Unsatisfied persons, who don't believe they have enough say, suggest other plans that, in part, also have, or could have, their good sides. The worst is when they inspire others to heated action out of prejudices, as a consequence of smaller issues. For what clouds healthy judgment of the common citizen more than the fear of, or desire for, agitated passion? In this fashion, the opposition links up with powerful and respected men. They can bring honor to the leadership of the faction. They attract blindly following or half-blind followers.

Ambitious persons at least see that the legislators possess a power that one can envy as long as one doesn't recognize patriotically enough how much effort, care, and responsibility lurks behind the glitter of this power, and that, behind the transient power, duty, and law that is dependent on the will of all citizens, one can expect a strict tribunal by means of the free, public judgment that can bring honor and shame for life in the free history of the entire free confederation [Swiss: *Eidgenossenschaft*].

I do not possess any information about all of the particular personalities who would like to inflame you. No friend of the people would gladly expose the nakedness of the fatherland. As Napoleon said, in order to wash black clothes, one doesn't go to the market and invite the pouring of juices over them.

Only as an observer of people, as once the Swiss-honored knight Hutten who fell asleep on the island of Usnau said, as one to whom comes everything humanly important warm in the heart, and as an observant freeman by means of insight, I describe as a carefully deliberated man who may never either allow or encourage destruction of a well-meaning cause, a means of discernment, of wisdom, or of intellectual formation for improvement. Personal concern should never "captivate" independent goals.

Having grown up in a spiritually akin neighboring country under a monarchy but a long tradition of constitutional government, I have paid attention to but, nonetheless, never personally fulfilled a lifetime wish to see with my own eyes Swiss customs and Swiss prosperity or to experience the causes of the same. I can envision the Swiss situation only by means of general anthropology and several, particular phenomena. However, having been educated up-to-date some almost 60 years ago in even the

ancient, once monastic educational institutions of Württemberg, which to this day raises its pupils, without stifling mental restrictions but all the more shaped by comprehensive "studiousness," – as now Professor Strauß in a livelier epoch – I have been obliged since to acknowledge my great appreciation to several German monarchical governments for fifty years of rich research and teaching. However, never, not from dissenters even, in that time did the constantly exercised freedom granted to me as a university professor and in writing bring forth good fruit by means of [external; trans.] personal persuasion or party pressure but through clarification of reason aimed to be valid either by means of dutiful agreement with others or practiced confirmation of them.

I have taught publicly for years. I have written much (almost too much?) but never claimed something that I didn't regard as having been proved to be true. When it frequently diverged from what was usual, from that which the majority wanted to be the case, never did either the German people or the government call into question my academic freedom, still less my person.

In all of my theological efforts, what mattered to me as my conscience and utterances confirm, was the most important thing: to portray the Christian religion grounded in itself, in its simple, undeniable, permanent truths from within itself, believable, applicable, independent of persons and times; as I look back at the enduring important persons with respect, with amazement, with the intent by others and myself to be able to make them firm convincing examples of the (practical) will's activity. And as long as I am aware of the reasons of my conviction, I will not cease to look back on them so reverently although I at the same time have found nothing human that is infallible.

This all was permitted to me by the principal ruling individuals, as well as by many others in our German-monarchical institutions of higher education or universities, as among the most important corrective means for all that can be improved academically, and it unquestionably enjoyed legal protection as was also the case with those who taught otherwise than I.

O esteemed Neighbors! Even you can't be surprised, that I am astonished, yes, extremely surprised, that even now in a state organized through itself (by a clear and developed understanding of its citizenry) and under a government that has planted the corrective means through rearing and education in school, church, and institutions of higher learning, to be sure commencing at the right places, nevertheless should seek to achieve exactly the opposite having been forced by demand of the people. Simultaneously, a fear of ghosts was engendered like once occurred at the Sea of Galilee where Jesus' disciples believed that the storm raging around them was caused by wandering ghosts on the shore. Or is it more than a fear of ghosts when you, strong Christian believers as you are!, when you allow yourselves to be convinced that someone could steal from you your faith, when you truly know what you believe? Or the tiny boat of faith of at least the good trusting citizenry or of the children and grandchildren will sink because a non-Swiss will be called to the university, an

individual about whom in recent years, by those irritated with him, all kinds (mostly very insignificant) opposing voices have rung out, but with respect to whom, as well, many testimonies of respect on the part of rigorously examining dissenters, has gained universal recognition.

Why this split? Because he, this 30-year-old, distinguished Tübingen private lecturer, by means of lengthy, excellent preparations and thorough philosophical-theological lectures, armed by a research method that promises much more and with unselfish love of truth and possessing a mental calm, whose strength and mildness in his work and even more in his defensive *Streitschriften* must shame all of iron will. Because he has directed attention in a radical manner to the great difference "that stories of the distant past, when viewed in reflecting minds as the truth in-itself and from which should arise ever more clarity, cannot by far have the clarity and certainty as pious teachings whose stories' primary content are the product of those very pious teachings."

How is this any different than that Strauß adds to the principle:

Certain and effective is the internal, religious Christian faith when it is constructed on essential content more than on stories from persons and brief, merely traditional events of the past, which, certainly, have attained from their temporal context their powerful, salutary influence.

An honest mind should question himself when he conscientiously holds himself back as a result of some inclination to injustice in a biblical passage or a biblical example. Is this not primarily possible because it corresponds to an in-itself true warning from one's innermost reflection? The warning occurs because it is true and undeniable at all times. And we should thank the person who says and adheres to it because it is true in-itself. But the warning isn't true because that person said it. And the judgment remains for that reason universally solid:

There would be many, and many among us, who would be habitually more effective in Christian action when from childhood onward, they had taken on as their own as in-themselves true and as eternal duties of conscience, certain powerful words and examples from our book of holy folk tales and not mixed them with tangential claims that often require too much belief.

Doesn't just the opposite occur, when one wants to rebuff a pressing desire by means of a biblical passage all too aware that it is just a mere play of understanding to interpret merely historically differently – with the consequence that the passage is no longer so strongly applicable for erasing my desire from my mind by the interpretation providing an excuse for this entirely different situation? Yet, only that decides how to act properly and cannot be denied as worthy of, and desired by, God, which still today is and has been for thousands of years as true-in-itself in conscience and reason. Where else does the rawest contempt for religion break out than where piety is to

be constructed on the unbelievable and to be followed only to achieve the praise of people.

In contrast, the principle that what is historical and personal from antiquity, indeed, is to be tested, but, primary recognition of the means for the applying of the in-itself as true of Christian piety is due, surely, to the higher academic freedom that has arisen in the German, monarchical universities; the academic freedom that until recently still no one dared to be stunted for the blessed Johannes Schultheß. Someone with his conventionality, erudition, and biblical exegesis could be compared, in the first place, to us non-Swiss whereas his talent of presentation, his breadth of knowledge, his gentleness still especially justified the vocation with the young and the stranger. For now, we are speaking only of academic freedom that is primarily exercised only by such individuals who are generally recognized as talented, as independent, and capable of serious research.

How can it be that this academic freedom can be now placed in question with respect to someone with these qualities among a very respected part of proudly, freedom loving Switzerland? Why so intently fought against? Before I can speak to the issue and person, I need to make myself clear.

Switzerland, to this point, has had little engagement on its own with the question of the goal of higher education. Germany has tested its dual goal for centuries.

One would never call a professor of law to a German university under the stipulation that he exclusively propound and teach the currently applicable (now stable) law. One does such things perhaps in the Gymnasium as an introductory exercise to be expanded upon in the higher years of school in order (one perhaps doesn't even know why?) to bring the uninformed students closer to the so-called "sciences" of the university.

However, the academic professor of law must explain the existing laws in his discipline with respect to their usual or controversial meaning. He must also draw attention to and nourish by comparison to external causes and internal reasons how the currently existing law has come to be. But where he no longer finds the existing law relevant enough, he will clearly formulate, unquestionably, precisely this existing sense of the law in order that what he regards as needing improvement can be carefully judged and his modifications clearly profiled. Never has it occurred to a Department of Justice to forbid such a practice, which would threaten the authority of existing law.

Why not? It is clear that one is to act and govern in conformity with existing law as long as the law is valid. But from where would appropriate improvements and often great improvements come from given that there are constant changes in circumstances and, especially, changes in human character? Would the religious and worldly authorities or the people have stopped burning persons at the stake had not the university professor of law, Thomasius, lit a different light in the minds of youth? Would the examining magistrates have substituted other methods that were for them much more difficult, objective investigations for what was for them the convenient strategy of torture? Would those comfortable with the long-standing lawful order have

made the effort to carefully distinguish between justice and injustice, if not for the spirit of justice and legislative skill that stands above the law – by observation of the true in-itself also in these disciplines – had they not been trained by men, who, according to the standard of academic freedom in institutions of higher learning, had concerned themselves, irrespective of past and present practice, exclusively with the examination of the knowledge and ignorance in the broad expanse of their science? Such improvements come from men who have nothing personally to gain either in honor or profit from maintaining or changing long-standing traditions and only are powerful as a consequence of the thoroughness of their judgments! It would be irrational to expect those who wish to be guided by truth in-itself from now on to search out the most careful and demonstrable if it were to be prescribed in advance what they are permitted to find.

That manner of investigation that examines its object on the basis of nothing other than itself (i.e., with respect to the truth in-itself), as is well known, is called theory or the theoretical (that is, contemplated [Grk.: *theoria*; trans.]) However, it is not to be set over against praxis as an enemy. They are to be combined with one another, to be sure. However, acclimatization in application or praxis has become so comfortable for some officials and most conduct themselves so mechanically that, when they happen upon something in practice that shows itself to be in need of improvement, most leave everything "as it's always been," were there not institutions and times in life where new wine must be filled in new wineskins; to be sure, in a manner that the wineskins don't tear. However, I can't imagine that Swiss youth, prepared for university, are easily torn: such tearing would have to be caused by ignorant wrenching.

Seriously, when it comes to the teaching of law, one hears least frequently anything about limiting academic freedom, the one strategy that can bring about learning and self-reflection. The historical school wants to further broaden itself by drawing upon all the legal wisdom of Rome, Byzantine, and India. The newly educated, legal understanding might give examples that adapt a German legislation to the Germans, but it isn't necessary first to make them un-German. Should there be competent professors who perhaps as individuals are too one sided with respect to this or that other favorite opinion, his concern is to create a discussion with those in his audience and with the public generally who wish one.

It occurs to no one, to whom the most pressing issue is justice with respect to mine and yours, that without academic freedom one can hinder on the basis of recommendations from accepted praxis unthinkable self-reflection over symbolic books, or objections by juridical graybeards, or impromptu decisions of citizens.

Why not? Jurisprudence has things that through perceptible life experience can readily be used to confirm what is missing whenever academic freedom attempts something inappropriate. In contrast, only those disciplines eager to protect themselves prohibit certain teachings for whom those in control find it difficult or impossible to demonstrate that they are immutably correct (as those in control usually want to believe themselves to be, without backtalk).

The more one's work advances into uncertainty, the more people tend to believe. That is, that which they mean to have brought back is to be trusted without question although much of it nobody can demonstrate as true in-itself as something to be accepted by everyone as indispensable.

Nevertheless, I don't even want to ask, for example, if one could expect of a long-standing, traditional, medical staff of reputable practitioners to give their studied opinion for approval of a university professor who introduces unsophisticated, simple remedies that question the credibility of well-studied prescriptions and could give pharmacists less to do. However, a government board concerned with the healthcare as a whole would not veto the entirely different method from usual health practitioners that healed by means of simple procedures, and would vouchsafe the academic freedom of circulation for his opinion. However, the resolution of the conflict is not so obvious. For, if the patient dies, despite one's having done for him everything possible with medicinal flasks, the experiment can't be repeated again to see if the more simple remedies would have saved him. Unlike by the jurists, the question hovers over the imperceptible. The authorities may for a long time defend their traditional practice. Though, if one wanted to decide the issue by means of a republican, general election or by means of XXII representatives, in place of the absent professional wisdom, the majority would triumph with ease [regardless which side it took; trans.] under the old saying: "The more the better!" as long as no other considerations come into play.

We turn, rather, all of our attention to that, which the theological faculty?, to what by them is to be the teaching of Christian piety?, and what through this teaching can be necessary for the entirety of Christian faith for conscientious, liberty-loving citizens.

What once was done or attempted to be done better in your vicinity at the Councils of Constance [1414–1418] and Basel [1431–1445], where did that come from? As is generally known, from the seat and vote of learned instructors from university faculties next to cardinals and highly sinecured dignitaries of the church! Admittedly, instead of from relics of opinion, a piously-formed person knew more about how to ground in-itself true convictions. Pursued for that reason, he barely reached the Swiss border where his life was saved, whereupon Aeneas Sylvius first by the people (through popularity) and then by flattering the self-made church leadership and those congenial to them was transformed into Pope Pius II [1458–1464].

The Reformation, this great renewal, that pressed for focus on the cause not the person and replacement by biblical teaching of papal and church authority – this once tremendous renewal that we all now respect as an ancient faith, where did it come from? From the universities and from placing such intellectual and knowledgeable men filled with the power of youth, as a Melancthon from Bretten and Tübingen as well as a Luther from his Augustinian monastery to Erfurt, who were allowed un-atrophied, diligent academic freedom that soon elevated the schools and the clear self-awareness of the populous.

And your Zwingli, who can never be praised enough, would he have ever had convincing effect if he hadn't first, in an academic manner, gathered teachers around himself and investigated with them collegially the coherent significance of the Bible and essential, true teachings? Then, according to his own understanding, he called someone to account who, according to merely personal beliefs, converted gold into common coins and put them into circulation for the purpose of meeting the needs of the congregation. That is something even the noble Ruling Council of the day wouldn't have accomplished, that is, the replacing of the everyday for the preaching of the sincerely, pure biblical teaching, if Zwingli hadn't prepared the teachers academically and when the populous hadn't attentively waited to see what it could find for itself to be the truth in-itself.

How powerful in 1829 your Dr. Johannes Schultheß referred in the preface to his excellent explanation of the parable of the lost son (to the pleasure of the rejoicing senior citizen, Pastor Oeri) and at the same time to the enlightened Antistes Wirz [1737–1769], with whose lectures on the symbolic books and orthodoxy the older majority of the Synod of 1740/1741 was unhappy, and in the face of whom he [Schultheß] together with the theologian Joh. Jaf. Zimmermann erected a monument to truth. Schultheß remarked with regret on page XXVI that back then one "by repetitive presentation of the path that religion and church have wandered for as long as anyone can remember, never was given to hear the name of this pioneering man in the Zurich Synod; after whom came the Antistes Ulrich [1769–1795], an equally honorable benefactor and supporter of free thinking and clarification in religious matters."

You know yourselves that this good could not have emanated from Zwingli and also from the instruction of the people of Zurich if the veto of a church council, at the discretion of the majority of the clergy at the time and not yet independent, had reigned supreme in opposition to the application of this academic self-investigating manner of teaching and academic freedom. Indeed, in Germany also, it is reported at times of individual church councils but still more frequently on the part of half-Methodist pastors and synod members that they got all worked up against scientific, intellectual improvement in the institutions of higher education; that they warned against it as non-applicable; even warned against its dangerous overexcitement of the people's piety; and, therefore, more volubly preached against heretics of hearsay about which their congregations otherwise would hardly have heard a word. They quarreled over the character of science and didn't know what they were doing because they had never thought about the fact that, in order to be known, what is to be learned requires truths that are not concretely empirical.

They would gladly have us forget just how narrow-minded theological studies were in Germany as long as the consistorial councilors (*Konsistorialräthe*: in the Protestant Church of Germany these are members of the administrative authority; trans.), while focused on the practical especially in church governance, claimed to be competent, as well, when it came to constantly changing theoretical content and to decisions regarding the appointment of academic positions. For that reason, they viewed in particular

the academic, scientific nature of theology as really unnecessary because they were very conscious that, when academic theology began to influence congregations, they (the consistorial councilors), admittedly, first had to expend undesired attention in order that, what first and foremost was a mental exercise and conviction established in the university, now in part was to be utilized as edifying teaching in the church – but also in part was able to be pursued in private discussions with non-theologians. However, should the intermediary persons between the scholarship of instruction and that which is generally comprehensible, between theology and popular religion, after all, not be instructors, who are sovereign in their discipline and have learned to distinguish between prejudices and the essential in order to correct doubters? Should they vainly compel doubters like the laity to simply believe? Would Jacob Boehme have been an honorable school master, if he only knew how to accomplish instruction by beating people? Or isn't the skilled cobbler he who can cut leather for shoes neither too ineptly nor too lazily?

Those of us as fellow thinkers above the dreadful state of affairs of the factionalists want to ask more about the causes than the concealed intentions of prejudices that one seeks to cast before the populous – contrary to the way one proceeds in the university.

When we encapsulate the entire curriculum as would a law faculty as I briefly portrayed above, it is certainly the case that an academic institution doesn't instruct upfront its students to be completely fixed and set in their ways in order to be future lawyers and senior civil servants or to present them to the examining board the exceptional to be assistant heads of a government department, presidents, or even ministers of state. Someone is not well educated whom the master tailor has trained just to sew what is saleable today. He who wants to succeed over time must constantly learn new patterns and be capable of improving himself, which is why preparatory training with the master in the new but also the old fashion is necessary.

Only with three things is the student to become acquainted in all of the interrelated disciplines: with that which is taken presently to be valid; with that about which it is yet worth thinking (from out of which, as with inadequate knowledge, improvements can yet arise); third, however, with that which appears already now to require improvement. Indispensable in this threefold curriculum aim, by which the tradition bearers of the past are retained sometimes with praise, sometimes with ridicule, is that always student judgment is practiced on all such compelling material by searching for and finding of justificatory reasons. That which is presented to them without adequate reasons by means of merely the authority of old names and models can't have any resonance in those unbiased, ruthless minds and should all the less be presented to people only to be recited blindly.

However, if judgment as much as possible becomes not only enriched but also accustomed to the sharp distinction between that which is merely apparent and that which is true in-itself, then, admittedly, such a one must first immerse himself in what for him is the reality of everyday life and apply to that multiplicity of particularities of the real world that which he has learned to see in generalities according to the various

levels of approximation from the probable to the certain. This is what can't be learned in advance because someone can get close to the truth by this or another perspective, and even the Apostle surely thought about whether he had to give his brothers milk toast or heavy nourishment, in other words, must have prepared himself to distribute both.

In addition, many mental skills themselves are unexpectedly stimulated only through life experience; and, in any event, tenacity in commercial industriousness and perceptive agility (sagacity) in seeing through a situation is manifest in various degrees. Therefore, it can surely occur that someone without social status can rise to be the Minister of Justice because no academic training and academic freedom can prophesize such things.

How strange! Academic instructors themselves, who contributed to making such a promotion possible, do not fancy that they could be just as well Minister of Justice. They know their task consists in the observations of scholarship, not in life practice. They preserve (for others, as well) this inner mental life of free contemplation of those things that they can share with others as true in-itself; a mental love and sense also that with respect to mental things "It is more blessed to give than to receive." However, they are certain and are properly proud that the successful man of honor could not have become a worthy Minister of Justice without their competent, academic training, not without their academically sharpened legal sense but simply by means of faith and ignorance about why the law is fitting, also not without a clear overview of many, carefully thought through legal cases, and not without the skill to subordinate the reputation of persons below what is essential and true in-itself.

Why do I converse with you, friends of the mind (!) about what the juridical part of academic freedom in higher education does? – Only because, thereby, I have already portrayed to a great degree the theological-academic function. Here, too, the general, primary task is the threefold, foundational presentation of the utilization of the most accredited, then the ancient, out of which arises reform and other conflicts as well as judgment with respect to controversial opinions but also with respect to already accomplished improvements that, in part, have become, established but also, in part, are yet to be applied.

How? Will perhaps he, who has made public some suggestions of improvement with which others disagree, for that reason not be able to be competent in properly presenting on the basis of reasons variations of what is currently acceptable in church dogma and morality? Will he not as church historian be capable of portraying what is controversial (just as the law professor has to apply legal sense to many controversies) according to reasons and decisively important empirical instances if his talents for elucidation and justification and his technical skills in philosophy and languages have been proved to be excellent?

Otherwise with respect to the issue at hand, it is well known by most about Professor Strauß that he has drawn attention to deficiencies with respect to certain, mostly short (not with respect to investigation and transmission of many important

circumstances), established stories in the gospels, and, as a consequence, he's made himself conspicuous. Nonetheless, there is nothing clearer for those who comprehend the breadth of Christian religious studies than that the content of the teaching of early Christianity is not dependent on these [questionable] stories. Hence, for these scholars early Christian teaching certainly is able to stand itself with justifications. Because he not only believes it merely out of trust in the persons to whom the revelation of those teachings is indebted but also knows on the basis of internal reasons that the teaching in itself is true, so can he who knows his talents, teaching ability, knowledge, and his distaste for controversy, and non-revolutionary character not doubt that also Christian teaching (of the sort the teacher of the people must be prepared to defend with academic conviction) can be a central task of his scholarly, free teaching appointment. Isn't that confirmed by his statement of faith with respect to what is transitory and permanent in Christianity? Does not the human spirit of his writing in which he accepted the appointment testify to how correctly he distinguishes what can be taken to be striking by the less informed from the more difficult task to be able to meet the requirements of the informed?

Should not those, who spread suspicion with respect to Strauß' academic theology and created fear among the trusting masses, first and foremost state whether their Christian faith, rests on particular, personal considerations rather than, far more, on personal salvation that is capable of being recognized in-itself? Rather, we know far less than we might wish of the person, who fewer than three years ago appeared in the public sphere and, nonetheless, left his sunlight for the entirety of the educated world. Should not those, who assume that the faith of the weak is to be safeguarded like a shell-less egg, first say, themselves, what it is they believe to be and as faith wish to have guaranteed, if not that the guarantee of every truth of the spirit must be maintained only on the basis of itself?

All the less one-sided can Professor Strauß' Christian faith constitute a class of its own and appear so to students because it is likewise explicitly stated as his professional duty to provide historical presentation of that which has been the teaching of the church from the very beginning throughout the changing opinions in time as well as the constitution of the oddest churches. Who can work through the history of dogma and still remain opinionated and intolerant? By far not (!) a primary task of his teaching position is the outstanding dissonance among scholars over how the original stories were generated; even less is that a concern of the people and of general Christian faith.

It is good that these kinds of open questions have arisen. Only after having presented the possibilities with respect to what is most likely can those on the basis of the means of research decide whether the questions have validity entirely, in part, or not at all. However, how imperious those act, who question that which must first be illuminated by means of the pro and con of the researcher, and who depict the questionable as necessities of life to be decided by a majority vote in great haste as the "will of the people."

Those will hereby trust me to provide an all the more certain impartial evaluation [*Gutachten*], in that I already have the luck of being known by some of you, already. This is because for more than forty years I have sought to defend another view concerning the generation of the oral and written stories of the gospels. This has been the product of an incessant and conscientious academic freedom by an undisturbed examination on the basis of my acquired language-, historical-, and human-knowledge and most recently presented in my exegetical handbook of 1830 and in my "Life of Jesus" in 1828. By my pursuing the internal traces, the events of the life of Jesus in our gospels are closer to me. They appear to me so pure of connections to Jewish and church circumstances in contrast to those that arise following Jerusalem's destruction in 70, that they certainly would not have remained so had the narrator and collector had already inserted those later views into the earlier history. Could more fanciful images emerge of a pious faith so short, so incomplete, and mostly without expression of astonishment? Foremost, doesn't Matthew's gospel refer most of all to articles about which Jews of the Jesus' day could raise objections (such as that Jesus had done and suffered much that doesn't apply to the Messiah); objections, which few after the year 70 would have noticed and would not been recognized by later Jewish doubters with respect to Jesus' divine mission because they could originate only out of closer impressions regarding what had happened?

That it is possible to transform opinions into facts and then anachronistically to attribute them to the past is, admittedly, also an explanation of the origin of a transmission. However, aren't most of the peculiarities in stories generated more likely already with the idiosyncrasies of the first observers, witnesses, and by those re-telling them? Moreover, it is almost impossible to conceive how the so precise, specific descriptions of evident and palpable confirmation of the bodily resurrection of Christ so soon after having been laid in the tomb could have been generated out of mere visions. Yet, the effects of it were immediate not only by the courage to remain in Jerusalem but also that a congregation, in that very place in the presence of enemies, could organize itself and so rapidly grow by means of prudent organization.

Enough! You yourselves, who listen tolerantly to this old geezer talk about himself, will perhaps laughingly think that I have succumbed to my humanity by this tarrying with wanting to establish as valid a few of my own counter-arguments. It is so! I have published several reviews in the Darmstadt Theological Literature Supplement (*Darmstädter theologische Literaturblatt*) with almost all of my reasons against Strauß' personal view concerning those stories that are anachronistic (myths), over which very few on all sides possess adequate knowledge and training that would make it possible for them to form a judgment in such matters. However, are not the less trained, therefore, more certain that I wouldn't be so yielding in the face of an opinion that in the moment has won far more approval than my own which remains closer to the usual, common judgment? How could it be possible to champion something that so obviously would cause fear of a disturbance of popular Christianity? It has been my life-long endeavor to clear aside only views and reasons whose indefensibility even the

blind repeaters no longer will be able to conceal as expendable and not as un-Christian in order that, far more, popular Christianity all the more certainly consist of the true in-itself, of the universally believable and applicable, as well as bringing forth more living fruit. Meanwhile, my aim was that indolent belief in secondary matters that can only be addressed by scholars would become inefficacious and incapable even of evoking belief in eternal divine anger.

All the more earnestly can I come to the main point. Professor Strauß finds only narratives of events more uncertain. Not stories but what contributes essentially as teaching of the origin and fostering of Christian religiosity, what therefore, in the faith of a Christian people should be planted and cherished most of all is also what for him is the in-itself true and enduring in the gospels. This Christian teaching is so elevated not only above the expectations of the Jewish, later prophets but also above pagan, fearful, priestly opinions concerning the necessity to propitiate the gods with blood that Ur-Christian congregations, also, would not have had such certain visions and anachronistically included them in the gospels if they themselves hadn't received these "out of His fullness." What has been preserved and passed on in the gospels in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' parables (especially of the tax collector and of the prodigal son); what has been passed on of the sayings concerning his life's goal, the believers' emancipation from sin and connect it with forgiveness only through the desire to have true conviction, but above all, also of the necessity of strenuous remorse, and rebirth by means of which arises a more and more conscious increase of God's Spirit elevates one out of the dominance of sensuality; all this is the teaching pressing into Christian hearts, which, if only since childhood our complete Christian living had been bound, worthy persons and truly Christian citizens would be shaped.

These teaching points are in-themselves so eternally true that they certainly were made to be revealed by the true Christ, who fulfilled the better ideal of messiahship; because this ideal itself could not have been achieved according to the opinion and expectations of its time. It would be only our, the teacher's, fault if our church congregations believe merely on the basis of the effectiveness at that time of miracle stories and then, should it be that these historical stories prove to be uncertain, Christian faith be threatened.

Let me quickly summarize what is at stake and, especially, what is at stake for a people striving for the strength of faith and freedom.

Nothing, dear fellow Christians male and female, is heartedly more necessary as inward religiosity. I say: Religiosity (!) and not simply religious teaching. Just what is true religiosity?

The word itself suggests a thoughtful mental attitude, a reflectiveness. Out of this reflectiveness with respect to humanity and God comes the desire for a closeness and harmony with God as the certainly good, perfect spirit. Even pagan religiosity: from where does it come?

Thoughtful persons came to the belief in the necessity of harmonizing with imperceptible, higher spiritual beings. However, because they mostly considered the power

of these spiritual beings to cause external things, by them not even human virtues and the righteousness of the will that comes with them were presupposed with respect to those spirits; hence, they expected anger or grace from them to be capricious. As a consequence of their still all too incomplete reflection, religiosity couldn't be aroused as spiritual, active volition. Soothsayers and priests of sacrifices intervened in order that with their help the people were meant to win divine favors and grace by means of gifts, abasement, and vacuous devotion.

Alas, human reflection works slowly! However, at the time of Isaiah, not only for those capable of thinking had the faith in a single God arisen. After Anaxagoras had looked on the single God in awe as spirit, Socrates had stimulated knowledge or attainment of knowledge in terms of that which humanity should want and achieve – far more than in terms of speculations about superhuman rulers over nature. For that as is well known, ostracized forever from Athens by its misguided citizens, the venerable man was even shamefully maligned and rewarded with the cup of poison. However afterward, all the sooner and generally, a manifest, benevolent shame and remorse occurred. The maligning accusers were detested both in and outside of the Athenian free state (see Nüsslin's excellent explanatory notes to Plato's "Apology:" 69). Later philosophers or "want-to-be" philosophers were no more allowed to be disturbed and tormented by self-interest and reverence although their attempts at thinking, as is the case with everything human, never reached perfection; often, they had many peculiarities, occasionally a disgusting side.

At the time of Jesus, many reflective persons, the quiet ones in the country, developed the yearning to come into harmony in a reliable manner with the gradually acknowledged God, the One, highest, the ruler of many subordinate gods (Polydämonie). Only the long, ancient acclimatization with respect to conceiving God as capricious, as revengeful (one doesn't know how long), whose anger first needed to be propitiated (one didn't know, by what means), frightened many away from a religiosity fulfilled mainly among the pagan cultures of the no longer raw Greeks and Romans.

How did the one designated from the manger onward as the "Holy God" (John 6:68–69), raised by God the Father for that purpose, in a for us impenetrable silence and reverence, know to find the religiosity in the so-called Holy Land? Almost even worse!

To be sure, a great advantage of the Jewish people was prepared already several centuries earlier in that a magnanimous prince of shepherds in full possession of his desire for righteousness connected up with a righteous God and consciously affiliated with him. Abraham entrenched it in the popular religion of his descendants that those who are reflective (but these are frequently only the few!) revered the perfect willing of the divine whereby the instable capriciousness (the absolutism) of the pagan gods could be eliminated from religious teaching.

Reflective persons grasped this already that Abraham's confident adherence and his God of righteousness was acknowledged by God as the true virtuousness of the spirit and must be in the judgment of the one who knows hearts as counted up and

accredited (Romans 4:3 according to Genesis 15:5). They certainly hoped that all must go well for those who in this faith of Abraham lived in the desire for righteous-harmony with the just God – above all for themselves but also by the respect of others.

Oh, how easily human desires transform spiritual hopes of faith into expectations unworthy of God. They were even transformed into raw demands of selfish advantage and pleasures. At the time of Jesus, almost the entire Jewish community argued that, merely as Abraham's descendants, they must be blessed by God and preferred before all non-Jews.

The Pharisees added that, whoever only follows the laws commanded by Moses and their interpreters' is righteous enough if he only adheres to the external side of the fear of God and doesn't want to adhere to that in-itself lawfulness. The temple servants raised the stakes of national pride higher: They cried out that, we alone, possess the true worship of God. However, God has to want that the entire world worships him. God's omnipotence must put all peoples at the feet of us, God's only people, in order that we may force them to bring sacrifices to Jerusalem. They should work for us, and fall to our feet, so says a concluding chapter in the prophet Isaiah (60:10, 12, 14, 61:5; 66:12). And the arm of God (the unbeliever may always recommend other methods of conviction!) will guarantee for us an eternal rule over the world by our world-overpowering Messiah (Daniel 7:14, 27).

The worst was: the simple, freely chosen spiritual righteousness of the founding patriarch was forgotten. A faith of service to God without inner respectful harmony with his will of rights was called, in the context of such traditions, the religion on which one no insists. In addition, on the basis of an erroneous notion of the Messiah, a hate must rise up over against all other peoples, a contempt for the omnipotence of Jehovah that must achieve victory by means of the authoritative will of the Pied Pipers through their violence; the one who, like it occurs to the incorrigible, accelerates the demise of the wildly immoral and self-serving rage of the crumbling state.

Jesus' holy religiosity came to the rescue in opposition. He stood as if "on the parapet of the temple." His spirit said to all people: Only when you want to be spiritual children of Abraham will you be in possession of that righteousness-desiring religious faith that makes you free of sin and, as a consequence, free from fear of God's capricious punishment. Only when your actions arise out of conscientious righteousness willed by God, will you be religious or in harmonious peace with the perfect, good God.

However, Christ's spirit stood, also, as "on a high mountain that surveys all peoples." Then, his word began to make widely apparent that spiritual righteousness makes "children of God" of every single person everywhere, among all peoples and at all times; to make participants in the universal Father of all humanity that then, where such children of God remain in enduring fidelity to God and also hold together to the external order and supportive community, they achieve a part of God's great kingdom, a universal, life-effective religiosity. Everyone should "aim first" to be in accordance with this spiritual, messianic kingdom of God" because it can and should spread to

all humanity when each one for himself begins to want this religiosity without waiting first for the majority.

This was the original redemption of the Christ-religion. Especially the God-revering people of the pagan world accepted this comfort that God as Father could not be angry, who must be propitiated by means of one's own or by the penance of others. It was clear that God as spirit could be served only by that which is spiritually true, the righteousness of the will, but that the faith of the just without just actions would be only a poor secret deception. Thus, became obvious that this righteous attitude was available everywhere; the good of all nations would be united. The oppressed feminine sex would be elevated to human dignity, and the slaves who were innumerable and as horribly despairing would be treated as "Fellow brothers before God" and allowed to expect for themselves to be among the fellow redeemed.

Only those who continue to call for the reign of temple sacrifice and not that of religious harmony with God must call out to the world redeemer: "Your house will become for you forsaken and desolate" (Matthew 23:38, 39) until you are better prepared for the blessing of the coming Messiah (the founder of a spiritual reign of God) in the name of the Lord.

Safeguarding these simple, comprehensive ideas, along with everything that is necessary for the internal improvement of humanity, primarily contains that which is the original redemption that is our Christian religion. It is not about particular controversial questions, tasks of reflection, and possibilities that all too easily will be raised to dogmas or contentious doctrines but, rather a single reconciliation with God, inclusive of both pagans and Jews, that can be carried from Arabia, across Syria, Asia Minor, Greece over Rome to Spain. How could it have been made a world religion, offering a hand to every city as a light igniting from one town to the next if it didn't comply with the needs of hearts and lives en masse, but had been constructed on subtleties for which one demands belief by guarantee of literal formulae?

The certainty of a single, revealed reconciliation that is capable of universal achievement by active wills harmonious with the godhead and united for Christ's genuine Kingdom of God (i.e., what it means to be able and to expect to become a religious Christian) was as simple as it was unmistakable. Simultaneously, it was shocking to pious pagans and Jews that the Messiah for this universally convincing truth without violence, like a Pied Piper, had to sacrifice his own blood. It became clear that this direct mental connection with the fatherly divinity dissolves all that is limiting in Judaism and paganism (according to II Corinthians 5:17) into a third, into "a new creation" of conscientious, free spirits. Every reflecting person grasped that as ever more persons come together in this active attitude of faith committed to divinely desired reconciliation, the most trustworthy, Christian Kingdom of God would emerge and every honest person's welfare would be secured.

Out of this arose warm, spirited, excited resolutions. One fraternized, assisted, and exhorted one another. New converts were full of the Holy Spirit. On the tongues of acquaintances and strangers was proclaimed that "One thing is necessary!"

Yet, soon the simply undeniable became all the more difficult. Unquestionably, each individual in this moment of consciousness can renew the resolution "be consistently right" to make it a law for oneself. He fulfils in that moment, according to Matthew 5:48, Jesus' task: "Be perfect as your Father in heaven."

However, in this same moment, one can backslide by imagining exceptions. Only consistent habits lead to the spirit's subordinating the sensuous under itself without hesitation.

The more backsliding appears to make one's intention more difficult, all the more one believes: earlier I, too, was religious as one concerned only with God and divine things in thought – more than with willing. So much is excited by the invisible but also only the imagination. How more comfortable it would be if only by wishing all kinds of riddles in religion like (dogmatic) claims could be solved. Oh, how entertaining visions of spirits that accompany such descriptions; and if one in the first half of one's sermon calls up representations of the heat of hell, so the second half extinguishes the flames with the thought that one has already confessed and done enough if one only this or, even more, that believes – or wishes to believe. One overlooks, though, that Jesus himself, as often as he spoke in the gospels of his suffering death, never revealed anything of such things as the goal of his death. And if one or the other of such supposed teachings (dogma) is difficult to believe, the talking and hearing of them is more comforting than the serious, biblical demand for repentance, change of heart, and no one pleases God by believing that, without repentance, one's actions are already sanctifying.

In short! Mere belief in thought about teaching opinions has little effect on conscience, but, to be sure, educated and uneducated can feel as if by such speculations they are religious. The consequence is that in Christian congregations one deteriorates quickly into fragmentations of the primary, central ideas and slowly instructs and forms for oneself all kinds of ever more artificial, doctoral systems in which the morally sublime essential becomes concealed beneath the many pointed and entwined distortions. By means of sophisticated artificialities, in gothic cathedrals thousands of pointed columns stretch up toward heaven. However, not only do they not reach it, but they also don't bring hearts any closer to it ... and the sense of beauty and taste for them, as well, does not descend down from heaven.

In any case, anyway, not only was the philosophy of the day, generally, congested with such questions about dogmatics, but also it is altogether the nature of understanding that it not only wants to know "what" but also, still much more, wants to know "how." Already for the congregation in Corinth according to I Corinthians 15:35, it was not enough that the spirit would have influence on someone for whom spirit was due. The question was also "Why?" ... and the individual? He believed that his faith required a physical resurrection of a body that was recently discarded – as perhaps many now claim to believe that there can be no heaven or God if he cannot imagine and calculate for himself "how" God exists and reckons to his faith that there is a literal throne of God some hundred miles above Mont Blanc.

To be sure, one cannot magisterially prohibit even the understanding of such specific flights of thought as well as the transient doctrines that come from them. They are the training school of the understanding. Understanding should learn by means of them. We can do no otherwise than to examine carefully all possibilities in order to discern what is the most probable. Nonetheless, neither an instructor nor students, nor any other authority, is permitted to make an unequivocal law out of possibilities. Your Swiss form of agreement has the good intent, to spare people from doubt about some syllable, and prohibited even teachers to believe that biblical providence allows for some important textual discrepancy (variants). How does it help that one wants to restrict this provision only to the Hebraic text, which, in any case, appears to call for effort only on the part of candidates for the pastorate? Understanding should not be limited by understanding and still less by misunderstanding, which mostly occurs when understanding requires a strong-armed certainty about something that it cannot otherwise understand and believe (and also can't give convincing reasons) for which no other understanding is permitted to be different.

Do you not remember yourselves Zurich's famous, long followed, little misunderstood example? Our Luther with his prejudice-free research of the obscure biblical sense was convinced, not without trepidation (as he said himself), in opposition to Leo X that Jesus word: This is my body! This is my blood!" does not say: This bread is "transformed" into my body, and this wine (especially) is "transformed" into my blood.

What we human beings cannot know without revelation must either be openly said to us, or it is not a revelation. Luther adhered to this indisputable rule; but – not always consistently. All too long accustomed to worship of the "great mystery" (*tremendum mysterium*) of the glorified body of Christ, he felt something spooky when he no longer had to think about it as a mystery, a divine miracle. He examined the feeling and found that it led him to a new, unstated mystery. He said to himself. This blessed bread is the body of Christ. It is and is so because Jesus said so. Therefore – in, with, and under this bread, which stays bread must be Christ's body, and still more amazing in, with, and under this persisting wine is given to us Christ's blood by God's miraculous power.

But then, how did your reformer, Zwingli, equally scrupulous in the sense of possessing a more easily acquired sense of antiquity after study of Greek and Roman and who was freer and more calm in many ways (in the authentic sense: "republican"), judge differently? That in, with, and under the bread and wine was given a miracle, he found to be not certain! If we were supposed to believe it, Jesus would have said it to us openly without needing to wait for Luther's revision to be clear. Am I permitted to give up the one, unstated miracle, to replace it with a still more mysterious one, and to require it of popular belief?

Despite the danger of zealously being called an opponent of the mystical, a "matter-of-fact person" (because of Rationalism), your confessor and martyr differentiated himself in his "Dogmatics" by emphasis first and foremost on the essentially certain of original Christianity which can and should be interpreted reliably according to

common understanding and without depending upon mystery because, in fact, if it were to be believed by means of mystery, it would not be revealed by revelation.

For Jesus, who was still completely present with his entire body, and for the twelve disciples, the broken bread could obviously be taken as a symbol for what his body was to be confronted with the following day on the cross if he didn't sink into a death-slumber beforehand. It is explicit that he charged them, as often as they broke bread, to think of him, the person, in order that all that was connected with him would be never forgotten.

The obvious is revealed! That was Zwingli's conviction. The understanding in the period that followed him (that inquired conscientiously) noticed ever increasingly that he possessed the correct rule of explanation. Only "Church faith" appeared to suffer under the Lutheran danger. Many feared: "We turned Luther's re-writing into revelation for our people because we ourselves sincerely believed, all too narrowly. But now? Will not the people generally suffer a shipwreck of faith, will they not fall into superficial unbelief in opposition to Christianity, if we admit that we have made a mistake with respect to such a central article of faith?" This is the fear of ghosts which in so many cases surround that which is certain (but also much that is only probable) of the comprehensive church faith. However, religious faith and devotees of Christ will be only so fully faithful and, which is the central point, devout and actively committed, the less they are expected to believe as absolutely necessary what is incredulous!

In the end, no one among us can deny any more that the ambiguous cannot be revelation. Where there's no sign of mystery, what is said is to be explained according to the plain natural sense in conformity with its situation.

However, each comprehends this as good as he is able to comprehend it. Each one should beware trying to convince the other of his doctrinal position or to describe the other's position as abominable by means of denunciation, even with distortion of his character. The Evangelical Church-Union finally has offered in this respect the radical, better example.

At least in this respect of church faith, where one believed all too long that one must stand over against one another as damned, those of firm convictions have broken fresh ground when it comes to this effort, when it comes to wanting to be right, to think as correctly as possible. The desire to be exclusively correct dogmatically in order to want to rule on its basis universally, must abdicate. A more inward religiosity says that everyone should cooperatively do what Jesus openly said to remember of his cross and everything clearly united with it. However, neither God nor humanity will want to steal from someone what he is able to think or feel according to his own best possible insight. Only, the liberated ones also should not enslave others by meaning that they should make the means to spiritual liberation more difficult.

Here is a great example that the simple, clear, pious understanding finally leads more successfully to the goal than that which seeks mysteries and would like on their basis to construct castles in the sky that seek to employ laws enforceable by the police rather than reason to protect the people. Here is a proof from experience for

the fundamental rule that says: "Dogmatics" should in every significant aspect of its ingredients, that is, in its articles of probability, maintain nothing for popular faith as a mystery that is not given openly.

Surely, however, there are things that are mysterious over which the scholars and popular faith would gladly like to articulate more as different possibilities (i.e., dogmatically). For example, some want to know with such certainty the "how" of our eternal life, yes, even what we were or weren't before our existence, and what we inherited some six thousand years ago in body and spirit that they hate and avoid everyone who could "steal" this, his certainty from them. Oh, what certainty!, what faith renunciation that so easily must become uncertain that it is fearful of what the claimant actually only scornfully likes to call: "Winds of doctrine." I want to feel sorry for those who must be so anxious that, because they have maintained much that is merely possible as secure and certain doctrines of faith, all of a sudden fear they must see all religious faith evaporate as soon as they acknowledge they have attributed too much to them. However, No! On the contrary, what distances one from the community of faith is only insisting on what is unbelievable, the wanting to be right in matters of the church because whoever is committed to vigorously acting on what is right also wants to hear and think correctly and thoroughly.

Nonetheless, there are also mysteries! – mysteries both in and above nature, this great totality of all changing things! There are also religious mysteries although religiosity as wanting to be in harmony with the divine will is clear and without mystery. Who wouldn't gladly know how spiritual beings are in contact with God's essence? – and many other such things?

It is emphatically permitted to investigate impartially and conscientiously the solution to religious mysteries. However, when in the process different solutions depending on human ability and receptivity arise, the great, primary doctrines of Christianity are not, thereby, endangered. The zealots must learn humility that the mere possible doctrines (dogmas) should never become the foundation of the religious edifice! If something begins to be shaky in church faith, the blame can only fall to those who, in opposition to I Corinthians 3:12, now and again don't want to stop construction with combustible wood, rather than use bricks.

Here, too, I am reminded of a Zurich example. Jesus' so tremendous, historical influence stands as a miracle in the sense of being a delimiting meteor between our two worlds. How are we to think and what are we to believe about the divine and the human natures in the world? Were a human to be created beyond the degree of everything that any human spirit is capable of achieving with respect to wanting to do what is right, how could God be our standard in God-given true conviction?, how could He demonstrate what a human spirit with determination is able to achieve of divine-acknowledged dignity according to the aim of doing so only by means of the matter itself without the assistance of any accommodating social power? Was he able to do so by his own will, or was he essentially and from the beginning inalterably related to God?

Difficult questions? Nonetheless, it was not what he was as a person but what this person by means of the matter itself (through teaching and deeds) did for all Christians wanting to do what is right (and for what we should want to do in conformity with what is right) that is the primary concern of our religiosity. The personal is a mystery just as the eternality of spirits generally. However, the personal is capable of being investigated to a degree.

Only, from the very start it is established that, when it comes to this class of teachings about mysteries that are incapable of being known unequivocally, one is not permitted to ground what is essential to the Christian religion.

How the questions were answered over time when it comes to the essential divinity of the person, is known by almost everyone with respect to the words. Whether or not faith in the essential of the person Christ has been effective and enduring throughout the many centuries can be even less unclear. The perfection of our desires and actions is not dependent upon mysteries. For that reason, its investigation is unrestricted!

Your pious, educated, and judicious Antistes Heß, did he not discover (as I recently published along with a review of the excellent dissertation by Professor Melchior Ulrich in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt der allgemeinen Kirchenzeitung* [1838], Nr. 118 on the basis of the thorough description of his life by Professor Escher) something different (over against what has dominated since the Church Council of [Nicaea] in 325) in several biblical passages about the relationship of Christ with the godhead? He discovered something biblical and believable from that opinion of Zwingli and the German Reformers drawn from the majority of this Council. When it comes to spiritual things, what is less adequate than a majority vote?

Antistes Heß didn't only discover his honest conviction. He published it in his writings, in German, in universally understandable biblical exegesis. Even our best forebears are incapable of investigating from the beginning and sufficiently everything and for all times. How would it be to hope that, from the many possibilities, the overwhelming possibility (or perhaps better, the impossibility of determination), if not every possibility with all its apparent justifications, was permitted to be presented for open examination?

Well? Would that mean that that deviation would necessarily require a modification of Zurich's Church Doctrine? – when identified by an Antistes, especially an active and approved Antistes who has more direct influence on church faith than any instructor of theological knowledge and investigation at an institution of higher learning? Or would you think that God and Christ would resent this honest man, were you in all sincerity and conviction to be a different opinion on such points, which are not so formulated that they must be understood the same way by all linguists? Will all that is necessary [for faith] not be revealed with such certainty and made so humanly recognizable that all deliberating persons universally would understand in the same way?

Must not that belong to the unessential, which is not clear and revealed in the same way for everyone; about which each individual should believe what he finds believable according to his possible, best conscientious conviction?

When it comes to that which is necessary for Christian, religious harmony for desiring that which is right with God, no one can doubt. "Those with pure hearts see God" in non-counterfeit faith. Who can interpret this otherwise (although, unfortunately, most don't adhere to it) as it is undeniably understood? Remember each of you, though, what has equally been said: God doesn't allow His own to be ridiculed! Who among us could conceal from the all-knowing One, when he desired to embrace the Christian faith made it look as if he had, but was aware that his political and church principles were entirely opposed, or when he let himself be enthralled only by the noise makers to riot or to pursue dishonest intent under the resolution: Believe! Religion! Participate with others in the defense of that which is impossible or a universal harm. Vehemence is never a sign of a certain faith. That is as certain as that the clear, deep, heavenly blue in our beautiful lake is reflected when the powerful calmness of the lake receptively looks up.

A third point, still, is that there are traditions preserved in our Bible that ask us, what in that time was believed about such secondary issues but is not to be taken to be doctrines for us as enduring, central ideas.

One thought back then, for example, was that, until it was re-united with an appropriate body, every soul sojourned in an appropriate intermediate stage: the good in a heavenly, others in a painful place. Those crucified with him were to expect that, on the very day that their souls separated from the body, their souls would be in paradise with Jesus Christ. Read Luke 23:43 and 16:23! Christian doctrine not only began with expecting an immediate entrance into blissful heaven but also, in accordance with Matthew 25:41, 46, combined with an eternity of damnation in hell.

You yourselves know how many honest persons take this as an opinion of that age and not as Christian teaching; or only understand it as an expression of doctrinal cleverness. You know that when it comes to the question concerning – for many unbelievers – eternal punishment in hell, generally starts with the distinction between what is enduring and what is in keeping with the epoch. Who made us judges over those who think differently from us? Could, should we not allow their reasons to be open for examination and completely communicated in order with greater certainty that which is unbelievable in them can be separated out?

How did Friedrich the Great calm the storm many years ago in the case of Neuchatel where there was a temporary, threatening uproar in matters of belief with respect to the eternality of punishment in hell? "If my dear Neuchatel citizens want to be eternally damned, I am not able to do anything about it (as painful as that is for me)! However, that no one in this world will be damned or harmed is my obligation as the defender of the rights of all!"

Let us summarize that for which I have attempted to provide reasons for your reflection,

The quintessence, the result.

It is short and simple.

Nothing is to be decided in terms of the person, everything is to be decided and done with respect to the state of affairs, the truth, that is, with respect to the investigation of truth and the living of the truth!

Respect the person. The state of affairs can only be aided by persons who have earned trust and for whom faith in them is supported by enduring influence.

When it comes to religious faith, distinguish between what is necessary for harmony with divine will (the "Peace of God" of Romans 5:1; 8:6) and what is poisonous to our reflections and clarity.

What is personal can be historically doubted. For that reason, the state of affairs cannot be constructed on the personal. One has doubted whether or not the stories of [Wilhelm] Tell are historical. Has that in any way brought doubt about the achievement of Swiss freedom?

In conclusion! – in order not to be too loquacious. Dear friends and You who are of a different opinion! – with one word: You voters of the Republic of Zurich! Could a freedom-loving individual not view it as sinister when he with the greatest and least earnestness ends with the words: Don't do anything that would dishonor the constitutional spirit of free states!

It is no small thing, when I remind you of Athens, that once self-ruling people. As much as it was famous for its sense of the beautiful and good (for *kalagathie*), nonetheless it did its theory of freedom an indelible dishonor when it presumed to judge beyond its powers and banned Anaxagoras as an atheist (thankfully, not permanently). Anaxagoras, the first philosopher, whom we all venerate because he alone was able to think of God as pure, knowing, desiring, and active spirit (as *nous* independent of body) – at least, the first who risked stating it.

Why did they judge him such that their greatest, most powerful statesman Pericles, could drive the calm thinker, who merely uttered his own opinion, out of the agitated city and place him in physical danger? How otherwise than because the so-called free people made a judgment about something, which at the time required a much more improved, teaching aid. How many were able to say in their conscience that great word from the outcast: "God is a spirit!" in all its scope and unprejudiced consequences?

The will of the people is something powerful – yet, it is more easily destructive than constructive. It is only exercised in conformity with human dignity when each individual himself adheres to the law: decide nothing by means of mere will. Only when each individual wants nothing other for the public realm than that about which he has conscious, clear, and calmly thought through enough – only then can the will of the people in a republic achieve well-being and honor. Otherwise, those should be trusted who are able to have thought things through having bracketed self-interest.

I have not been merely concerned here about the person, Professor Strauß. To be sure, I am convinced that, were he able to be observed for a quarter of a year in your Canton, you would vote for him to come permanently. Wherever he has appeared in

person, he has won minds! I even believe that, were you to hear him lecture in church history and philosophy of religion, you will find it worth the effort to hear him lecture in dogmatics. Permit, then, others also to take your place. However, my wish would be that now the development of his mind has begun, he would narrow his position, with the same agency and conviction, without holding himself bound to that which he has already questioned.

Enough! In the Christian, cosmopolitan sense, I believed to be permitted to write to the honest Swiss. Examine! Vote, for what you take to be worthy!

Heidelberg, the 6th of March 1839

Dr. Paulus

De Wette – Dr. Strauß and the Church of Zurich:
A Voice Out of North Germany from Dr. W[ilhelm] M[artin] L[eberecht] de
Wette

With a Preface

Basel,
Printed and Published by the Schweighauser'schen Bookstore

Translator's Summary of de Wette's Themes

1. The important conflict in Zurich is between "free scholarship and the Church as a community of faith," "not because salvation is near." "[...] [I]n the background of the battlefield one sees clearly enough the beginning of a universal struggle in which church and scholarship gauge one another and both go at one another over the final question whether and how far the one is the boundary to the other.
2. The issue at issue is "absolute" academic freedom versus Church faith [Trans.: ignoring of the problems/advantages of "content" claims on the part of either party].
3. "Is the state so thoroughly the guardian of the church that the church must silently and obediently learn and accept from the state what is best for it? Or do we think of scholarship as outside of the church and state [...]"
4. "[...] Truth is not scholarship's product or its discovery but its foundation and content." "Had scholarship, namely, the absolute philosophy, created the Christian faith, that is, invented it, scholarship might do what it wishes with faith: destroy or preserve it."
5. "There is a papacy and priestly class of learning and scholarship, a fanatical tyranny of knowledge. Its motto is *fiat scientia et pereat mundus* ["Let scholarship be done, though the world perish"]!"
6. Warns against the tyranny of scholarship. Scholarship must necessarily be supplemented by religion, art, the state, church, and family. Truth is not produced by scholarship but is the foundation and content of scholarship.
7. Strauß represents the confrontation between Hegelian, speculative philosophy "above" history and the Church's historical faith.

8. Rejects the portrayal of Jesus as a religious genius: "[...] [G]enius can only be transitory whereas the Church has as its content an eternal gospel. The "genius-cult" combined with the tyranny of scholarship turns the Christ into a personality among many.
9. Defends an anthropomorphic conception of God ("the eternal self-conscious providence over the world") and the Christ as the exclusive, "actual second Adam without sin."
10. "Dr. Strauß' teaching^[1] [...] and the Christian faith on the basis of the scriptures and in all editions of the church's doctrinal concepts are essentially different and nullify one another.
11. "[...] [I]t is one thing within the church to practice free, scholarly debate, with doubt and questions about schools of thought. It is another thing to instruct future pastors in faith and knowledge with respect to the gospels."
12. When it came to the calling of Strauß, it was not good that the church was ignored and general Christian believers were only self-serving, anxious, pious religionists.
13. There is true and false reform. The false is merely destructive of the church's "positive foundation of faith."
14. True reformers would rather be burned at the stake than "lose the historical Christ, the eternal redeemer and savior of all [...] peoples."
15. Is the inward kernel of the Christian faith (God, eternal life, and freedom) to be thrown away and consist of a "wise kernel" of stone rather than bread? The "new teaching" does not defend the same God, freedom, and eternal life as that of the Christian faith.
16. Strauß' Hegelianism is not the product of historical criticism but its philosophical ground.
17. We won't desert the "good faith" of our youth by substituting for it the superstition of absolute faith.

1. ^[1] Trans. note: De Wette portrays Strauß as defending a universal, speculative Christology of the "transient," religious genius.

The Text²

Preface³

Although personally a close and by no means indifferent observer of the church movement in our neighborhood, I don't understand myself to be called to take some kind of active part in it. This "Voice from North Germany" I would prefer to see appear with those harmonious names of authors in all parties rather than under my own name. However, because my friend once preferred anonymity and wished to have an introduction from me, I didn't want to fail my obligation. Certainly, these words earn understanding, hearing, and heeding. Scholarship requires a defensive preface, as well, in that it has experienced rejection of a presence on the theological faculty of the Straußian critique by the raucous opposition by church people and their leaders, about whom a suspicion easily could be raised about them, as well. Especially to be desired is that young theologians, from whom will arise the guardians of theological scholarship, will be saved from passionate partisanship and not be the prize of a reaction which threatens to bring to us the fruits of protracted, grave, and radical investigations. The worst enemy of scholarship, that ought never remain alien to the church and whose results should be implemented bit by bit among the people (as my friend has shown), are its incompetent, lazy, or grimly determined youths who are incapable of learning or unwilling to learn the authentic spirit of scholarship and, when they enter their practical profession identify with the side of unscientific thought and maintain and promulgate suspicion against scholarship. The true mediation between them and the church should occur by means of the clergy who inwardly stand in the middle and who should mint out of pure gold the coins in circulation in the school. It is true that pure gold is not always presented in theological lecture halls. However, whoever has acquired an independent spirit and the capacity of independent thinking can find it in himself at least in mature years. Out of the deep, holy desire of my heart, I express the hope that the Lord of the church may send to you ever more such laborers, as you need!

Basel, April 15, 1839

2. The irony of the letters from Paulus and de Wette is that, whereas in the *LJ* of 1835 Strauß had employed Paulus as the paradigm of the erroneous, Rationalist reading of the gospels and de Wette as a defender of the 'mythic' reading of the scriptures (also in his *Streitschriften*), when it came to their submitted letters of recommendation regarding Strauß to Zurich, Paulus came to Strauß' defense and de Wette strenuously attacks him.

3. ^[1] Translator's note: "*Evangelische Kirche*" (literally, "evangelical church") in the German speaking world refers to what the Anglo world calls the "Lutheran" church. The term "*evangelisch*" does not have necessarily the conservative, pietistic overtone that "evangelical" has in English so that I have chosen to translate "*Evangelische Kirche*" more generically as "Protestant church" to distinguish it from the "Roman Catholic church" rather than to refer to a sectarian, theological orientation. There are two state churches in Germany: the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Church.

Dr. De Wette

The call of Dr. Strauß to be professor of theology in Zurich and, still more, the development of the drama that began with that appointment, has raised the greatest attention all over Germany, as well. Who could remain indifferent when confronted with phenomena that contain the beginning of unsettling life decisions! As in Zurich so also in Cologne, one would like to cry out in the same way: Look up and hold your heads high! However, not, as is claimed there, because salvation is near but because a fierce struggle is approaching.

The judgments of momentary impressions having been taken into consideration along with the clamoring parties both left and right – all calm observers, to be sure, agree that in Zurich a long conflict in the Protestant Church, at times secretly but soon openly, has come to a critical eruption between free scholarship and the church as a Christian community of faith, whose devastating power no one is capable of calculating. The movement won't be limited to Zurich. It will inexorably take its course through the entire Protestant Church, and sooner or later will find its end either in a new institutional split or a new powerful union. May God protect from the former and bring about the latter!

The confusion in Zurich provides a measuring stick of the degree to which the new theology has come to stand in contradiction with the church. What is gratifying is that, yet still, resistance is there from the side of the church; that the church is still present, yes, has even received new vitality. If we take Strauß and his party to represent theological scholarship in its purest form, as negative criticism, we then have the spectacle that the church, taking itself to be under attack, decidedly takes itself to be engaged in a life and death struggle. Scholarship, though, at the moment retreats, beat back with severely restrained resentment for a new defiant attack. When now this scholarship says that it, too, belongs to the church and whatever threatens it is not the church but a party in the church (the so-called pious), but the church party equally thinks itself not to stand over against scholarship as such as an enemy but only a scholarly sect (the so-called liberals), one sees of course that the conflict in the minds of the opponents is not yet a general war between church and scholarship generally but a conflict between parties – more like a broad duel than a proper war. However, in the background of the battlefield one sees clearly enough the beginning of a universal struggle in which church and scholarship gauge one another and both go at one another over the final question whether and how far the one is the boundary to the other. We are of the strongest opinion that actually each is and should be the measure of the other and that in their true universality this one has in the other its truth and its life. This will be the goal and true freedom in Zurich as will be the case everywhere that the struggle arises. We maintain this with all the more certainty because we don't find any other result in the first act of the Zurich drama as this: that the church, when it is attacked in its most inner heart and conscience because of God and law, will push scholarship back to its borders.

The objective of this pamphlet is not to follow the facts to their final foundation but only to point out a few things from this perspective that can serve understanding and peace both in and outside of Zurich. Far from the theatre of conflict, we are also without any personal commitment to any of the individual agents involved and can hardly be a party for anything but the facts. We have no personal knowledge of the particular events and individuals of the case; we don't know how the many political parties have been engaged. We know only that we find that both sides have been intent agitators. However, although the colors and nuances are faded for the distant observer, the more universal moments and outlines of the conflict are more clearly and simply manifest, and our judgment can be, all the more, calm and impartial.

We don't want to investigate what led to Dr. Strauß' call, whether it was *his extraordinary talent*, his quick-witted, critical gift, the art of presentation, the comprehensive, complete, and pure erudition, – or *his particular theological orientation*, his speculative, critical Rationalism, or even both together. In fact, his call to this university in the full flowering of youth and for its publicity would confer an important glamour, and it may be that some old and new universities have wished for such a new impetus wish for the same. The faultlessness of his development, his gracious personality of which one hears would be no little bonus. If he knows how to speak and teach so well as he writes, it would be difficult to find a more perfect professor. It is also appropriate for a free state that has freed itself recently to try out what can come from modern North American academic freedom for the lecterns and pulpits in old Europe. If the Protestant Church is nothing more than the community of absolute, individual freedom, so one can expect of it yet more than Strauß' teaching. Whoever holds this teaching [of academic freedom] as absolute truth, as the long-cherished, silent conviction of all scholars, for him it can hardly appear otherwise than as a stab in the back of the Protestant Church, particularly, when it refuses to accept this truth in such golden containers. Perhaps the politicians (in my opinion, the philologists and philosophers, as well) acted on the basis of this view of history who proposed Strauß' call. Though, when the church of Zurich explains its faith otherwise than by means of this pure negation of all that is held together by a common, positive belief, when it discovered that the religious communities in Zurich decisively believed what this new teaching emphatically denies, the clergy had to rebel. After it had been brought to the attention of the church in honorable humility by the Theological Faculty (in this respect the church had an inalienable right) and, more decisively yet, by means of the actual church regime, that, the theological students would be confronted with the original Straußian dilemma – either the faith of the congregations must be abolished (and in place of a historical Christ, was to be preached openly a half mythical, half speculative Christ) or one must engage in concealment and hypocrisy when one stands before their congregations –, it was thoroughly a duty to engage with the church in a more comprehensive debate. The church as a religious community had an absolute right to protest against a teaching of this kind – it is the right of self-preservation, not the right of governance. Or is it only the state that possesses the

right to forbid theories which threaten to destroy it at its foundation? Is the state so thoroughly the guardian of the church that the church must silently and obediently learn and accept from the state what is best for it? Or do we think of scholarship as outside of the church and state, and these [church and state], on their own neither knowing nor in fact having knowledge, are only to obtain an absolute truth, life and death, knowledge and ignorance from scholarship? For us scholarship is a valuable commodity, and we surrender it only by sacrificing life itself. However, scholarship is not the most valued good even were it to be complete and its truth be transparent to all. As an essential part of the highest good, scholarship is necessarily supplemented by religion, art, the state, the church, the family and, as when it comes to life as with nature, truth is not scholarship's product or its discovery but its foundation and content. Had scholarship, namely, the absolute philosophy, created the Christian faith, that is, invented it, scholarship might do what it wishes with faith: destroy or preserve it. However, even Dr. Strauß wouldn't make this claim. Hence, it remains the case that church and scholarship are equally divided, and, as limit to one another, each possess truth and life. We discard and disdain everything of the papacy and priestly class, all fanaticism, not merely in the church. There is a papacy and priestly class of learning and scholarship, a fanatical tyranny of knowledge. Its motto is *fiat scientia et pereat mundus* ["Let scholarship be done, though the world perish"]! We discard and disdain this tyranny, as well. Is there any trace of it in Zurich? We don't wish to judge, but we know this: this monster is equally deleterious to scholarship and the church.

If the church has a birthright to require a more comprehensive debate over its relationship to Straußian teaching, it has also, on its part, the duty to recognize that, after his most recent explanations, Dr. Strauß does not face this dilemma between open destruction and hypocrisy but has sought out a mediating position where this appalling choice is eliminated. The quiet power of the church's and scholarship's arguments, or both together, which no one can deny, may have made it necessary for him, eager to placate his opponents (be that as it may) in the third edition of his *Life of Jesus* to give Christ's historical actuality more scope and honor. Christ, to be sure not the sinless and absolutely perfect but the amazing, religious genius, actually founded the church – no longer merely as mythic exponent of a [Trans.: Hegelian] speculative idea. Admittedly, speculation informs thinking of something yet more perfect, but, as history knows nothing higher and the church is content with history, so one could be undisturbed by the speculative element. In light of this explanation, one now asks, is this the correct meaning and expression of church faith? It could be that the church here might find expressed the true substance of its faith, only more modern, clearly, and precisely in the style of the new education. Were that the case, peace would be achieved. The aristocratic community that consists of the witty might perhaps draw this conclusion although a leading presbyter, the deceased and subsequent Semilasso [Trans.: the nom-de-plume adopted by Prince Hermann von Pückler-Muskau (1785–1871)], and the much celebrated Jewish or much more

universal prophetess of Berlin hardly would be in agreement. Namely, this faction of the new church appears to snuff out the power of the religious genius, Christ, as well as the genius of Moses and Muhammed so that either a new genius of this kind is to be expected or even none at all. However, the church not only generally but also in its deepest foundation must forbid this Christian genius-cult in all earnestness for that reason alone because such a genius can only be transitory whereas the Church has as its content an eternal gospel. It must reject this teaching still more, or on these grounds, because the notion of a religious genius in combination with the new teaching in actuality is nothing other than one among many personalities through whom the eternally evolving world- and human-spirit is manifest and resigns itself to the Golgatha of history as a moment of its self-consciousness and self-reconciliation.^[4] This open-ended process permits one to think of an infinite number of Christs, and no one can know whether or not in the next moment a new, higher Christ will arise. However, the church knows no other than that the eternal, personal love and wisdom of God, the eternal self-conscious providence over the world, has sent once and for all this man from Nazareth with his cross, not as product of *natura naturans* but as the work of free, creative grace, as true saint, as the actual second Adam without sin, not as one of many for whom unavoidable sin is just a point of passage, with world history simply a wagon that rolls on, and not the exemplar of general Spirit for which perfection and imperfection completes one another.^[5] Here we have straightforward points of comparison, and, therefore, the decision, which is understandable and clear even for the masses, cannot be otherwise than that Dr. Strauß' teaching, including this new formulation, and the Christian faith on the basis of the scriptures and in all editions of the church's doctrinal concepts are essentially different and nullify one another. We admit, that the free Protestant Church is capable of an open-ended expansion and its faith, too, can consist of different levels and through multiple forms maintain its substantial unity. However, this expansion has its limits, and if one wants to expect that the church recognizes what is most contradictory as a moment of its truth, its faith would become, admittedly, very general and ethereal. Nonetheless, even in this airy universality it would find its demise as the Christian church, and it would

4. [□] Trans. note: de Wette is here describing the Christ event according to Hegelianism as a universal, Second Negation by means of which God is reconciled with Himself. Strauß' Christology in all versions of *LJ* is an *inclusive*, universal Christology in contrast to Hegelianism, which either limits the Second Negation to the individual, the Christ, or to those intellectuals who grasp the meaning of the Second Negation. De Wette is conflating the Hegelian meta-narrative of Double Negation with Strauß' presentation of the Christ as "religious genius" in Strauß' 1838 "On the Transient and the Permanent in Christianity" ["Ueber Vergängliches und Bleibendes im Christenthum"]. Although in the latter, the Hegelian meta-narrative is silenced and replaced with a 'Rationalist,' Scholastic 'Intellectualism'.

5. [□] Trans. note: This appears to indicate the influence of Schleiermacher's Christology of "Perfect God-consciousness" of the 'feeling of absolute dependence' as the originating, historical impetus that makes possible the individual Christian's cultivation in her-/himself of Perfect God-consciousness.

not be foreseeable why it didn't in addition to the positive, Christian chair, name an Islamic, a Jewish, for my part, an Indian chair for its reciprocal completion.^[6]

The Protestant Church does not damn or ban anyone no matter what level of knowledge he possesses in faith. Someone who advises that the author of the *Life of Jesus* should be expelled would be an archenemy of the Protestant Church, and I would be his most outspoken opponent. The church has enough strength to hold this courageous and sharp mind within it and to be reconciled with him in love and patience. She has endured and retained keener minds. However, it is one thing within the church to practice free, scholarly debate, with doubt and questions about schools of thought. It is another thing to instruct future pastors in faith and knowledge with respect to the gospels.

For this reason, it was not a good thing to call Strauß against the will of the church and to take the warning voices from general Christian believers to be only the self-serving cry of anxiety of some pious religionists.

The unwavering principle of the Protestant Church is continuous reformation. She has never denied it although it has frequently appeared to be obscured and restricted. When properly embraced, the church has judiciously accepted every true reform. However, there is also false, merely apparent reformation, which, as purely negative, destroys the church's positive foundation of faith. No one expects that, without examination, the church is to embrace every reforming mind that presents itself and, in turn, allow itself with the same readiness to have anything whatsoever done to it by the uncalled as if legitimately called, for example, to take the English Deists as equal to Luther and Spener.

However, in Zurich one frequently said that Strauß was a true reformer as once Master Huldreich [Zwingli]. In Zwingli's name one absolutely demanded the appointment. Completing the parallel, one thereby viewed the resisting church as the reflection and horrendous vision [Ebenbild und Schreckbild] of the fanatical obscurantists of the 16th C. Surely many were shocked when Mayor Hirzel invoked the great reformer's shadow to aid his call for Strauß' appointment. It was even more unexpected and sad that Dr. Strauß was not humble enough to forbid the parallel. Would he take offense when one asks in all seriousness whether or not Luther and Zwingli, Melancthon and Calvin (were they to appear among us today, undeceived by the culture and leniency of the 19th C) would recognize Dr. Strauß as their comrade and true successor? Certainly, they would treasure and honor him as an honest and diligent researcher, but, even when it came to the third edition of his *Life of Jesus*, they would more than merely shake their heads. Both Luther's and Zwingli's speeches would be sharp and heavy blows. They would not ask him concerning his particular, doctrinal formulas but rather about Christ, who permeated their souls, and about the substance of faith on the basis of which they built their congregations. Or should

6. ^[1] Trans. note: De Wette is obviously very prescient here.

the Reformation of the 16th C actually and essentially have no other content than the destruction of everything that the heroes of that age took to be an indestructible rock? Or would the essence of the Reformation be nothing other than the formal negation of every present-day church? Every actual church has more from Christ than Strauß acknowledges. Back then there were minds, in their own way honorable minds, who themselves would have found joy and truth in the first edition of the *Life of Jesus*. However, we don't find them among the reformers but, in part, among the Scholastics, who had a Christ of speculation without the appropriate historical grounding, or among the Italian men who spoke of the legend of Christ and for whom, in the end, Plato meant more to them than Christ and his Apostles.^[7] Yet, even the latter would reject Strauß as a comrade because Strauß [claims to] have and know even more about Christ. However, both Strauß and his friends should consider that the Reformation was simultaneously the destruction of such Scholasticism that obscured the historical Christ. Those who truly and enduringly reform were always those who would rather allow themselves to be burned at the stake than lose the historical Christ, the eternal redeemer and savior of all times and peoples. When the Roman church excommunicated them, these men were given the task of establishing a new Christian community, an enduring church, grounded in the Word of God from which it has its right and its strength. We don't want by means of the new Reformation to have imposed a difficult test by which a new community or church succeeds in its right over against the old Protestant Church. There may be a large number here and there attracted to such a new church, but what about the devolution? We have enough wise examples, old and new. To be sure, it will be attempted, but God's judgment will reign down on the effort! –

History teaches through the founding Reformation as well as the on-going reformation in our church that, although scholarship always played its part, the school of Christian faith, of religious life, is its actual, positive strength and power. However, this life always had, and wanted to have, no other foundation than Christ, the only begotten one, as judge, who cannot be duplicated by another.

If the conflict in Zurich was only about a few doctrinal, church formulas, whether or not they should be maintained or step aside to be replaced by scholarship, it would be not only outrageous but also laughable to raise resistance. The church that would be protesting in this case would be no pure, true Protestant Church. However, cross your heart! Is this all that is at stake? The talk is about the most inward kernel of the Christian faith, and the question is whether or not this kernel should be turned into the husk, which one winnows out and throws away. What one then takes to be the wise kernel, I question if it's not a stone that one gives when people are asking for

7. □ Trans. note: As correct as de Wette is to identify the Scholastic roots of "Rationalism" and Hegelianism in the *via antiqua* "Intellectualism" of Christian Platonism, he fails to acknowledge that his own "Rationalist" (Schleiermachian) Christology stands squarely in Scholasticism's *via moderna* of "Occasionalism"/"Voluntarism".

bread. God, eternal life, and freedom, this holy triad is what one says is the true kernel, the eternal, the immortal. Granted, that is the schema of Christian truth. However, is that the content that is really at stake? Until there's evidence to the contrary, it is permitted repeatedly and skeptically to ask: does the church teach the same God, the same freedom, and the same eternal life as the new teaching? Whoever looks more deeply cannot answer, "Yes." The church is supposed to retreat unequivocally and unconsciously until it attains this, its new world, by means of an endless progress of which Lichtenberg once predicted would lead to where the breath of faith evaporates in the highest peak of absolute knowledge?

Strauß' teaching is a leap, not an absolute beginning. Its first principles, its guiding threads, lie clearly enough in the history of the recent past. If one had asked in Zurich whether or not these first principles are the peak, the completion of the new Rationalism that is countenanced, even demanded, everywhere from the lectern to the pulpit, one would not be completely wrong. However, when one carefully examines this earlier Rationalism that stood over against Supernaturalism not only in opposition but also as correction and supplementation, one sees that the old Rationalism is something other than that, which this new opposition has abolished by means of absolute philosophy. The primary difference lies less in historical criticism than in philosophical background. Earlier Rationalism always had as its background the decisive, anti-panteistic substance of Christian faith even if frequently weakened. As often as it reached the outer limits where this threatened to disappear, it was convinced, again and again calmly and from the beginning, Christ actually had established, once and for all, the church, as the community of the absolutely, true religion. We can leave open whether this Rationalism necessarily leads to Strauß. What matters is what comes of it? Only this! Rationalism's correctness, which it possessed in its original form and as correction to Supernaturalism, is snuffed out with the commencement of the Straußian phase. In order to retain its truth, it must reverse itself. The true resolution of the contrast that scholarship requires of the church does not lie where Strauß found it but over and above that which he found.

In short, the way we also prefer to regard it: the church in Zurich acted not fanatically, not as a pious party, but actually as the Protestant Church, when it forbade the Straußian teaching from the theological lectern. Yet, the church cannot and will not suspend scholarly debate. It would also be a disaster for the church to violently terminate scholarship. However, another question is: whether this scholarly debate is something to be presented from the theological lectern as the theological education of young men? Even educated youth are not called to be judges in this conflict. Youth are not even listeners, who thoughtfully examine everything carefully and take only the good. We have a good faith in the youth. We live with that faith and won't desert it. However, we take absolute faith to be superstition – for something out of [Ludwig] Tieck's inverted world. The issues can be engaged in complete freedom and brought to verdict only by a senate or jury of experienced leaders of scholarship and religious life. This jury is available, only it is strewn across the entire church. However, it has been

gathered as a published forum long since, and its verdict will be given in due time. To be sure, it is not possible to conceal the conflict from students. Nonetheless, it is one thing from the lectern to turn them into party members, to transform the Youth Council into the absolute opposition of the Aged Council. It is another thing, on the one hand, to inform them out of a calm center in the interest of the church and at the same time to impress upon them veneration of the church as well as, on the other hand, to impress upon them veneration for scholarship that they learn to be modest and humble in their scholarship and to be fresh and of good courage in the church. Had the church in Zurich only wanted this – who can say it is wrong? However, it will be wrong if it allows the impassioned conflict to serve something else other than to clearly formulate and peacefully order the relationship among church, school, and state. Woe to it, when despicable passion is introduced into the mix and the conflict doesn't come to resolution until the university of Zurich becomes servilely bound by it or, what others can be blamed for, it pays with its own demise! Revenge would be inescapable. It is equally fanatical for the scholarly school of the church as well as for the church itself to bring about the sacrifice of one by the other. May the grace of God preserve the noble church of Zurich from both kinds of fanaticism! –

Anonymous – Strauß Can't and Shouldn't Come!

A Truthful Account of
How a Farmer in Canton Zurich
Feels about Doctor Strauß

Author: Anonymous

A Fun Read but Very Serious

1839

Printed by Oreli, Füsli, and Company in Zurich

"Strauß Should Not Be Allowed into Our Country!"

"We will not permit our religion to be stolen! We adhere to the old faith!"

That's what I thought and said as I – now a few weeks ago – entered the community meeting that was to call Doctor Strauß.

The room was full of anger and zealously. It felt like I had drunk a glass of wine. In the heat of it all, I no longer can remember what occurred; although I had had my fill of coffee; but then, my wife had put way too much water in the coffee because she had her mind on Strauß. That's what happens when women get mixed up in things with which they have nothing to do.

Nonetheless, I remember clearly one thing. As we gathered to make our decision, someone stepped forward and wanted to say something in favor of Strauß. A cry went out: "What does he want? He should be silent! Away with him!" and I had joined in. Now that I think about it, that wasn't right. If one doesn't allow one's opponent to speak, one could conclude that we aren't intelligent enough to answer him intelligently. Doesn't that give the impression that he was wise when he actually

wasn't ("*die Weisheit mit Löffeln gefressen*"), and we are the stupid ones? But we're free Swiss, and our opinion should be free! Today mine; tomorrow yours! If I help shut someone's mouth, then I must accept that tomorrow it won't be otherwise for me. In that case, those are right who have big mouths and scream the loudest. But that would be, God knows, the worst regime there could be and then – Good night freedom! But I had only joined the cry out of zeal, and that must be taken to have been meant for the best. Especially, when religion is threatened, as our Pastor said.

I went home completely red-faced. I was so wild that, had my wife greeted me with a wry face, in my Christian zeal I would have boxed her ears. Afterwards, I would have greatly regretted it, but that wouldn't have wiped out the blows. Fortunately for me, my wife was busy in the kitchen, and I was in the living room. The Bible was on the table. As I saw it, my blood pressure raised even more. "I won't allow the Bible to be taken from me!" and hit the table with my fist so hard that the walls shook. And – I must confess – I cried out in anger: "The devil take me, I'm not giving up my Christianity!" Then I gathered myself together as these words flew out and thought: "But how can it be that the devil came just now into your mouth as you were filled with Christian courage?"

And I remembered that a lot of devilish things have been written in the name of religion. That the Jews, in the name of the Jewish religion, nailed Christ to the cross; that in the name of the Christian religion, heretics were burned at the stake; that pious men, Zwingli and Luther, were attacked and ridiculed by a zealous Christian mob. Such things happen in the world! Everyone has in his heart his own devil or demon! Namely, his evil passions and desires, his dark thoughts, his arrogance over against heterodox believers and whatever they can be called. These demons are so crafty that they frequently make us believe that we're acting out of pure, Christian love to God and humanity, when they are leading us around by the nose in order to take us deep into the thick muck of sin and injustice. Even our pastors have such demons in them and are not a hair-width better than the rest of us. And because one thinks of the devil as the black one, so must – I believe – our pastors wear black clothes in order to remind each and all of us there is something of evil exasperation, even in our pastors: that no one internally is pure and clean. As it says in the Bible:

"No one is good but the one God"

However, if that is correct, could there be something devilish going on in the great outcry against Strauß and against those who have called him [Trans.: to the university]? Since this has occurred to me, I've been pensive. Yet, I've kept tight reins on myself with: "I will not allow my faith to be stolen!" I sat down to the table and began to leaf through the Bible. A passage from the Gospel of Matthew (5:5) caught my eye:

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth"

I had to be a bit ashamed for my earlier anger so that I quickly turned to the next chapter. It could well have been the devilish pride or vanity that caused me to quickly skip the quote. So I read further and found the passage from the Gospel of Matthew (6:20): "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust consumes and where thieves break in and steal."

Wait a minute! What kind of treasures are these? Surely it is a good and righteous change of lifestyle, which pleases God? Faith in God as a living Father of mankind? And faith that we will be rewarded for our works in this and in the next life? And faith that, out of his love for humanity, Jesus Christ suffered death on the cross to the bitter end? When I think vividly, now, how Jesus Christ loved, how he was persecuted, how he died; I remember how I here and there, overcome by evil coveting, have treated unjustly those closest to me. I experience remorse. And I want to make everything better that was wanting. I, then, treat more kindly my wife and child, my servant and maid. Then I have proper Christian love in my heart, and I notice that I am closer to God because "God is love!" And I feel myself comforted and know that my injustice is forgiven because "whoever loves greatly will be forgiven greatly."

According to my simple mindedness, this is the core of a good Christian faith. I'm not so good at talking about it. It doesn't spill off my tongue easily as it does by our pastor. But I know that I carry it in my heart as a treasure inaccessible to any thief. I also don't know how Doctor Strauß would want to begin to take my faith from me. Were my faith like a full keg of wine in my cellar to which I go down every Sunday to draw out a glass and enjoy its taste: then Strauß could sneak into the cellar overnight, take the peg out of the keg, and let all my faith drain out into the sand. I would have to look. But I don't think that's not how it is. If Strauß wants something of my faith, he must say to me perhaps the following: "Look, good friend, I believe this and that," and he must tell me why he believes such and not something else. Now, Strauß is among those who've studied. He throws around pieces of Greek and Latin and perhaps doesn't talk in a way that one like us would understand. But if I don't understand him, then I also don't believe him. That's at once very simple. But if I realize where he's going, I think for myself about the matter. I perhaps go to our pastor and listen to what he thinks. Or I speak with this or some other reasonable man in the congregation. Now, if I've heard, talked, and reflected, and I don't like what Strauß said; then, I hold onto my faith and Strauß his. He hasn't taken anything from me, and I haven't taken anything from him. That's also very simple. And still – it is very peculiar! Didn't I cry out today: "They want to take our faith from us!" Now, I said something dumb! That can happen to the wisest among us. And at least I'm wise enough to think better.

There's no big danger when it comes to stealing faith! But could there be something worse hidden behind the call of Doctor Strauß? Let's take a look. Here the Apostle Paul says:

"Test everything and hold onto the best"

It is true that there are many and among them truly brave people who are opposed to Strauß and who oppose all who don't take Strauß for the living devil but for a professor from Swabia [Trans.: southwest Germany between Baden and Bayern]. But! But! There could be a bimbo among one or the other of them. It could be that they have a hoe by which they want to seize us and lead us around, should we, namely – allow ourselves to be led around.

Take for example our pastor. He is a courageous man. He means well, to be sure, for his congregation. But he means even more well when it comes to himself. Should Strauß come, people would come running to his house asking him to explain this and that, which Strauß said or didn't say. And that will require great effort by the good pastor. As well, the pastor must increase his understanding in order to show just where the error is in Strauß' teaching. He will have to bring something new to the pulpit every Sunday. He won't be able to use warmed over, old sermons. This, too, would require effort from our good pastor. But a bit more effort wouldn't hurt the good pastor. Doesn't he already have it comfortable enough! A lot more comfortable than we country people who, sulking, toil and sweat in the fields or at the loom to earn our bread.

There's also the rich manufacturer in our village who employs over a hundred workers. For the sake of Christian love, about which he talks a great deal, he could reduce a few hours the work done by poor children in his factory without cutting their wages. He could increase the income of the other workers and still be able to keep enough for himself. But he means much better for himself. In short! Strauß is something new. Should he also bring something bad, so, too, he could bring something else. For the rich, naturally, it is good enough the way things currently are.

Then, there's the physician in our village. He doesn't often obstruct seats for others in the church. He doesn't have a halo on his head but an ordinary hat. He treats his sick patients no better or worse than the way he was taught. And he means well by those patients who come to him and pay him. But he means much better for himself. This physician has most rapidly come to be a strange Christian. But – speed is no heresy. At least here there is none because it has come about entirely by natural means. The pastor doesn't want Strauß, and, should people need a doctor, the pastor can say: "Take this one; he is a truly Christian doctor." If the pastor does something to please the physician, the physician can do something to please the pastor and speak against Strauß. One hand washes the other! And the physician now talks entirely incensed against Mayor Hirzel with whom we all until now have been completely satisfied and who was until four weeks ago for many even very pious. But, my dear doctor, we won't allow our legs to be pulled. Mayor Hirzel has become so little an Antichrist overnight than the physician overnight has become a good Christian. Such things don't happen in a gallop either with one or the other.

And then, there's old debt-manager in our village or old Seckelmeister or – I myself don't properly know his name. But he is old and one of the aristocrats. And he would gladly have things remain as they were, namely with respect to the old social order. There he had a say in things. Now, though, all that has come to an end since we brought an end to the old social order in the "Days of Uster" (*Tage von Uster*).^[1] Perhaps he means well. But when it comes to himself he means better. And because he had a small leadership role earlier, he's itching to occupy one of the regime's easy chairs. That reminds me of a story. Once upon a time there was an ape and a cat. And the ape badly wanted to reach some roasted chestnuts; but the chestnuts were roasting on hot coals. Hence, the ape spoke to the cat with moving words, and the cat was convinced to take the chestnuts out of the fire. Thereupon the ape ate the chestnuts – but the cat? Well, naturally, the cat had burned its paws. Roughly, that's the way things are now. The aristocrats are the ape, and the people, whom one wants to drive into the fire in opposition to Strauß and the regime, are the cat, whom the aristocrats want to take the chestnuts out of the fire. Bless the meal! Yes, if we were dumb enough!

These gentlemen in our village who are striking out against Strauß and the regime, then, have their own reasons that they don't want us to know about. But their reasons are not our reasons. If they want to be the bell-weather and charge with their horns, we're not yet the good sheep willing to run after them in order, in the end, to return home sheared. And – I bet you! Precisely those with the shrillest voices will be the first to draw in their horns and leave the people, who chased after them, stuck in misery.

Our good pastor, whose sermons I hear gladly when he climbs to the pulpit, and the other gentlemen who with him now are blowing their horn so loudly – they won't be especially pleased with this pamphlet. The "*Bürklizeitung*,"^[2] church papers, and others are not likely to praise it, either, because they recognize in it that we don't blindly follow them but want to see, first, with open eyes. For that reason, they will say and write: "Don't allow yourselves to be fooled by such writings! That is, again, just another work of Satan!" Or they will say: "There are only dumb and silly things in it," and so on. Agreed! The pamphlet is nothing special. I have only simply written as it came to me. But must one be a well-educated man in order to speak clearly (*frei von der Leber reden*) and to hit the nail on the head? The all too educated people, like Bürkli, trip all too often over their shrewdness and are unable to see the forest because of the trees. If you want yourselves to be confused by the pamphlet, let them only gossip and write. With educated gentlemen it's like water drooling from the mouth. We don't know how we're to respond. After they have finished babbling, go home and read through, entirely calmly, the pamphlet once more for yourself. Then ask yourself:

1. ^[1] Trans. note: Uster is a city and capital of the district Uster in the Swiss Canton of Zürich. On November 22, 1832, on the day of the Cantonal Public Meeting, fire was set to the Korrodi textile company in opposition to its automated looms; trans.

2. ^[2] Trans. note: "*Züricher-Zeitung*" purchased in 1724 by F. von Johann Kaspar Bürkli, later published by Johann Heinrich Bürkli and, until 1890, David Bürkli.

"Who is right? This one or the other? Because it is clearly stated in the Bible: "Test everything and hold onto the best."

If we want to test properly, naturally we must ask first: Do you have the right to do such and such? – That's why it says in the Holy Script:

"Seek first the Kingdom of God and its justice"

Now, the regime says: "Strauß come!" And we want them to say: "Strauß don't come!" I have a neighbor who lives a bit of an angle across from me. Through his garden I can see my field. If my servant and maid are engaged in buffoonery and laziness instead of working, I can call and wave to them that they return to their work. My neighbor now is building a shed in his garden, and, once it is built, it's all over with the view of my field. If he had asked me first, I would have encouraged him to build a bit to the left or to the right. Maybe he would have done it to please me. But now the shed has been begun. Can I now threaten and say: "Neighbor, you must stop building, or else –? Of course not! My neighbor is building on his property, and he has the right to build as he wishes.

It's no different with Strauß. Had someone said to us half-a-year ago that he was to be called [to the university], we certainly would have said our little piece. And had we enough time to come to our senses and calmly spoken about it, I am certain, that many would not have objected who now protest loudly once the decision had been taken. But can we now threaten and say: "The decision must be reversed!" Should we say: "Strauß can not and should not come!" Or else: "And then threaten the regime with fists, as the 22 pastors, physicians, industrialists, and other gentlemen did who met together on March 1st in Zürich?" Of course not! ... if we're true republicans who believe the law sacred. The regime should have told us a half-year earlier that Strauß was to be called; no differently than my neighbor should have said that he intended to build a new shed. The Board of Education [*Erziehungsrath*] and Governing Council [*Regierungsrath*] have the right to call professors. That is clearly stated in the law, and to make matters worse the Upper Council [*Große Rath*] explicitly acknowledged this right. Just as my neighbor stayed on his own property, so, too, the Board of Education and the Governing Council stayed on the property of their rights, and they didn't take a step beyond the boundary. Were we to force them to reverse their decision, we would violate the word of the Holy Scriptures that one should honor and obey one's superiors. And it would not only be unlawful, but also it would be to disembowel ourselves. The people itself wrote the constitution; voted itself for the government (or through the Upper Council voted). Now the people should curse and bluster because the government has exercised the right that was given to them by the people? That looks entirely too childish and not a hair width better than were I in anger to use my own mouth to bite my head off.

Granted! If the country generally were threatened by the event of Strauß' coming, then one must watch how things worked out. But – "Test everything and hold onto the best!" What can happen that's so horrible? OK, let's assume Strauß comes and occupies his professorship just like all the other professors. Whichever students want to attend his lectures, can do so. Those who don't want to, can stay away. Then, Strauß begins with something like: "Gentlemen!" or "My dear audience!" or whatever it is that he says. "You see, I myself believe this or that, because or because. But others believe something else, because or because." Then, the dear students see for themselves, which "because" is the best; whether Strauß' own or the others.' And they would not leave it at that, but they would go listen to other theology professors and receive their advice. And they would read the writings in favor and against Strauß; and they would consider and compare them all. I can't begin to imagine how one in all haste should be so constipated by falsehood and erroneous teaching that the truth could not yet sink in – in as much as our young students in Switzerland haven't fallen on their heads any more than the ancients. They're also no airheads and easily swayed by the slightest, newest thing, as the case with the Walhaz in France on the Art river. Even if it should occur once that someone becomes enthralled with Strauß and his teaching as right and proper; so must he first be seen and heard by us before we permit him to become our pastor. And if we're unsatisfied with his chatter, we can let him go his way. He can keep his wisdom to himself or find others of his opinion elsewhere. And that's the end of that!

Or what else could happen were Strauß to come? So much is certain, our pastors would watch out for every wrong word that came out of his mouth; and for every wrong word he has written or will write. And what would then happen? Strauß must be a clever man! Even his enemies must say that of him, and, if he wasn't, they wouldn't have to worry about him. That's the reason why our pastors must take such effort, as I said earlier, in order to say something intelligent against him. We would not only get something new every Sunday but also something good to hear. If Strauß stays in Swabia, our pastors will forget him quickly and wouldn't engage him at all. Everything would be like it always was: the harp – and that's all! The old harp has in the meantime become boring. We've had enough of it! Fewer people are going to church. But since the chatter over Strauß has begun, our pastors have become agitated, and going to church has become interesting. Were Strauß to be here, we would get better sermons – it couldn't be otherwise – those of us in the countryside who go to church most regularly would benefit the most.

And yet – it occurs to me suddenly -our pastors have begun a racket as if the Canton of Zurich would stumble head over heels into hell if Strauß was even to be seen by us. Some are so afraid of him and have lined up as if in his Strauß-head there was more brains than 200 pastors in the Canton, or how many there are, all together. Otherwise, they wouldn't have raised such a horrid, wailing cry. But now I have an entirely other opinion. I have far greater respect for our pastors! They have become too humble. They've allowed themselves to be too overcome by Christian humility.

Because I'm certain that they are far more clever than they even think themselves to be. And I won't allow anyone to convince me otherwise than, were Strauß to be here, our pastors would have enough mind to force him to cease with all his brilliant leaps. Admittedly! I haven't been any different. Didn't I also scream: "Away with Strauß!" Even when I did so because I heard the others so screaming. Another brings the next into an agitated state. A fire spreads to the next, and in the end it's burning in every head. Anyway, it's no different than Carnival [*Fastnacht*]. There one shouldn't take offense over the other because at Carnival all over the world it is common that pleasing comedies are played out. And the comedy that we performed in the Canton of Zurich unquestionably generates heat: "Much Ado About Nothing!" I have only to laugh that I was so strongly heated by it all.

I had just gotten to this point with my thoughts when I heard cries and noise out in front of my house. I threw open the window. A rabble of young men was passing by with a Scarecrow that they called Doctor Strauß and wanted to burn. There were also older people with them. The young men didn't get the idea from themselves, and the straw was surely given by the older people from their own heads. The youths were screaming their heads off: "Drive Doctor Strauß out of the country!" And some of the older people screamed with them; admittedly, only a few. Then, I had to laugh out loud! As I went to Germany seven years ago, someone said to me: "The people of Nuremberg are clever; they don't hang anyone until they have them." If we are so eager to chase Strauß out of the country, so must we above all else have to allow him into the country. But because I laughed so, a serious thought came to me: Would it be so horrible to put Strauß to the test at least once? There's a good aphorism:

"Tested is superior to studied"

And so could Strauß come, yes indeed, at least once and allow himself to be seen and heard. I know this much: fire and brimstone would not rain down on Zurich. That couldn't be the case; we're all so pious here. Should we be unable to get along with Strauß, and he with us, surely, he would leave on his own. Or one could make him understand: "Mr. Strauß! You see yourself that it's not working out between us. We citizens of Zurich agree. Also – – " Naturally! Everything would be said with the greatest politeness, as is always the case with us.

But, as things stand at the moment, we're going to have to wait awhile before Strauß comes. There are those, I'm told, in the government who want to pension him, that means, to give him our money although he has done nothing for us. I'm not all that excited about that! We have already enough such gentlemen to whom we pay our money for nothing. And – that's how it goes! Now, I'm truly curious about Strauß and would like very much to see him up close. There must be something special about him otherwise we wouldn't be making such a great fuss over him. For my sake! He can

come! He might like to stay awhile; it's no skin off my nose. And in the end, it doesn't trouble me that I participated in this spectacle. Admittedly, some dumb things have happened. How can it be otherwise when everyone is screaming? But here and there a kernel of truth has also sprouted. And I am certain, that we now will find an open ear for all just and proper wishes on the part of our government and the Governing Council. We surely have screamed loud enough that they must notice that there's a populous in this country.

If they want to force the government to rescind its decision that it has lawfully taken, I don't want any part of it. I also don't want to hear that the Governing Council in all haste has swallowed what the 22 Deputies have brought on. Recently, these gentlemen circulated a document in which stands at the beginning: "The citizens of the congregation N." and at the end stands: "The citizens of congregation N.N." And between the N.N. one finds all kinds of amazing stuff. Some of these things have perhaps been allowed to be heard. As such, it wouldn't displease me when in church affairs and at the synod not only pastors, but also other persons, were permitted to speak. First, they are saying: "We have had seven productive years, and in those seven years much good has been accomplished in the country. But it has been almost too good, and one had done better had one proceeded with more caution." Hardly have they said that, then they come – mixing up cabbage and turnips! I, II, III, IV, V, and VI and with a, b, c, d, and e, that one doesn't know where one stands for all their wise and smart-aleck recommendations. Would they want to call a church conference again, I would attend. But then I would take the liberty to speak on my own behalf. And my address might sound so, only it must be composed with other words:

"Messrs. Upper Council! There's a lot of talk going around that in church affairs many things need improvement. And there may be something to it all because there is nothing perfect under the sun. But look before you leap! And look very carefully because good things take time. Many of us citizens said, "Yes!," to all of the seven items that were presented to us by the 22 representatives. But just because of that, you shouldn't conclude that we allow ourselves to be duped and that the pastor has bagged everything. That is because it is obvious that we only said, "Yes!," because we know that it is the duty of a gentleman of the Council before taking a decision after having gathered all of the inquiries and checking everything wisely and weighing all the evidence. With all the suggestions concerning Strauß and in light of the church council, the seminar, and the university; or whatever you otherwise took into consideration or wish to present, nothing should occur too quickly. Take the time that you need! Otherwise, in the end you will receive poor thanks from us', and a member of the Upper Council would be properly advised: And that's the bottom line!"

If we did otherwise, we would be fools ourselves. And in the other Cantons, they would laugh over us as they already now have grounds to make fun of us, and we have earned nothing better.

I know, what I am doing. And when it comes to Strauß, I also know, what I am doing. I'm not doing anything! If you want to call meetings again against him, I'm

staying home. One participates once, but a second time would be two times too many. And as I think, I know, so will many others also think.

**Strauß – Epistle to the Highly Esteemed Messrs
Mayor Hirzel, Professor Orelli, and Professor Hitzig in Zurich from Professor
David Friedrich Strauß**

Published
by the
Associations for Promotion of Public Education

Zurich,
Printed by Zürcher und Furrer
1839

Translator's Summary of Strauß' Themes

1. Should congregations not be able to trust the claims of their pastors? Clerics "[...] are above all, the least appropriate to be an independent judge in this matter where they [...] constitute a party in the case."
2. Describes the "old Christian faith" and its anthropomorphic "difficulties."
3. It's not specific miracles that confirm the legitimacy of faith but "[...] those so-called miracles disappear like drops in the ocean among the countless miracles that God performs daily and hourly in every region of His created and sustained world." "We lost nothing [...] with these heavenly voices than is lost by the removal of a piece of paper stuck on a beautiful painting that contains the message that it is a beautiful painting."
4. Accused that the savior is nothing special because the "[...] Son of God has become just a normal human being." Response: "A human being, a true human being: Yes!, but a normal human being: No!, and he also remains for us the Son of God no longer in the coarse sense that must eternally remain an offence to reason. Does it say in the scriptures Christ is called merely the Son of God? Isn't he not also often called the Son of Man? [...]"

5. The old Christian faith has the deceased Christ immediately rise from the dead [...] [W]e speak of resurrection that always was in this life as he already resurrected this side of the grave all those who follow him as he himself said: Whoever hears my words and believes in Him who sent me, he has eternal life and has passed out of death into life (John 5:24).” Christ “[...] didn’t need a cloud first at the end of his life to take him up to God in heaven; rather [...] he was incessantly with God [...]”
6. Question of Strauß’ belief in a judgment of the world? “[...] [H]is coming in judgment for us is not as in your case such that it remains outstanding and delayed from century to century: rather, the Lord sits on the judges chair in us every day because he gave to our hearts his spirit that judges us, punishes us, whenever we do or desire evil, and rewards us with peace and bliss when we permit ourselves to be driven and ruled by him.”
7. Responds to the charge that he contradicts biblical teaching and “turn[s] the books of the Bible into a book of fables.” The bible is “[...] indispensable for our edification. However, it is a misunderstanding to take this holiness in such a way that we have to accept everything in it as literally true [...]”
8. “How many up to now have come to reflection over his [Jesus’] moral teaching through believing astonishment or curious rumination with respect to Jesus’ miracles? However, how many, conversely, have spurned the entire Bible in ridicule or indignation because for him these stories of miracle were repugnant? Our view protects us from both. No one who embraces it will henceforth be distracted by the glitter of the supernatural away from the less gleaming but more important parts of the biblical content.
9. “The hostility on the part of the greater part of clerics against the new view of Christianity is no more astonishing than as has occurred everywhere on the part of members of professional guilds against a new invention because that invention makes it easier to do a task than the way the profession has practiced it. The majority of clerics, I say, are well practiced in awaking pious feelings in their parishioners by means of clinging to the literal words of the biblical stories and concepts. That we undertake to edify ourselves and others by means of a more liberated insight into the Bible is an embarrassment for them and arouses their indignation because they are not equipped to respond to it.”
10. Strauß maintains that there are three books that “[...] in combination [...] constitute the one and entire divine revelation:” the book of nature, the book of history, and the bible.

The Text

Epistle to the People of Zurich From Professor Orelli

Dear Fellow Citizens!

Read, I beg and implore you to do that; read calmly and non-prejudicially this booklet in which the believing thinker, Doctor Strauß, presents and explains in a completely understandable manner accessible to everyone the perfect example of his theology and Christian faith – just as formerly the highly enlightened men of God, Zwingli and Luther, communicated openly and clearly over against the papacy their religious conviction to the people and a new, more beautiful life emerged for them.

Once you've read this, then with all conscientiousness test the teaching of Dr. Strauß for yourselves, preferably in a quiet chamber when God's peace prevails over you and in your hearts. Hold onto the best, that is, to everything that appears to you, reasonable Christians, as true, good, and beautiful; throw out the remainder that might appear to you to be untrue, un-Christian, or dubious.

Ask, as well, your pastors with their synodal vows and conscience: what stands in agreement with the divine savior's teaching in this epistle; what, otherwise, stands in contradiction, hence, is heretical and condemning.

Ask your trustworthy, ecclesiastical leaders, whom you wish to advise you calmly and with gentle minds, honest and openly regarding each particular item and how it fits with Christ's servants.

I beg that you don't only spout spirited rage against Dr. Strauß and this his pamphlet -such rage is appropriate only for the Pope in Rome.

Ask your shepherds whether they might want to contradict what for them are, apparently, false claims in Strauß' epistle on rational grounds and with sound proofs drawn from the treasure of their erudition.

Dear fellow citizens, I speak with the holy Apostle Paul (I Corinthians 7:23, 24): "You have been purchased for a dear price: don't become slaves of people. You brothers! each should remain in that profession to which he has been called."

Heed without all passion what an old friend of yours in evangelical freedom of faith, who lovingly calls all to the constitution and laws to which we have sworn and, as well, to the free schools!

Your,
Johann Kaspar Orelli

Epistle From David Friedrich Strauss

When I read in the public press of the agitations in your city and Canton that my having been called to the university in Zurich have caused, of the meetings that have occurred, of the speeches that have been delivered, of the texts that have been exchanged; when I think about the attacks made against you, highly respectable men and on all the others who helped to bring about my call to the university, the invectives directed at you, the insults that you have received from all sides: I am overcome with a deep and deserved pain that men, to whom I feel myself so indebted, should have to pay such a price for their benevolence and disposition on my behalf. All this while I, for whom you expose yourselves to the indignant waves of popular outcry, I am anchored in a calm, wind-still port, barely aware of the howling storm and the roar of the flames in the distance and send over to you at most a word of greeting, but unable to charm the wild waters to calmness.

When my call to the university after long and tenacious conflict came to fruition, I believed that your fight had come to an end and comforted myself with the hope that I would be soon personally in your midst and be able to gradually remove the debt of so highly accrued guilt of thanks to you as a consequence of your heartfelt goodwill, respectful courtesy, and encouraging helping hand with respect to the common goal of spreading truth and light. However, it was just the beginning of your efforts, and the point at which I am going to be in the position to assure you my thanks in person – who knows when that is going to be? I would vainly sow seeds of scholarship upon a field flooded by such wild waters as now is the case there. Didn't Noah first have to allow the floodwaters to recede before he could be a farmer and plant vineyards? – but what am I saying to you about thanks? For men of your sensitivities, when unfavorable circumstances make action impossible, thanks is enough that lives in hearts: and that this thanks in me will not lapse before my life ends is assured.

How do I want to answer before the bench of public good and scholarship that, as a consequence of my call to Zurich, men like you, have been so woefully troubled who have worked to advance both [the public good and scholarship]? Like fruit of general well-being carefully harvested by your work and care, most honorable Mayor, has blown unripe from the branches or hindered from ripening by the current storms, so the many hours that you would have devoted to the ancients to the advantage of all lovers of Classical Studies, esteemed Orelli, have been curtailed by the negotiations or the annoyance caused by the present circumstances! ... and you, dear Hitzig, how frequently might the devoted action or feeling for my sake have hindered your own work by which you have shined such pleasant light on what, to this point, have been dark passages in the Old Testament! Yet, here may it be that the public good exculpate me with public good; scholarship with scholarship. You meant to serve both were you to have brought me to your university, and, when it comes to my own good will in that respect, you would not have been disappointed. For now, I am not in the position even to undertake the attempt as much as I would like to fulfil your expectations. For that

reason, unfortunately, it appears that with respect to your more important aims, your time and effort have been wasted.

However, don't believe that, honored Gentlemen! Your voices have echoed far and wide and, even more, they've found quiet resonance; your words are not lost even if they don't have an enduring effect in your immediate vicinity. They are like feathered seeds that appear to be blown away by the wind but frequently find fruitful ground faraway where they can germinate and sprout. Now or later, by me or someone else, in Zurich or wherever in Germany or Switzerland: it's all the same; but with certainty the day will come when one will be able to think and speak freely about religion rationally and without being taken to be godless; and will be in one's heart pious and god-fearing without defaming reason and branding the sciences as heretical. The events in Zurich, the deliberations of the three Councils, the addresses and opinions expressed are all indisputably portents of that day to come. Even without unequivocal success, it is already infinitely important that at least once in the assembly of a people's Council thoughts were expressed like the conviction that one can be a Christian without believing [literally] every word and story in the Bible. The results of these negotiations and the decisions [to call Strauß to Zurich] taken by these sessions might now from a particular perspective want by some to be reversed: hopefully, not! Nonetheless, if it were to happen: for that very reason, those who would succeed will have little grounds to celebrate. Were they to be more insightful leaders than they appear to be, they would say, as that old war hero said in victory: one more such victory, and we are lost.

This is because a single victory and single defeat decide nothing. Frequently the victory is the seed for a future defeat; whereas in defeat, to the contrary, the guarantee of ultimate victory is concealed. Everything depends upon the manner with which the battle was conducted [On the one hand,] on the part of those whom one now seeks to overpower, the fight has been conducted in open deliberation where speech has stood up to counter-speech, the accuser has been confronted by the defender, and the assembly, as judge, after hearing both sides, has decided in favor of the accused and the defendant. It was an honest open fight and an impartial judgement. On the other hand, on the part of those who would like to nullify this ruling, the battle is being waged, as all battles have always been waged from this side. For some, the Council Hall is an unwelcome battle field on which to fight for their cause because there, one can expect that every strike will be met by a counter-strike. A more pleasant battle field for them is the church, where the parapet of the pulpit constitutes an unconquerable fortification and the orator is right because no one is permitted to contradict him. This is the courtroom where the prosecutor, yes, is heard but not the defendant and his defense lawyer; where with the slightest declaration of the prosecutor, the judging community proclaims, "Guilty!" No one can deny a just court, an honest battle; were the good congregation, which is to decide here on the Christianity and admissibility of an appointed teacher at the university, only had some other knowledge of his teachings, so that it could compare what the preacher accuses him of and judge him

according to what it itself knows of him. Yet, ask this community: what do you think Strauß' actual teaching is? I cannot keep myself from laughing when I imagine what the answer would be. The simple, modest citizens who constitute the majority of the congregation will certainly admit that they have not read or hardly seen the book that stands in question; and even the educated to the extent that they are not actual scholars should at least admit that they, if they have read it, do not possess the means to appropriately appreciate and to thoroughly understand it. There remains merely the judgment of the cleric, who, consequently, ends up being prosecutor and judge in the same person because the judge [in this case, the assembly] has no informed opinion of his own in the matter.

Should the congregations not be able to trust the report of their pastors with certainty? Definitely, in all those aspects that are concerned with the personal salvation of congregation members! When it comes to the question: What must I do in order to receive eternal life?, clerics are expected to give the nurturing answer to their flocks. In the absence of any special reason to the contrary, one presupposes that they will give the right response. In contrast, who will name clerics as such judges, for example, with respect to the best way to farm the land, build factories, govern the state? Surely, one will retort that that is not their office. However, clerics must know how to judge the true faith of a theological instructor because they themselves have studied theology. That they have! Nonetheless, if I may use a parable, the clerics in general are, above all, the least appropriate to be an independent judge in this matter where they, on the contrary, constitute a party in the case. When Guttenberg created the printing press, who were the most strenuous opponents to the new technology but those who up to that point were the producers of books by hand copying them? To take an example from our own day, who opposes weaving machines with greater energy than those who up to now likewise are weavers but without machines? Who curses with the greatest passion steamships? Surely, those who likewise are sailors but who row and sail! Would the book copiers ever vote for the coming of the printing press?; or, if left to the decision of freight haulers, would they vote for the steam engine?

These examples are sufficient to demonstrate that, at the beginning, with every new discovery, no matter in what discipline, the irreconcilable opponent is precisely the guild that until that point had performed the task of the new invention. This is a perfect analogy for the reaction of the majority of clerics to those changes which are being introduced (and I am among those so engaged) into theological scholarship. Awakening pious sensations in their audience, fortifying virtuous resolutions in them, planting the fear of God in children, keeping adults safe against the forces of passion and the business of the world, providing comfort out of God's Word to the sick, giving the dying blessed hope as a companion in their last days: that was always, remains, and will be the profession of clerics. For that reason, Protestant pastors are so used to tackling these tasks that they take the Bible into their hands and say: "See, there is a God who in ancient times created this world in six days and rested on the seventh, to whose commemoration the seventh day is sanctified as a day of rest for

the faithful. God also created man out of a clump of clay; but man, at first innocent and without error, allowed himself to be seduced by the coaxing of a snake (behind whom was perhaps the devil) to decide to eat the forbidden fruit; upon which he was thrown out of the garden of paradise, and the earth as well as all humanity were cursed because of him, his descendants ever since having been born sinners under the judgment of eternal damnation. However, God revealed Himself to certain members of the corrupted race from then onward. He appeared to Abraham as a human being, personally wrestled with Jacob and lamed his hip. By means of Moses, he led his people out of Egypt and on Sinai gave Moses the law with his own audible voice. A sequence of miracles followed through the entire history of this people: Balaam's donkey talked for himself; Joshua commanded the sun and moon to stand still; Elijah prayed for fire from heaven and rode in a fiery chariot up to heaven. Straightaway, the prophets rose up one after the other who prophesized a future Messiah; and when the time was full, the Christ appeared. He was like all other human beings except with respect to sin and was also an exception in that he didn't, like the rest of us, who not only had a human mother but also had a human father, but in his case the role of the father was replaced by the divine spirit. His birth in Bethlehem was proclaimed by an angel to shepherds, and the Wise Men from the East were guided by a star, like a carried torch, to the town and birth house of the divine child. With adulthood, he was baptized by John, and God's spirit hovered over him in the visible form of a dove. God the Father Himself spoke in distinctly clear words his blessing upon him. Straightaway his life was a sequence not only of good deeds but also miracles. He raised persons from the dead, fed thousands with little bread, walked on water, and transformed water into wine. However, he succumbed to his enemies, died on the cross, and spilled out his blood for the atonement of the world. After three days, he rose again from the dead, and after another forty days he rose to heaven visibly before the eyes of his disciples from where he immediately, in the roar of a storm and in fiery tongues of the spirit, poured into his followers and from where at the end of time he will come again in order to raise the dead and lead them to judgment."

This is the old Christian faith. Who wants to underestimate in it what is beautiful, elevating, and comforting? We certainly don't. However, on the other side, one shouldn't for that reason be so cheesy not to acknowledge the difficulties and the challenges that are plainly more obvious with every decade. God should have walked in paradise with Adam, appeared to Abraham in a visible form; whereas John says: No one has ever seen God; and our reason agrees with the Apostle. God formed man out of a clump of clay: is He not presented as a person with hands? In paradise, the snake talks, later the donkey of the pagan seer: but is a speaking animal something that we in any way properly can imagine, not to say, think? The sun stands still or, more appropriately, the earth is halted in its daily rotation on its axis: we know what happens to a chariot when it in a fast race suddenly is brought to a halt by a barrier; a jolt occurs, someone who hasn't held on tightly will be hurled out of the chariot; and were the earth stopped with its incomparably faster spin, should Joshua with his

droves been able to pursue unshaken the enemy, or, is it not more likely that Israelites and Amorites including towers and houses not only in Gibeon but all on the entire earth would be thrown to the ground by a jolt stronger than the strongest earthquake? Then there's the elevation to heaven by Elijah and Jesus: is there a divine throne up there over the clouds? Are not there stars above and completely surrounding the earth in all directions, and do not these stars not have worlds, and is God not omnipresent? ... When "we live, move and have, our being in God," as the Apostle Paul says (Acts 17:28), why would He then need to abduct someone from the surface of the earth whether on a fiery chariot or clouds if He wanted to call someone to Himself?

However, this and everything else will be held against us, which you take to be an offence against sacred history, as when Jesus drives out the devil, heals the sick, resurrects the dead, yes, simply performs miracles by which God demonstrates that He made heaven and earth and everything in it – How? Wouldn't God be able to be recognized as the creator simply by the existence of the extant order of things and the orderly course of the world and nature? Who is godless enough to make a claim to the contrary? Or should I not rather say, childish enough? This judgment is really almost exactly the same as that made by children who aren't especially moved when one says to them: the clock, whose constant pendulum swing you see and whose routine striking of the hours you hear was created by this artist; but, when only now this man steps forward and lifts the bell hammer with his hands and lets the bell ring, interrupting the order, once, twice, or as often as the child would like, only then is the clockmaker celebrated by the children and acclaimed. It is sad that humanity hasn't wanted to escape from this childish notion. Miracles in the sense of ancient, popular faith can only have a special value for someone who is incapable of recognizing in the natural order the power and wisdom of the creator. We, who are accused by others of not believing in miracles that God did in the land of the Jews at the time of Moses, the Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles, think nothing of it because those so-called miracles disappear like drops in the ocean among the countless miracles that God performs daily and hourly in every region of His created and sustained world. – Recognize the finger of God – one cries out at us – He stopped the sun and moon in their tracks at the time of Joshua! What, "Just a finger?," we respond. We recognize His entire hand, his strong arm that doesn't stop the sun and moon only once for a few hours, but His arm that since the creation of the universe until now holds, carries, and moves in their proper paths all suns, moons, and earths, as well as the entire army of stars. – According to your faith, speechless animals have talked with persons and, thereby, promulgated the divine power to do miracles: by the artificial construction of their appendages, by their wonderful powers and urges; what about animals forces us to believe that it has spoken with a human tongue? when precisely this is the greatness and marvelousness in God's creation that He is praised by every creature by its own language, by a polyphonic chorus. – You find yourselves elevated that in his Father's power Christ twice fed thousands with limited supplies. What? only twice long ago your God has done what ours does every year, yes, daily? It is certainly a

limited supply that we yearly entrust to our fields and our gardens; but the broadcast seeds bear fruit, as Christ said, some hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold (Matthew 13:23); and from that fruit, daily, hunger is stilled for more than only four or five thousand and still there are leftovers. – In short, there is no miracle that you can present that we don't also have and that we don't have that is greater and more marvelous.

However, we are accused that for us the savior is nothing special; the Son of God has become just a normal human being! – A human being, a true human being: Yes!; but a normal human being: No! He remains for us also the Son of God but no longer in the coarse sense that must eternally remain an offence to reason. Does it say in the scriptures Christ is called merely the Son of God? Isn't he not also often called the Son of Man?; and doesn't it follow that one must be able to be Son of God and at the same time Son of Man? Just so, for us Christ is the son of two pious parents, Joseph and Mary; but God also sanctified the fruit of their union is the sacred God; he blew into her the beautiful, pure soul, the lofty and powerful Spirit, that showed itself precociously in her child: and, therefore, we properly call the Son of Man also Son of God. – This is the case with all the other miracles in life. Twice God is supposed to have called down to Jesus that he is his true son, of whom he is well-pleased, to whom humanity should listen. What do we lose if we doubt these stories? That the shock in us is eliminated when we think that God speaks to us in a human voice, we don't take to be some kind of loss, should we? Still, nothing disappears; God must have been pleased by a life like Jesus' life, and we can do nothing better than to adhere to him as God and His holiness, on the one side, as we know without explicit explanation when we observe the divine blessedness and purity of this life and, then, on the other side, consider our determination [as human]. We lose nothing more with these heavenly voices than is lost by the removal of a piece of paper stuck on a beautiful painting that contains the message that it is a beautiful painting. Whether Christ healed the sick merely by word and touch – what difference does it make for us to whom this good no longer can occur and for those who will never be able to do it themselves? He might have possessed special powers from God even to perform such works, which was the conclusion of those who lived in his day. However, he doesn't help us by these means any longer as he did the blind man of Jericho or the exiled and lame in Capernaum, or the dead men of Nain and Bethany: but he opens our eyes that we see what God's holy will is for us; he strengthens our paralyzed powers to follow his example through his admonition and promises: our heart is made pure by his Spirit and awakened through solidarity in his life in which he accepts us to a new life of sanctity and justice.

Where do we find – someone asks us – the atoning death of Jesus in your faith? Is he also for you, as he is for us, the lamb of God sacrificed for the sins of the world? – Here we have to ask a question in response: Do you mean by atonement that God at the time of the Old Testament was only angry and zealous, sought revenge in humanity, and that only with the shedding of the blood of Christ was His wrath appeased and His temper toward humanity was milder? Whoever thinks that is opposed to God

Himself (not to speak of the irrationality and unworthiness of the whole notion), when he dismisses the love of God for the world as the presupposed motivation for why God gave us His Son (John 3:16). Were God from the beginning mercifully inclined to forgiveness, it is not obvious that that, other than repentance and the improvement of life on the part of human beings, in addition, should require the death of an innocent man and that this death should have established the conditions to indulge his mercy, and, for the purpose of cleansing humanity, actually to forgive. Notwithstanding, even for us the death of Jesus is the image and the guarantee for our pardon and salvation. Because as with that man, whose mind was united with God, whose love for sinful humanity never diminished even to the point of suffering death, yes, pleaded to God for his murderers, so we ourselves are able to measure the grace of God by the charity of this God/Man and his willingness to forgive even those who acted towards him in the most egregious fashion, if they only do penance. Whereas an Elijah called for fire from heaven to fall on those who were sent to capture him appears to reveal an angry God (however, God had already made Himself present to him by a gentle whisper [I Kings 19:12 etc.]), so we see in the patience and personality of the dying Christ that God is, far more, love.

The old Christian faith has the deceased Christ immediately rise from the dead and ascend to heaven. – Ours, as well; but not merely once and not first at the end of his life. Rather, we speak of resurrection of those dead whom he called "their dead" (Matthew 8:22), a resurrection that always was in this life as he already resurrected this side of the grave all those who follow him as he himself said: Whoever hears my words and believes in Him who sent me, he has eternal life and has passed out of death into life (John 5:24). For that reason, he didn't need a cloud first at the end of his life to take him up to God in heaven; rather, already in his lifetime he elevated himself to heaven in those prayers that he nightly offered on lonely mountains or in daylight in the circle of his disciples; yes, that which Paul requires from Christians (I Thessalonians 5:17) occurred with him in full measure so that, namely, his life was a prayer without interruption. Thus, he was incessantly with God as he himself said to Nicodemus: the Son of Man, he is in heaven (John 3:13); in heaven where also the true Christian transformation already occurs in this life, as Paul said (Philippians 3:20).

We are asked: "Surely you believe, as well that Christ will return to judge the world?" We do believe that, we respond! Only his coming in judgment for us is not as in your case such that it remains outstanding and delayed from century to century: rather, the Lord sits on the judges chair in us every day because he gave to our hearts his Spirit that judges us, punishes us, whenever we do or desire evil, and rewards us with peace and bliss when we permit ourselves to be driven and ruled by him. Our inner judge recognizes and prepares us already in this life that we be purified by the Spirit of Christ and by a strengthened conscience, according to our worthiness for reward or punishment, pleasure or pain. Is that not a guarantee that also in the coming life the divine judge will assign us to that apartment in his Father's house for which he has made himself worthy here below? Is a special, solemn day of judgment necessary

for this? I believe hardly so; at least the rich man was judged, and the poor Lazarus blessed, each immediately after his death without the day of judgment. What about the resurrection to eternal blessedness and damnation of our bodies? The Apostle Paul speaks of an ecstasy that he experienced up to the third heaven and added: whether he was in the body or outside of the body, he didn't know; God knows; but he [Paul] knows that he was in ecstasy and heard inexpressible words (II Corinthians 12:2 f.). Hence, were we, as with the Apostle, to want to hope to enjoy ecstasy and blessedness in a future life, that we leave up to God, who will do that which is best for us.

That all sounds acceptable enough, perhaps some clear and calm thinkers say to us. However, you contradict all too much that is said and taught in the Bible, and you scorn divine revelation in that you turn the books of the Bible into a book of fables. – We scorn neither the revelation nor its record; we seek only to gain a more correct understanding of the Bible. Granted, we no longer believe that God talked with Moses and Abraham like a human being, that he inspired word for word what the writers of the Old and New Testaments should write. However, from time immemorial God reveals Himself to humanity in their own minds, in the works of creation, and, finally, in excellent and talented individuals, whom He awakens as lawgivers and prophets, teachers and Apostles among them. Such men arise in all nations, especially the Jewish nation. Among the Jews arose early the insight that there is only one God, that He is the omnipotent creator of heaven and earth, that he is not to be represented by any image, that he is the holy lawgiver and just driver of human history. For that reason, because the religious texts of the ancient Jewish nation are the only ones in which this foundation of true religion is so purely and powerfully to be found (for that reason the New Testament, also, is grounded in, and draws from, them), therefore, it is for us also Holy; the books of Moses and Samuel, the Psalms and Prophets are indispensable for our edification. However, it is a misunderstanding to take this holiness in such a way that we have to accept everything in it as literally true – every notion that every book in the Bible contains, every story that they tell. The same applies to the story of creation – a pious Israelite who was immersed in the marvelous divine works pondered their origin and imagined graphically that process; with childish sense, he divided God's work in daily tasks just as we humans do, and as a Jew accustomed to observance of the seventh day, he let the Creator himself celebrate this day. Furthermore, he or an author thought about the fallenness and suffering of humanity; he couldn't believe that humanity was originally created by God in such corruption and for such hardship; it must be humanity's own fault that everything has deteriorated so badly; therefore, he wrote the story of the original parent's fall into sin. The people of Israel experienced a remarkable fate, especially in ancient times; it escaped slavery in Egypt by a strange set of circumstances and, after a sojourn of nomadic wandering, conquered Canaan in a bloody war. Naturally, these events lived on in the mouths of the people from generation to generation; correctly, one saw God's guiding finger in them; but, because one did not yet realize that it was also God's work that He had left the people in Egyptian slavery to become strengthened,

that he, afterwards, at the proper time allowed a man like Moses to emerge and equipped him with all of the capabilities that were necessary for the liberation of his people, that He, further, let the Israelites encounter in Canaan corrupt and divided tribes – because one did not recognize the imperceptible influence of God but still was correctly convinced that God had played a role in them, so one imagined to oneself the divine activity with respect to the exodus out of Egypt in such a manner as if God with a human voice had called upon Moses to liberate his people and as if He himself led the people in cloud and fire pillars, etc. That was all written at a later time. In this fashion, the stories developed as we now read them in the so-called Books of Moses [Trans.: the Pentateuch]. There is a similar explanation for the New Testament. One asked oneself in the earliest days of Christianity, from whence came this clarity of Spirit, this sovereignty of wit, this purity of heart, which are all unlike anything in any other human being? One answered, he was not conceived out of a sinful seed; he comes directly from God, the origin of all light and so developed the stories of his supernatural conception that we find in Matthew and Luke. He appeared to be a higher Spirit who came down to earth for us for a short period of time, but, upon his departure, appears to have been raised up again to God from whom he came: Hence, the stories of his resurrection and ascension to heaven, etc.

It is far from the case that this insight debases or that Christians are being admonished not to read the Bible: far more, only from this point of view is the reading of the Bible for the thinking Christian truly edifying. As long as he feels himself obligated to the literal faith in all the biblical accounts, so long will he find an affront to his every step – the overcoming of which requires so much effort; and the mind is rocked by such wavering and turmoil that the best benefits of reading the bible are lost. How many up to now have come to reflection over his moral teaching through believing astonishment or curious rumination with respect to Jesus' miracles? However, how many, conversely, have spurned the entire Bible in ridicule or indignation because for him these stories of miracle were repugnant? Our view protects us from both. No one who embraces it will henceforth be distracted by the glitter of the supernatural away from the less gleaming but more important parts of the biblical content. No one, however, will be shocked by the offence in the face of these kinds of stories in the Bible. We rejoice over the pious and childish sense of the biblical authors and the deeper meaning of their stories even when we must recognize these to be legends and fictions. The author of the book of Matthew reports to us, and certainly believes himself, that pagan Wise Men from the East followed a star to the newborn child Jesus. However, we don't take this to be literally the case; although we recognize it for a useful image of light that was illuminated through Christ also for pagans. The same is the case with the Fall of Man. Don't teach us how the first humans fell: they [the first humans] only show us – which is more – as in a mirror, how it happens when we bring ourselves to fall by succumbing to sins. In this way, the Bible remains for us the foundation of edification; but also with the creation we are edified and by the guidance of humanity in the little and great things of life of which the bible grasps only

one but the most strange and instructive part; these three books: the book of nature, the book of history, and the bible must supplement one another; we are not permitted to neglect one over the others, and only in combination do they constitute the one and entire divine revelation.

Yet, where have I gotten to? All this is not what I want to say to you, esteemed Messrs., who know so well as I and who have known for some time that this is my conviction. Unnoticed, I turned my talk to others who don't know this as good as you and who perhaps would accept it from your instruction. Surely, this is not to be expected from this aroused crowd that glows a certainly un-Christian pagan-hatred and now wants to defend under the cover of piety all possible other-worldly interests: with these I have nothing to say – mindful of Christ's saying, that forbids presenting explicitly to such people the jewel of religious conviction. Yet, what I actually wanted to say to you, and from which I have been diverted by this digression, was this: The hostility on the part of the greater part of clerics against the new view of Christianity is no more astonishing than as has occurred everywhere on the part of members of professional guilds against a new invention because that invention makes it easier to do a task than the way the profession has practiced it. The majority of clerics, I say, are well practiced in awaking pious feelings in their parishioners by means of clinging to the literal words of the biblical stories and concepts. That we undertake to edify ourselves and others by means of a more liberated insight into the Bible is an embarrassment for them and arouses their indignation because they are not equipped to respond to it.

We let them be so indignant as they want and let them defame and brand us as heretics as they wish. They or their successors will adjust themselves in the end to what we say with certainty and must become comfortable with our new approach as the case with those trades, chosen above in comparison, who were required to accept, in the end, new inventions and to adopt them although initially most cursed the inconvenient development. Naturally, who today still has a book hand-copied when he can have it printed more cheaply and beautifully? Likewise, sooner or later the time must come that no one will listen to a cleric who believes he edifies his parishioners by a sermon in which he maintains and interprets the children of Israel as crossing the Red Sea on dry ground, Jesus' walking on water, the discovery by Peter of a coin in the mouth of a fish as truthful miracle stories. Do you not know – one will then ask a preacher – do you not know nothing more important about Jesus and Peter than this? Do you not know to prove divine omnipotence by nothing greater than that He should have done something once at the time of Moses? I don't know and it is not important whether one will think of us when that time comes – it can take a long time to occur because, when it comes to humanity as our daily experience testifies, God has in them no students in a rush to learn. However, to have diligently played a role to that end that Christ's promise of a time when one will worship God in Spirit and in truth finally comes to fruition, this witness we are able now already to provide.

May you ascertain, honorable gentlemen, consciousness of the numerous contradictions that are occurring around you as it has maintained the serenity of Christianity before in the past.

Stuttgart, March 1, 1839.

Your sincere admirer

and, more specifically, colleague, even when at this point still partially,

Dr. David Friedrich Strauß

Anonymous – Response on the Part of a Layperson to the Strauß' Epistle to Hirzel, Orelli, and Hitzig

[Anonymous Author]

Translator's Summary of Anonymous Authors' Themes

1. "We understand him to be free and rational [...] who views his own self-will as sinful as soon as it is not in agreement with God's will. You appear to view someone to be rational and free who assumes there to be no limits to the human spirit."
2. With [...] your] kind of [...] universal rationality], [...] you] stand[...] opposed to God, arraign[...] Him for His deeds, and with [...] this] limited human understanding want[...] to reign over the omnipotent creator of all things even over [...] your] own creator.
3. Should not clerics defend God's Word and against attacks of unbelief?
4. On the charge that Strauß' opponents have not read his Book: Those who have read it tell us that you maintain that most of what is in the Bible is untrue. We call such wisdom foolishness. "Your epistle, which is written from an entirely unscientific perspective, does not deserve [...] investigation."
5. On a Guild's Rejection of New Inventions: "[...] [W]hat is your invention? It is a well-known, old story [...] [Y]ou deny God's revealed Word and replace it with your understanding [...] You laugh over what believers worship and ridicule them for what they are unable to grasp. Our clerics do not accept this method for becoming a Christian. They believe according to God's Word that, in order to be part of Christian salvation, a person must let go of arrogance and confess to being a sinner, yes, must be entirely reborn so that you must peddle your invention elsewhere.
6. On miracles: "[...] [I]t is these [particular] miracles, performed entirely by our savior, that make it possible for us to understand the essence of our God and the daily occurring miracle of his providential sustaining of the world." "You cannot understand [...] [miracles] so long as God does not give the grace of understanding necessary for his revelation. You should pray for that understanding for the sake of your salvation!"
7. On Christ as a Normal Human Being: "If Christ is just a normal person, then you have no savior, and what will become of you? ... Your sins remain, and for them is promised eternal damnation!"

8. What "We" Know: "[...] [W]e know this, that what God does is done for good and that whoever knows Christ's teaching but does not believe it cannot attain eternal life."
9. On the Bible's Provision of Comfort to the Anxious and Suffering: "According to your explanation, the Bible is a collection of good stories, yet most of them are for children. What has happened to the strength of the Bible by which already millions have endured the suffering and accidents that life brings to all of us, by which already millions received peace at the hour of death, by which alone thousands of martyrs were strengthened to overcome disgrace, plagues, and painful death?"

The Text

In light of the fact that, as of today's decision by the esteemed Education- and Government-Council that you should in fact remain Professor *in partibus*, to be sure not *Infidelium* but *Antistraussianorum* – and as a result I will not be permitted all that soon the honor to see you with us, I take the freedom, to write a few lines to you. The cherished recipients of your last epistle took it to be addressed to the people and distributed it widely (there would have been only a few who would have purchased it because your name – you will excuse the Swiss-openness – is not among the most loved at this point in time). I received a copy, have read it twice, and found that I absolutely do not share your opinion. Yes, I take your perspective to be so wrong that I must speak out against it everywhere, but first, in order not to reason behind your back, I speak to you directly. – Admittedly, I am only a simple, you might say, dumb, layperson. However, as God lets the humble and simple live, yes, specifically to the latter has promised salvation, so also you will not refuse me the right to a small statement as a drip in the ocean of Spirit.

After a long, polite introduction, you hope (page 2) "the day will come when one will be able to think and speak freely about religion rationally." That's nothing new to us! A Swiss by birth thinks and speaks freely, and he doesn't allow that right to be taken away; even speaking rationally is Swiss! However, you probably understand free and rational in a different sense from the way we do. We understand him to be free and rational whose thoughts, talk, and will are completely subordinated to the will of God and who views his own self-will as sinful as soon as it is not in agreement with God's will. You appear to view someone to be rational and free who assumes there to be no limits to the human spirit because he, like you (for example, when it comes to explaining miracles and the greatest miracle, resurrection) applies the universal, measuring stick of everyday experience and its understanding. With this kind of understanding, he stands opposed to God, arraigns Him for His deeds, and with his limited human understanding wants to reign over the omnipotent creator of all things even over his own creator. I call irrational this kind of reason because it

ignores anything coming from above by taking everything from itself. It will not find any receptivity by us. No Hirzel, Strauß, Hithzig, or Orelli is capable of prevailing upon us to embrace such an opinion. For precisely that reason, you cannot come to Zurich. It appears that even in Tübingen your reason is not recognized as rational. Otherwise, you would have surely remained there. Yes, as far as I can discern from the pamphlets of silly laypeople, your reason is not recognized anywhere in Germany!

On page 2, you begin to strike out at clerics and accuse them of having attacked you from the pulpit because from there no one is permitted to contradict them. Mr. Strauß!, you are wrong, or you only want to mislead yourself. Have you heard nothing of the advisory opinion from the Theological Faculty, from the minority of the Education Council, from the unanimous advisory opinion of the General Council, and from the open advice from our Antistes in opposition to the motion calling for your appointment?; from the addresses of a Vögelin, a Brunner? Haven't you read anything of the many publications in opposition to you and Hirzel's warm, but not wise, defense of you? Even the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* would have served to give you notice of the open conflict in and outside of the Council Chamber if you did not learn about it from your friends. From that place where they proclaim God's Word, should clerics not also use the same place to defend against attacks of unbelief? It would be to their disgrace if they did not. However, you go further: the congregations do not know what you teach. The simple citizens have neither read nor understood your book.^[1] In that respect, for once, you are correct. For example, I have not read your book and surely would not have understood it, but it is not necessary to understand your huge book in order to want to remain as far from it as possible. Your friends Hirzel, Zehnder, and Co., who surely understand (!) your book, told us that you are to become a Reformer and that you will explain to our pastors, who till now have taken the Bible to be a true book, that most of what is in it is untrue. That alone is enough for us. According to the scriptures, we call such wisdom foolishness, and we don't want any fool to be a Reformer. Your short epistle, written for a public audience, is sufficient in itself, without any assistance from your friends, to recognize your teaching as heresy as we will soon see.

In your attack on the clerics, you on occasion employ pictures, to be sure neither beautiful nor noble minded but, as you say, appropriate. You say pastors, like professional, guild members, view as evil those who invent new machines and methods. However, because you would probably not depose the pastors directly, they would have no reason to oppose you with your simple method of turning people into learned theologians and good Christians – I was entranced by your analogy, I almost said

1. [1] Translator's note: Strauß actually says that the "scholars" "admit that they, if they have read it, do not possess the means to appropriately appreciate and to thoroughly understand it." Of "simple, modest citizens" Strauß wrote: "The simple, modest citizens who make up the majority of the congregation themselves, will certainly admit that they have not read or hardly seen the book that here is in question [....]"

"to fabricate" them. Yet, what is your invention? It is a well-known, old story. As has always been the case by those who are not illuminated by a higher light, you deny God's revealed Word and replace it with your understanding. You laugh over what believers worship and ridicule them for what they are unable to grasp. Our clerics do not accept this method for becoming a Christian. They believe according to God's Word that, in order to be part of Christian salvation, a person must let go of arrogance and confess to being a sinner, yes, must be entirely reborn so that you must peddle your invention elsewhere.

Then you turn to miracles and present them delicately – whether correctly, as well? – so as if belief in miracles was limited to Christianity. Laugh, Mr. Strauß, all you want; we believe in miracles because we view the Bible from alpha to omega as God's revealed Word whose correctness and truth precisely does not depend upon whether or not it is a weak human understanding that takes it to be true. The explanation that you give for the miracles is also less than new. It is the most trivial that has ever come from shallow Rationalism. Indeed, the preservation of the world is a daily miracle. Indeed, it is a divine miracle that He still permits mockers of his Word to remain unpunished for their attempts to foment devilish revolt against Him among the people. However, as amazing as this is, precisely in comparison with the known, if still uninvestigated, rules of the reigning natural order, the miracles in the Holy Scriptures turn out to be miracles quite definitely and clearly. They prove that the persons who performed them were not so completely normal men as – God forgive the comparison – you, Mr. Strauß! I will not try to explain to you the deep, holy meaning of these miracle stories to be constructed stories by humans (as you take them to be) but as true events (the significance of the darkness at the death of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, the guiding light of the Wise Men). You cannot understand them so long as God does not give you the grace of understanding necessary for His revelation. You should pray for that understanding for the sake of your salvation! As you say, what is true is that these miracles in terms of their numbers disappear like water drops in the ocean when compared with the daily occurring miracles. However, it is these miracles, performed entirely by our savior, that make it possible for us to understand the essence of our God and the daily occurring miracle of his providential sustaining of the world.

Parenthetically, you speak, then, of Christ's nature. For you, Christ is a normal, obedient human being. This is actually the central issue. We believe that the Christ who said: I and the Father are one; the Christ is God's Son who constitutes the Trinity along with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Woe to him whose reason takes offense over this truth! Woe to him who takes eternal truth to be a fable! – Mr. Strauß, you will surely admit that you, as I, am a sinner. How do you think you will escape your sins? Somehow like him who, sinking in mud, pulls himself out by the hair? You yourself know that that is not possible. Do you believe that some other, normal human being is capable of saving you? Hardly! If Christ is just a normal person, then you have no savior, and what will become of you? ... Your sins remain, and for them is promised eternal damnation! –

Mr. Strauß, what God does with people who only know the law and not Christ's teaching, whether He damns them or gives them grace, that we do not know, and you also do not know! However, we know this, that what God does is done for good and that whoever knows Christ's teaching, but does not believe it, cannot attain eternal life. – You do not believe in retribution after death. We believe in it because we believe in God's justice. Because you don't believe, [my wish is that you] may come sooner rather than later to faith!

According to your explanation, the Bible is a collection of good stories, yet most of them are for children. What has happened to the strength of the Bible by which already millions have endured the suffering and accidents, which life brings to all of us, by which already millions received peace at the hour of death, by which alone thousands of martyrs were strengthened to overcome disgrace, plagues, and painful death? In your hour of death there is no comfort offered. At that point, your reason will abandon you, and the last hour will be bitter. However, Mr. Strauß, when you say at the end of your epistle that you want nothing to do with a people who are a fanatic crowd, who under the guise of piety only defend this-worldly interest and then at once say: "Don't throw pearls before swine,^[2]" that is a way of speaking that even a half-educated person should not allow from himself, particularly over against an entire people. All of Germany has rejected your teaching. Four thousand citizens of our Canton have declared: "Strauß may, and should, not come! None is concerned with worldly things but only with the promotion of religious elements in our schools and life, and – they demand guarantees for them. Now you come with your arrogance and speak to our people in this fashion! Shame on you, Mr. Strauß, and plead to God that he does not treat you as your deeds deserve. You, who still have not constructed a system but only destroyed the sacred, want to speak of pearls. – You can keep your bad jewelry that no one wants so that whoever still wants to doubt you can measure you for the spiritual child that you are.

So much for now! I am incapable of theological investigations as a layperson. Your epistle, which is written from an entirely un-scientific perspective, does not deserve such investigation. I only wanted to give you a public witness with respect to what the people of Zurich think of your teaching and to explain to you freely that you have lost all respect with this epistle. Still, take 1,000 Francs yearly out of our state coffers! Only, stay far away! That way we will not regret this sacrifice.

Zurich, March 20, 1839

One of the 40,000

2. ^[1] Trans. note: Strauß makes no reference to swine in his epistle. The author is speaking metaphorically?!

Henne – Epistle to the Upper Council of the Canton of Zurich From Dr. Anton Henne

St. Gallen, 1839
Printed in th J.Fr. Wartmann'schen Offizin.

Translator's Summary of Henne's Themes

1. God is ubiquitous and present with all peoples.
2. All "[...] believe and trust that the Father has left to them the gift of His authentic and true will and that they cannot be deceived in that belief." "Out of ignorance, the children condemn each other to hell, and stay far away from one another."
3. There are two "gospels or revelations:" nature and history. The latter is God's "[...] covenant that He has made with the peoples of the world [...]" communicated like "parents speak to the child according to its ability to understand" "written in a sequence of books appropriate for the age of their origin."
4. "[...] the people of that time could not endure true food; they need to be raised yet on milk." "[...] [T]he New Testament texts are God's Word but only as He at that time could reveal himself to the Jews and pagans of that day."
5. The Reformation did "[...] well to see that which was non-essential to be modifications according to the times and circumstances. However, you were wrong when you took the written word [...] to be the eternal, unchanging Word of God."
6. "[...] [W]hat is paganism but to take the search for God to be found in what is merely transient, the worship of, and praying to, what is created by human beings?"
7. "Christ proclaimed the living God, who has never come but is always coming. And when they ask you: 'Is He here or there?' you should not believe them!"
8. Academic Freedom: "No branch of research can be lacking at the university as long as it wants to have earned its name [...]"
9. "[...] when [...] [Pietists] condemn others who question, then they step outside of the circle of what is acceptable."
10. Were someone to say that s/he cannot imagine an "authentically, living and complete God-head in Jesus of Nazareth" but that he is "a human being in the sense of the first among all human beings as the divinely desired and created individual

actuality of the *imageo dei* (divine image) in human nature,” “I would elevate Him [Jesus] in my thoughts far above him, [who says such things], who hangs onto the church’s conception or some other concept of Christ’s divinity, and who exclusively for that reason believes himself to be enlightened and blessed [... as possessing] the comfortable feeling of condescension for being among the chosen but by no means living in Christ in Spirit and mind [...]”

The Text

Epistle To the Upper Council of the Canton of Zurich

Honorable Men and Confederates [*Eidgenossen*]!

The events happening in Zurich are so serious that they serve as a mirror of our time to every thoughtful person. The decision of the Governing Council on the 4th entrusts them to history and public judgment. They have become general property and now serve, as the case with all historical facts, as instruction. They are no longer Zurich events; they are Swiss. They are no longer isolated events, but one of the oscillations of the earthquake of our century. You, Honorable Men, will find on the 18th a touchstone of your manhood. You will have to take stock, and it is always good to know how one stands or, even, whether one is even standing.

Here, we have an agitated horde; not agitated by nature, not out of pressure, not by an historical event, but because of clerical arrogance [*Pfaffheit*] and demagoguery. (The agitated horde was around as the region of Basel bled, as in Schwyz the Hornen-regiment exercised wantonly capricious destruction. The horde was around just a few months ago as the masses remained indifferent to the achievement of the rule of law. It showed itself to be fed by pure inventions as at the time of Montebello [cousin of French King Louis Philippe I, diplomat in Switzerland from 1835–1838, bitterly hated by revolutionaries and anarchists], and, religiously as well, the horde was always more practical than pleasant.) Here, we have barbarism rather than strength; intoxication instead of enthusiasm; blustering and tension in place of calm sense. This is not how hurt religious feelings speak.

Those in power, of whom a part was never popular [*volkstümlich*]; who, when it came to the Canton Alliance, were never open and offered nothing fresh in the developments of the day; who under Kummert, instead of being a true banner declaring itself at the front of the national majority, preferred to push the cart from the rear; who above all, when it came to the Swiss question, caused the turn to viciousness; who sadly, rarely stood in solidarity with the Canton’s populous in true, republican

openness and, as a result, in a matter such as the simple occupation of a professorship, some muddled people in her midst and individual demagogues outside her were immediately thrown from their horses. In this case, the victims were the truly upright, solid, manly minority.

However, abroad and at home there is a corrupt driving and churning up of hatred in all the papers that reported nastily with respect to the cause of the people seeking reform and republicanism. Further, there was a spying by the [German] *Allgemeine Zeitung* [newspaper], the paper open for purchase by all interests with the exception of the greatest, humanity, that preferred to take a position with respect to Switzerland like that of the papal nuncio along with the *Ablégeplaze* [?], that absolute opinion of the day, which, as a consequence admittedly, was never dangerous because it was never popular, as the case with the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, as well. The same goes for the so-called *Bundeszeitung* [Confederation Newspaper] that was once a claw but now is incessantly narrow-minded. A flood of pamphlets, that, stirring up dust, sacrifices what is actually such a clear cause rather than to illuminate it for what it is. Yes, as if such struggles ought to contain within them all the puss of the times, the party of darkness consisting of even two converted Jews, as if by command, sound the bell: the friend of truth, Joel Jacobi against the government of Prussia and the pietism of an inflated pastor from our Canton against Hirzel [Mayor of Zurich].

Once more: what kind of *posse comitatus* [*Landsturm*: posse; volunteer militia] is this? What army marches under such a flag? Who are these men whose catchwords are hate and raw violence? Indignation has brought me to label crude things crudely. I couldn't do otherwise, but I want to change my tone and, in the face of the devil, once again speak from the heart, even if it has been slapped or stabbed.

A person originates from God as a creature fashioned for something great, for all eternity, full of strengths, the divine essence, and spirit, a true "image that is like God." In this manner he awakens and doesn't know from where and how. He is surrounded by the eternally changing earth, which is also eternally beautiful that possesses an order according to a wisdom that assures him, as anything perceptible is capable of assuring anyone, that in and behind the perceptible the imperceptible lives, rules, creates, and leads him. He sees the seasons of the year in their fullness and enjoys their different configurations as they truly appear to, and pass before, him. When the sun leaves, he shuts his eyes in sleep; before the sun appears, a voice wakens him, and low-and-behold, the sun reappears. A current of comfort undulates out of his heart in all his arteries. He feels that everything is arranged for luck and joy, and, if he remains awake, worlds like sand on a beach appear immeasurable and a quantity that he sinks down on his knees, longingly stretches out his arms to embrace his homeland, and believes that he hears voices from distant shores where great things await him. There is a God, there is a will, there is a providence, there is a greater plan, and he feels fulfilled. The small plants with their tender and sublime structure call out to him. His heartbeat and the eye confirm it just as with the enigmatic text that are flowers strewn out by the millions over pastures as well as those unmistakable features like the stars

above in their silent spaces. Whoever's courtyard is so wonderful, His house must shine! Whoever's external appearance compels worship and adoration, how sublime, how deep, how great His essence must be! All that is what the eye sees, first. Yet, what ideas of Him and what voice about Him will ring out in the mind! When joy in Him arises like a red sky in the morning – just as when a jolt of pain strikes one like a lightning bolt – how can he not feel the "passing" of the Lord! When he shuts his eyes and also sees in his inward heaven the rising circle of stars, he peers into the depths from which his own soul often looks back as if it brushes the spirit world. Where is the being who says to me: "God does not exist?" Where is a spirit who grasps how He is? Is that not enthusiasm [*Schwärmerei*]? Is that poetry that flows through the arteries of all creation, causes a million voices to cry out, and is felt to be present in every heartbeat and breath of air? Truly, a day calls forth the next, and a night is followed by another. A century strides into the next, and the events of history show the fire pits where He passed by and set up his tent. That is the living, eternal God. Who hasn't felt and believed in Him?

Where is that people on this earth who cannot show the footprints where He has stood? From the Maoris who lay there dead in the earth and make offerings of fruit to the Great Spirit, to the magnificent, hallowed out cliffs of India with their more than 4,000 year-old carved pillars and images – up to the highly sublime temples of the old Nile and the pyramids as well as the light, heavenly-rising column-halls of Greece and Italy in which the fine spirit of a splendid people left its image – where has He not wandered and passed by? Which of His children has He not visited? Which has He cast out? Which has He privileged? When we ask them, they show us the sophisticated, holy books from their ancient times and know of holy rituals and visible festivals in which the ancient world depicted the imperceptible and sought to say the inexpressible. These religions all bring forth tremendous phenomena, personal sacrifices, death for the Fatherland and truth, the magnanimity of the soul in life and death, comfort to the suffering, and hope in passing.

Here we're at the crucial point. All of these children believe and trust that the Father has left to them the gift of His authentic and true will and that they cannot be deceived in that belief. All are equally His children and reflect in their faces his unmistakable image. However, in pride, the Jew but also the Christian separate themselves from the others, point to their books in Hebrew or Greek, and explain in their arrogance: He is solely with us; our scriptures alone are God's Word; He has only visited us; He was never with you. We are God's people. When the others ask: How do you prove the divinity of your book? Jews and Christians answer: miracles prove their divinity. – OK, but how do you prove your miracles? – Answer: the book in which they are written proves them.

Out of ignorance, the children condemn each other to hell, and stay far away from one another. Is that the way things should be? That's nothing that God wants because he has not stopped coming, continues to wander to this day through the world, and

humanity could remove the destructive obstacle if it wished. I state my confession of faith openly. It is well-nigh time that we state so to one another clearly.

God has given us two gospels or revelations. The oldest is creation: nature, unchanging despite its eternal transformation and fluctuation, unfalsifiable because He has written it by His own hand in the truest sense of the word. I am sorry for whoever is unable to read it (it is truly, the most childish and most understandable to be read); he misses the most beautiful and the greatest; he is not yet God's child because such a child understands and should perceive, above all, the eyes and laugh of father and mother; his heart remains cold and his mind barren. Creation is full of wonders, which we will never be able to measure or grasp although the most erudite have tried to do so for thousands of years – and ever-new realms and new gateways open up into new courtyards for the investigator.

The second gospel is history, the revelation in the person, in his inner self, his experiences, or as people say, in the covenant that He has made with the peoples of the world. Now everyone knows that parents speak to the child according to its ability to understand, its age. With a child they speak as a child in childish expressions and images. In this fashion, God has spoken with his children on every island. However, it is God's Word solely in a form that is appropriate for them. Is not the Christmas tree and the laying of the Christ child in the manger not also a parent's word surely meant for the young? For those who are older, it is no longer true, but they, too, remember with affection these childish days. He spoke in this fashion with the peoples of India and Egypt (their wise men, who came from the East, knew for a long time of a coming Messiah, and recognized his star as it shined) and helped them build their temples, which to this day evoke astonishment from the observer. He spoke here, too, but now as an adult with the Patriarchs on the mountain tops of Mesopotamia and Canaan and with Moses on Sinai. I speak now from my innermost soul: all that was God's words, but each time spoken according to the concepts and the mental standpoint in which the Father speaks to children. They are revelations in history; the divine becoming human, appearance of the Word in flesh; the old covenants; testaments.

Bits and pieces of this revelation were written down by individuals in the course of time. The Old Testament of the Israelis provides the apparent confirmation of how God's Word slowly was written in a sequence of books appropriate for the age of their origin. For example, as a divinely enlightened individual so truly anticipated, designed, and saw God in creation and history that he, in the truest sense, spoke with Him spoke, and God took him into Himself, which didn't happen frequently, he wrote in a book this fullness, a prophet of his time, as a saving legacy in order to transmit this divine fullness to others. However, first, no finite human being is able to grasp in words this complete fullness to represent it; (yes, can never place on paper an idea, not even a great one, in the way that the idea completely fills him, – yes, he can only write a word that would be as it came from his own heart and mouth). Second, it was only God as he could reveal Himself in that time, and His revelation is no number or measure. In this manner, Moses presented the God of the Old Testament.

In our age, God revealed Himself in his complete fullness and truth in Jesus Christ, in the new covenant. I hold it to be at this point a sin, given that I am speaking with Christians, to say a single word concerning the divinity of the man or his teaching. I have already done so with my whole heart in the epistle to the people of Zurich, and in the course of my entire life. However, I speak ever so decisively and would sacrifice my life for this conviction: not even here in the God/Man of our age has his complete fullness or his complete essence appeared in a written word. He himself didn't write anything; his primary goal was his work of salvation; text and letters are dead, they're nothing. His church grew, flourished, lived, added saints and martyrs, and spread itself across the world before a single word was written. The Messiah wanted to appear as the Son of David to the Jews (i.e., as Jewish) and did so. He himself explained that only in the course of time did he intend to send his spirit that will teach, at that point, all truth, and the writings appeared without arrangement, hence, in pieces and at different times. The Apostles say this themselves that there are not enough books in the entire world to contain all of what he did and said (i.e., God's entire Word). Further: the people of that time could not endure true food; they still needed to be raised on milk.

I am not going to be smart, as my friends advise me to do and speak out without fear what I am thinking without making any bones about it or retreating. Here I abandon myself to the enthusiastic Pastor Bernet in St. Gallen, the only one who in the Strauß affair has hit the nail on the head,¹ equally childishly impartial, my complete heresy: the New Testament texts are God's Word but only as He at that time could reveal himself to the Jews and pagans of that day. The work of salvation is his entire, divinely nature; but text and letters, language and narrative character is Jewish. That is where I am, as well.

Dr. Strauß (as I understand him – if he is otherwise, God knows) is the man, who takes his research to show how one might distinguish what is Jewish in the New Testament from what is generally human or Christian as do others (it was earlier the case, but I also don't have that from him – Schultheß in Zurich and Fels in St. Gallen don't either), and that is his crime.

Protestant Christians (!), your Reformation removed from the written word all human additions made over time and took the core document to be the foundation of the church. You did well to see that which was non-essential to be modifications according to the times and circumstances. However, you were wrong when you took the written word, as it could and must have been given some 1,800 years ago by tenacious and narrow-believing Jews and in the sensuous fallenness of the Greeks and Romans, to be the eternal, unchanging Word of God. You restricted the Holy Spirit that was promised, and you hindered Jesus' work of salvation to make his coming, his return, impossible. Yes, you are precisely on the way to do what he came to destroy, namely, to establish the merely written word as a new covenant, a new circumcision,

1. "Daß neue Heil und das geschriebene Wort." St. Gallen 1839.

a new Talmud and Koran. For what is paganism but to take the search for God to be found in what is merely transient, the worship of and praying to what is created by human beings? However, "text, mere letters, according to His own Word, is death, and only spirit is life." Christ proclaimed the living God, who has never come but is always coming. "And when they ask you: is He here or there, you should not believe them!"

The Catholics let God be ossified in dead works of faith and dead words. Luther and Zwingli didn't want that, and had they wanted it so, they, too, would have been mere revelations of their time. When Bernet says to me that everything is merely negative, whereas humanity needs a positive church so that the negative and protest must have its limit somewhere, I must ask: when and where does God's coming have an end? When will He be completely here? Don't be concerned about that! Be concerned that Christ is in you, but the living, not the dead Christ! Allow him, the Christ of freedom, full of grace and truth to appear to our depressed people, to whom spirituality was present 1,800 years in the Jewish Christ, and you will stand under his crusader flag. Once again, the protectors of the Word have sinned horribly, and their hour of judgment has struck. The winnowing fork is to separate the wheat from the chaff. The axe is laid to the tree. If you don't do what is yours, it will be done by someone else. Yes, it has already happened, and your guards of Zion have promoted themselves against their own will.

And you, deceived, misled people!, you let yourselves hear that your constitution has been violated. Have you forgotten the time when Roman Catholicism was a mainstay in Zurich, and the city was filled with cloisters and ceremonies?, when Zwingli 1519 stepped forward and illuminated the night?, as new believers you participated in the Federal Diet?, as those of you set out for Rappel, toppled the tattered army at the gates, the reactionaries fleeing proclaimed the return of the old regime, and the people's dangerous movement smoldered? How did things stand with Zurich, how did it stand with its Council in this storm? Was the need not greater?, the situation not more difficult?, the test not more serious? Honorable Men, don't you recognize the role that you play for Switzerland and Europe? Do you want to break your word and, because of a rowdy crowd, be cowardly? Reassure the people that a competent man at the university is teaching dogmatics "according to the Protestant-reformed doctrinal concept" and that the agitators are failing in their real purpose, which is to place the demagogic element above the government and to be able to endanger order and tranquility at any moment. Were that to happen, scientific research, the voice that was given to the university by the Education Council, would be conducted only by the Protestant element. Don't stand there in the face of such decisions, like even the smallest Canton wouldn't, and destroy Zurich's powerful influence on the Swiss confederates! If one doesn't pay careful attention, he can no longer be trusted anymore. Don't let individuals triumph who then in victory go it alone in this struggle! Don't submit to a government majority that with one hand curtly and politely dismisses the movement's Committee while it with the other hand breaks its sworn oath formally and calmly before the whole world in order to do something that is neither tepid nor

hot! You men of Zurich, you see differently than the government. A proclamation from you will be a different voice for the people than what has been heard to this point. You know the people. It honors dignity and character even when it is agitated. Don't erase the one, marvelous achievement that has come to the fore again out of the history of Switzerland! Representatives of the people, don't strike down the people, who have turned back, once again, from confusion and present themselves as true and courageous at your side! When honor is lost, everything is lost! The best words do not whitewash a retreat. This time all of Europe is watching!

If you do all this, what will happen? It would leave the institution of the university to the believers and the direction of research to the current Protestantism. If you don't do this, I grant you, the university would offer positive theology; but without this, theology would be neither Protestant nor scholarly. No branch of research may be lacking at the university, especially in these matters, where the system has long been in place, but so far more suspicious of the holy scriptures than seriously and openly examining them, if the university wants to deserve its name. Luther and Zwingli challenged a church power structure with far deeper rootedness. They destroyed a much more splendid worship service with its engagement of all the senses, they suddenly took away from humanity an entire world of blood and poetry. They risked much more – and on the basis of what authority? – merely on the authority of free investigation in opposition to all that was to that point sacred whereas the present reformation, in contrast, with some things wants to re-vitalize and revere the world of blood and poetry.

Truly, he whose mind is faithfully committed to something remains unoffended. I take the truly believing Catholic or Protestant as well as the so-called Anglican, to be people who deserve respect. Blessed are those who believe! They have retrained their sense of childhood, which so many others have left behind. I have worked with all my strength for a long time, privately and publicly, against the oppression of so-called Pietists because I honor them and take it to be outrageous to infringe on someone's inner conviction. However, when they condemn others who question, then they step outside of the circle of what is acceptable. A believer may feel sorry for someone of less faith. He has advantages over the latter. He dies calmly holding onto the certificate of the Word in his hand. The person of less faith has more difficulty with life and death. He can only depend on God's Word in his heart and in nature; he has to sacrifice, like Abraham, the Isaac of his heart without having it in writing how it will all work out. He must step onto the bridge to the afterlife with a determination that recalls the heroes of ancient times and thereby dare to trust in God and life, I would say. His submission must be greater; his faith deeper and more internal despite the appearance of unbelief. I take such a person to be one filled with Christ. Pastor Bernet, to whom I referred above, says in his sermon on understanding the essence of Christ (St. Gallen, 1839)), where he says on p. 15:

"If someone were to admit to me: 'He absolutely cannot imagine the presence of the authentically, living and complete God-head in Jesus of Nazareth and, therefore, cannot convince himself to believe it; is unable, likewise, to think of the glorified and resurrected Christ in heaven in his particular personage and simultaneously universal, worldly power; especially not, then, when he in the process considers God as Father. Yet, he takes Christ to be a human being in the sense of the first among all human beings as the divinely desired and created individual actuality of the *imageo dei* (divine image) in human nature – Christ's person and essence is for him, nevertheless, or more correctly said, his enduring attention is directed toward the ideal of his Spirit, the joy of his heart, the life of his innermost living. He only began to properly recognize his own humanity after he came to know Christ. His humanity is each day for him preferable, more important, venerable, and sacred for the sake of the human Christ. Yes, Christ became for him above all the God of humanity. Christ's existence made religion credible and faith possible (i.e., made living religiosity necessary). He sees for himself no true salvation except, with his mind, fittingly heartfelt, to live in this Christ, and he knows of nothing in the world able to provide a substitute. He believes that he has come somewhat closer to his self-determination when Christ's Spirit and life also comes alive to a degree in himself, is palpable in and on his own spirit and life, etc.' – Should a person come to me in whom these things are lived not merely in words but in Spirit and in truth, I would elevate him in my thoughts far above him, who hangs onto the church's conception or some other concept of Christ's divinity and exclusively for that reason believes himself to be enlightened and blessed and, as now thousands and thousands do, with the comfortable feeling of condescension for being among the chosen but by no means living in Christ in Spirit and mind and thereby demonstrating in all that he does that it is the fruit of a spiritual union with Christ but only results, as with the former believer, at best in a superficial moral teaching.

I would say to the first believer with cheerful certainty: 'Continue in confidence on your path of simple experience and purely human appreciation of Christ! The more you seek him, the more you will find him. The closer you meet him, the more he will grow in you to immeasurable heights, yes, even to heaven just as the ever-approaching high mountains elevate the hiker.'

Whoever doesn't take a Moses Mendelssohn to be close to God although he remained to the end with the One God of the patriarchs and with Him whom Jesus called his and our Father, he does not possess Christ's Spirit.

Yet here there is no issue of introducing religious pluralism or indifference where, on the contrary, precisely the religious feeling of a person as his inviolable sanctuary is being defended. When in the temple of Christianity, the two confessions have each his own huge side chapel, why should the majority not also enter, who constantly increase in number and who, when they hear the call to repentance, remain on their feet, beat their breast, and are silent, but with the deep feeling of God's omnipresence? Once again: the Jewish savior Jesus has become the savior of the world as the Christian savior under whose flag we want to live and die, just as he came down transfigured from Mt. Tabor and brought a new age. That is his promised second coming.

His peace be with you, honest men; his courage lift you; and the hope in Him to whom he wants to lead us make you strong!

St. Gallen, March 12, 1839.

Dr. Anton Henne

Afterword for the People of St. Gallen

Here is an Oestrich egg [*Straußenei*]. My faith is so that it, without any ground, may be presented [*dargelegt*] to you. Each should take it as I present it. I leave it to free judgment. For Pastor Wirth in Rappertswill, it will just be "sheer invention" [*blauer Dunst*], again. In God's name, I cannot do otherwise. To the St. Gallen citizens who sent me three publications in recent days, for whom my confession of faith generated discomfort, may this serve as an answer to you. Let us bear with one another until we enter into God's glory in whose expectation I calmly and humbly approach death. Pastor Bernet's pamphlet was a direct hit on my heart. However, I believe that we are of one faith and that his Christ should also be mine. We, who want to meet one another on the other side, are not opponents here. I would never be able to shoot him. That he knows.

Meyer – The Value of the Written Word

from M. Meyer, Pastor in Glattfelden

An Answer
to
"The Epistle of Dr. Anton Henne"
to the People of Zurich

[Translator's Note: It is not until the "Postscript" (page 246) that Meyer refers to Henne's "Epistle." He, apparently, wrote the majority of this "Answer" in response to another pamphlet from Henne.]

Translator's Summary of Meyer's Themes

1. Evangelical-Reformed Christians "[...] recognize the written Word, as it has come to us by direction of the Lord, as elevated above all human wisdom and as the decisive authority in matters of faith."
2. Henne takes "[...] our Holy Scriptures [...] to be no more worthy of respect than some human text directed at some finite goal [...]"
3. All human suffering arises "[...] because humanity has been disloyal to God's written Word [...]"
4. "Just try sending to pagans someone with all of the trappings of Straußian scholarship and philosophy, and you will see that the written Word, simply understood by means of faith, has infinitely more value than the empty abstractions of fleeting ideas of a Speculative Idealism."
5. "[...] [M]any teachers in the church and especially in school elevate themselves above the written Word of God and want to conquer it with their own wisdom [...]"
6. Even you, Dr. Henne, could not have come to your watered-down faith "without the written Word that you so scorn."
7. "[...] [Y]ou come out swinging unconcerned whether or not you undermine for thousands their faith in the Holy Scriptures and their authenticity and throw them into a painful fire of doubt from which they cannot possibly save themselves [...]"

8. No question that the gospels are authoritative: "[...] [A]ccording to the unanimous witness of the church Fathers, the four gospels were in general use already in the middle of the second century and that the church already then had eliminated all that was inauthentic or doubtful from the recognized gospels so that we can take as certain that our handwritten scripts are copies of the early, authentic gospels [...] Only ignorant hubris or concealed malevolence can attack the authenticity of the gospel history on the grounds of insufficient hand-written manuscripts."
9. Dr. Strauß presupposes that "What human understanding is incapable of grasping and an educated reason cannot grasp is not true – as well as that everything must be set aside that he is not able to bring into agreement with his way of conceiving things so that he works through the entire life of Jesus and leaves nothing left over of Jesus but empty shadows."
10. "You want us to doubt the written Word of God and, as substitute, give us a living Word of God. Yet, where is this living Word of God to be found except among Christians and, namely, the true Christians whose knowledge has been refined by humble investigation of the written Word, who have received their faith by reading and lived understanding and commitment to this Word?"
11. "You are able to do everything self-sufficiently, you are able to rule the world, you are able to create faith, you possess Titan powers and pile up the crags of your understanding and knowledge on top of one another in order to conquer heaven. For you, pride is a virtue; but humanity is a poor cowardice that you see in the clouds only at a great distance."
12. Ridicules Henne's focus on nature as revelation of divine providence: "May you with your sighs of freedom be conjoined with mild spring air, may you entrust your lamentations to the sublime mountains and cliffs, may a rushing stream of complacency flow out of your heart into your arteries; all that we do not begrudge you in the least. [However,] we need far more for our hearts. We follow on His way to the cross the scorned Son of God and Son of Man. Doing so, His divine love invades our souls; there we find rest for our souls. For we know: the Lord sacrificed Himself for us."
13. We know (!) that the scriptures are God's Word and our reading is God's interpretation: "We know that when we read or hear with reverence the written Word that the Lord Himself is in our midst, that He Himself interprets for us this Word [...]"
14. Bible believers "[...] hear far more eagerly the stories of their loving Father than the stories of charlatans told for money and relate pleasant words as they wish or what occurs to them in the moment. – If you wish to write something, again, concerning the written, divine Word, I advise you: First ask someone who knows this Word, even the most simple farmer [...]"

The Text

Always ready to stand in the front line when it comes to the struggle for freedom, Dr. Henne encounters us here in the field of theology, and we are only sorry that, again, we must experience that a heart committed to every form of human freedom is by far insufficient to be successful in the holy struggle, which he undertakes. His failed attempt is driven by the assumption that the people of the Canton of Zurich, blinded by self-serving pastors and an aristocracy that seeks to oppress, have been misled to declare a war of freedom against the pastors. In the process, he combats the written Word and maintains that "the dead, written Word has always served to oppress the people. With the written Word one has burned at the stake and frequently silenced and killed the most honorable hearts and tongues that risked proclaiming the sunrise of a coming day, etc." He raises the question: "Has the written Word up to this point brought you blessedness or salvation?"^[1]

Every Christian owes him a response, especially evangelical-reformed Christians who indeed recognize the written Word, as it has come to us by direction of the Lord, as elevated above all human wisdom and as the decisive authority in matters of faith. Though before I respond to you, Dr., I must call your attention that what you mean by the written Word is something entirely different from what we mean and that you, apparently, take our Holy Scriptures, which we take to be God's Word, to be no more worthy of respect than some human text directed at some finite goal or other. You say: "with the written Word in the hand, one has alienated the people from emperor and oaths, loosened all holy alliances, and whipped up upheavals, national wars, and civil wars, etc."^[2] Your raising such charges betrays that you know very little of the written Word to which our people hold themselves committed as God's revealed Word. Our people know this Word completely differently. They know that all such sufferings of humanity arise because humanity has been disloyal to God's written Word, that they have placed on the lampstand their own will-o'-the-wisp rising from the swamp of loveless selfishness rather than this light of heavenly revelation and, thereby, thrown the deceived people out into the darkest night. As a Catholic, who bewails the bondage of the Papacy and groans for freedom for the Catholic people, shouldn't you know that the true commitment to the Bible as God's Word can be, by no means, compared to holding firmly to the human statutes of the Papacy; that, far more, the turning back to God's revealed Word was the first mortal blow to the capricious pretensions of the Papacy? Shouldn't you not know that all zealous devotees to the Papacy, at all times and still today, maintain that the free and true reading and application of biblical teaching is the most dangerous weapon that can be employed against the Papacy and that all those liberal Catholics who encourage the reading of the Bible are viewed by the Papacy as an evil?

1. [1] Trans. note: These quotes do not come from Henne's epistle.

2. [2] Trans. note: This quote does not come from Henne's epistle.

When I answer these questions, when I maintain that the words that the Lord spoke in the written Word of the Old and New Testaments are not dead letters but spirit and life, when I claim: indeed, the Lord has blessed and saved primarily by means of the prescribed Word those who have clung to them truly, I must refuse to tolerate that you place on the same level with our divine Word the repressed Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and other esteemed human concoctions, or generally other merely profane written words, or our Zurich laws. I claim that, certainly, our written Word in God's hands has been the primary means, already before the Reformation, to sanctify and save from the spirit of bondage all the heretical individuals and groups who have risked reading our Word of God, have proclaimed it, and have led their lives according to it. I claim that Huss and Jerome of Prague under the severe persecution from the Catholic Church primarily found their salvation by means of the enlightenment by, warming of, and enthusiasm for the written Word. I claim that the best readers, those noblest Christians, in your Catholic Church before and after the Reformation were always those who demonstrated themselves in their writings, teachings, and way of life to be humble, true students of the written Word. I further claim that our Reformers were able to achieve an enduring victory over the Papacy only by means of the written Word of God that had lain for many centuries in dust by pulling it into public light and by translating it into the public language of the people. – I believe further that it was just this written Word whom the black slaves in our newest time owe thanks not only for their freedom in an external sense but also, and primarily, for their internal freedom of the spirit. Just try sending to pagans someone with all of the trappings of Straußian scholarship and philosophy, and you will see that the written Word, simply understood by means of faith, has infinitely more value than the empty abstractions of fleeting ideas of a Speculative Idealism.

You ask our people: "Have your pastors, the servants of the written Word raised you in wretchedness, and do they stand at your side?"^[3] I believe that I can claim that all people who believe in a historical and living Christ, can say to you from their hearts: "His Word has become our faith from sunrise to sunset, and His cross is the flag of our freedom" – they will answer: Yes, certainly, the more a pastor is a true servant of the written Word, the more truly he himself is committed to it, the more truly he defends it and needs it for the reason that it was given, to teach, to punish, to improve, and to raise in justice, that the Man of God was sent in perfection in every good work (II Timothy 3:16, 17), all the more he has raised us in wretchedness, all the more he stands with us at our entrance now in this life all the way to the last hour. This is precisely the complaint of the faithful among the people (the unfaithful, indeed, want a teaching that itches their ears and cultivates in them nothing other than always something new to say and to hear) (Acts 16:21) that so many teachers in the church and especially in school elevate themselves above the written Word of God and want to conquer it with their own wisdom instead of learning from, warming to, and being

3. [] Trans. note: This quote does not come from Henne's epistle.

enthusiastic for the written Word in humility as is the case with the rest of the people. You know from many years of experience in joy and flesh that the Word of God, even the written Word of God, can save the soul to the extent that it is adopted in faith (James 1:21).

Now that I have answered your question, I want to ask you something: How can you say: "All of us hold in heart and mind that age in which the Patriarchs communicated with God," etc. – further: "It will grip our soul with overwhelming power when we see later the anticipated, promised one come in his gentle, stern, and true divine manner,"^[4] etc.? From where does such faith come to you? I am assuming that your words are serious and not merely presented to deceive your readers. Do you have such faith from [Carl] Venturinis' *Natural History of the Prophet of Nazareth* [1802], from the writings of Dr. Paulus, or his transfigured Schultheß, or Strauß' *Life of Jesus*? I must seriously doubt that you have come to such faith without the written Word that you so scorn. Here is something to think about: Romans 11:18. "Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." –

However, I almost want to say that the faith of which you speak in your writings at the very outset is not a living faith as our written Word requires. It is not the living faith on which you base your salvation, or else you at the least must be on mighty shaky ground with this faith. Otherwise, how could you off-handedly maintain in an open call to a faithful Christian people: "The books of the Old and New Testament are honorable remnants of antiquity, treasured resources, but they are not the covenant, they are not the Word of God."^[5] In order to claim this, you are making everything easy for yourself. You pronounce a quick judgment in a few sentences over the origin and development of the Holy Scriptures. You have come to this judgment so quickly, have read here or there, perhaps in a dictionary or acquired from a circle of associates, what other people must research and investigate their entire lives before they venture to give a judgment about such an important matter. However, you are a Dr. and are a zealous man of freedom and, because you are convinced that you mean well, you come out swinging unconcerned whether or not you undermine for thousands their faith in the Holy Scriptures, their authenticity, and throw them into a painful fire of doubt from which they cannot possibly save themselves because they can't check themselves to see if Dr. Henne has spoken the truth or if he only has spoken in the manner of the times of things about which he knows nothing. Unfortunately, the history of the Kingdom of God is so little known on earth, also in our Canton among the educated and uneducated so that many could easily take as valid the counterfeit coins of an educated Dr. Even our Association for Public Education broadcast provisionally such things.

4. □ Trans. note: These quotes do not come from Henne's epistle.

5. □ Trans. note: This quote does not come from Henne's epistle.

How do you know – "that the church was split over 500 years into two camps, with one side, mostly Egyptian, founded by an educated Alexandrian in the first century (i.e., a contemporary of the disciples) who constantly challenged the authenticity of the New Testament writings, namely the history of Jesus?"^[6] – This claim I throw back at you as crassest ignorance or as brazen distortion of the truth. With "educated Alexandrian" you most likely are referring to Philo? However, he was a Jew. You mean by the one camp that questioned the authenticity of the New Testament writings, namely the history of Jesus – probably primarily Clement and Origen the church Fathers of the so-called Alexandrian school born in 183. I can assure you that there are students among us who know more about these church Fathers than you, and I recommend to you that you consult the first, best instructional text of Church history, in order to learn of your crass error. Yet, because you are an educated Dr., because you can consult the writings of the church Fathers in St. Gallen,^[7] so I ask you to take a look in them and to hold in more honor the written Word. Otherwise, I will have to soon believe that you talk about all written word, even our written divine Word, without having read them. – To be sure, it is true that the Alexandrian school applied its scholarship and its philosophical knowledge to Christianity (contrary to those Christians whose gospel and its history was taken to be more external) by placing more worth in solitary contemplativeness, in self-tormenting abstinence with respect to external pleasures of life (especially in contrast to the realistic tendencies that dominated in Asian Minor and Africa as Montanism) to urge a higher, academic version of Christianity. It is true that Origen distinguished between a sensuous and a higher, spiritual understanding of Christianity, but he was far away from calling into question the New Testament and especially the history of Jesus. On the contrary, he said:⁸ "One must believe that there is no point in the Holy Scriptures in which the Wisdom of God is lacking. For He, who had spoken to a human being, 'You should

6. [□] Trans. note: This quote does not come from Henne's epistle.

7. [□] Trans. note: St. Gallen is the location of the oldest library north of the Alps. The library itself has a storied history: that extends from its association with Gallus, companion of Columban, the Irish monk determined to "re-Christianize" Europe after the departure of the Romans, who because of illness remained behind and established a hermitage in what is now St. Gallen, Switzerland, rather than go on to Italy; to Wiborada, the aristocratic woman who had herself walled-into a tiny cell with only an opening for food and a view of the altar of the church of St. Gallen, who after ten years of solitude had a vision of the coming of the Hungarians and warned the Abbott to hide the library, who herself was removed through the ceiling by the Hungarians and martyred for refusing to disclose the monastery's treasures, and who was the first woman to be elevated to sainthood by a pope; to reception of the status of a World Heritage Site by UNESCO for the baroque library that now houses the manuscripts. See Arno Borst, *Mönche am Bodensee 610–1525* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag GmbH & Co., 1978): 83; Peter Ochsenbein and Karl Schmuki, *Sankt Galler Heilige. Handschriften und Drucke aus dem 8. Bis 18. Jahrhundert* (St. Gallen, Verlag am Klosterhof, 1988): 32–35; Johannes Duft and Tibor Missura-Sipos, *Die Ungarn in Sankt Gallen: Mittelalterliche Quellen* (St. Gallen: Kommissionsverlag Leobuchhandlung, 1992): 68–75; Johannes Duft, *Die Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Gallen. Der Barocksaal und seine Putten* (St. Gallen, Verlag Ostschweiz, 1974).].

8. *Philokalia* c.1.51.

not appear before me empty-handed' (Exodus 34) will Himself not say anything empty. The prophets take what they say from His fullness. Therefore, everything wafts out of this fullness, and there is nothing in the prophets, in the law, or the gospel, or the Apostolic letters that does not come from this fullness. The revelation of the divine fullness wafts over those who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and a nose to take in the fragrance that comes from it. However, if you ever in your reading come across a passage where you say that it is a stumbling block and a rock of offence, you should call yourself into question. Don't doubt that this stumbling block contains [Trans.: valuable] thoughts, and it will at times appear to be so, but as it is written: Whoever believes will not have his hopes dashed. Believe first, and you will find much holy benefit among those things that appear to be a vexation."

Could this be an any more diametrically opposed from the way of understanding the scriptures than that by Dr. Strauß? Admittedly, it is true that Origen took to be his highest goal to impart the higher truths to the academically trained capable of understanding them; that he didn't reduce everything to the single goal that we find in Christianity: salvation, rebirth, healing, and blessedness; that the practical goal of improving the heart played for him a more secondary role. He was more interested in the investigation of what God is, what the nature of His only begotten Son was, and in what respect the Son was divine; why He descended and took on human nature, etc. However, he maintained throughout that there must be a connection between what to him was the higher aim of spiritual development and the subordinate aim of improvement of the heart. It is also true that the Alexandrian spiritual school of thought could have resulted in the historical dissipating into merely abstract ideas, but the pious sense of these men protected them from such a false path. Precisely in this we recognize the marvelous leadership of the Lord that He balanced out this great one-sided form of Christianity with the other side so that such one-sidedness very quickly deflated as a Christian sect and, therefore, gradually disappeared.

What you present to the people about Arius and his followers is, again, entirely erroneous because Arius fought over nothing else than the nature and essence of Christ before he appeared on earth. Precisely out of this long-lasting, fruitless conflict, we can recognize how much people can err when they distance themselves from the written Word and with their reason and wisdom want to go beyond the revealed Word.

However, now you wish to show how uncertain the origin as well as the authenticity of our New Testament texts are. You rely on the fact that now in the entirety of Europe no single handwritten manuscript can be found that is older than the fourth century. This reliance I take to be nothing less than plain. When you know this, so must you also know that, according to the unanimous witness of the church Fathers, the four gospels were in general use already in the middle of the second century and that the church already then had eliminated all that was inauthentic or doubtful from the recognized gospels so that we can take as certain that our handwritten scripts are

copies of the early, authentic gospels. You surely also know that nothing questionable was able to be brought forward against the other writings of the New Testament that over time could achieve validity and that the newer and newest investigations and research of academic theologians have successfully defended them. Nonetheless, the primary question is that of the gospels and the history of Jesus that they contain. Only ignorant hubris or concealed malevolence can attack the authenticity of the gospel history on the grounds of insufficient hand-written manuscripts. That is also by no means a dangerous attack that can dispute, successfully, our written Word. Thanks be to God that in our age scholarship has achieved some victory in this respect. If Dr. Strauß wished to undermine the written Word in this fashion, he would not quickly achieve his desired aim. He does not seek the truth without prejudice but establishes for his entire project a condition that must be met, namely: What human understanding is incapable of grasping and an educated reason cannot grasp is not true – as well as that everything must be set aside that he is not able to bring into agreement with his way of conceiving things so that he works through the entire life of Jesus and leaves nothing left over of Jesus but empty shadows. The huge number of those who quickly, audaciously, and with wanton recklessness and, thereby, take themselves to be people of influence affirm everything that they have overheard from the boulevard press and eagerly clap their hands in gleeful agreement when, by driving through the entire field of theology in a steam-roller of arrogance, it can maintain that: I have seen that there's no substance to it [the Jesus history]. The young student, instead of studying fervently and humbly submitting his heart to the written Word to transform the Word in himself into spirit and life, finds it more comfortable to dismiss the entire task and likewise conclude: There is nothing to the historical Jesus. We would rather study and do something that appeals more to us. This is the reason that our people are so concerned and is generally so unhappy over the call of Dr. Strauß. —You, in contrast, recommend this kind of teaching to us. You want us to doubt the written Word of God and, as substitute, give us a living Word of God. Yet, where is this living Word of God to be found except among Christians and, namely, the true Christians whose knowledge has been refined by humble investigation of the written Word, who have received their faith by reading and lived understanding and commitment to this Word? When we ask them, how they came to the living Word of God and by what means the Lord was revealed to them, how he saved and sanctified them; they confess that they came to the correct knowledge of God and their salvation by means of the written Word that that this alone was the right measuring stick by which the spirits will be able to be and must be tested. When we ask the reformers how they liberated us from the oppression of the Papacy and how we can best preserve our freedom; they will answer us unanimously⁹ with the Apostle Paul in I Thessalonians 2:13: "For this cause also we thank God without ceasing, because, when ye received the

9. Not as the Committee of the Association for the Protection of Christian Freedom of Faith in which suddenly two theologians demonstrated that they apparently know only so much of the written

Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.”

When, finally, they cry out to us – “from their most inward soul” –: “Now is the judgment day for the clergy” –; many of our people and above all many pastors will agree with you, but perhaps not in the exact manner as you mean. The judgment occurs, certainly, in all countries and among all peoples, and it is the Lord of the church who calls to us through his Apostle: “Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light” (Ephesians 5:14) and that means, obviously, that the call goes out to the pastors, first. Certainly, woe to those “who want to relax on the basis of the written Word” –! The written Word must become the Word of spirit and life, and that will require a difficult struggle on the part of many. The Lord demands difficult sacrifices and humiliation and indignities on the part of pastors; so that I believe that I can guarantee that many pastors, especially those who have doggedly opposed the frivolous spirit of the times, that especially those who have defended most faithfully the written und at the same time living Word of God to use it as the sharpest sword of the spirit, that especially such pastors are ready to make the difficult sacrifice as soon as it comes to the point of helping the Fatherland in living faith to experience rebirth and the one freedom that originates from the spirit of the Lord. You [Henne], too, in your efforts to save the Fatherland should remember well: Only where the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom (II Corinthians 3:17) – and don’t forget – as it is written: See, I place a stumbling block in Zion and a rock of offense, and all who believe in him, will not come to ignominy.

Postscript: occasioned by your [Henne’s] “Epistle to the Upper Council of the Canton of Zurich,” which has just come into my hands, I take the floor [*ich ergreife das Wort*; word play on *das geschriebene Wort* (i.e., the written Word)] once more against you. – For those members of the Upper Council who agree with you from the get-go and for whom you probably were encouraged to stand by them in their hour of need, you may have written well. For such an individual will, indeed, always be pleased to hear beautiful and superficial words concerning God’s revelation in nature and history because one is always able to get into this revelation, to interpret it, and to enjoy it, how it is pleasant and on a fancy calls forth such pleasantries. Such people will forgive this kind of a sermon, no matter how reluctantly they normally hear a sermon because you confirm your true intention immediately afterward: to destroy the revelation of God to be found in His Word. For this revelation, which for everyone who doesn’t read just a dead letter but draws Christ’s life out of it and must look into one’s heart and know the weakness and need for salvation, is for such gentlemen in

Word and Reformation history as the bossy pastors have communicated to their youth; namely Messrs. Furrer und Benz. This Committee gives us the brand-new information about Catholic teaching: “The basis of Catholic teaching is the New Testament according to the literal Word; – in the Word of the New Testament thy find divine truth, and only someone who believes the Word, can be saved according to their conception.” – Such ignorance is surely not worth contradicting.

part foolishness (as with pagans) and an offence (as with the Jews). You are able to do everything self-sufficiently, you are able to rule the world, you are able to create faith, you possess Titan powers and pile up the crags of your understanding and knowledge on top of one another in order to conquer heaven. For you, pride is a virtue; but humanity is a poor cowardice that you see in the clouds only at a great distance.

Other members of the Upper Council who already have experienced in their own the life giving and saving power of God's Word know because of it that it is for them, doubtlessly, an obvious lie and a blasphemous perversion when you say: "The Messiah wanted to appear as the Son of David to the Jew (i.e., as Jewish) and did so. He himself explained that only in the course of time did he intend to send his spirit that will teach, at that point, all truth ...," etc. – These other members of the Upper Council also know that Jesus himself said: Heaven and earth will pass; but my Word will not pass. – They know, indeed, that the lord promised the Holy Spirit to his first disciples, and this promise was fulfilled in the most dramatic manner. – Your [Henne's] pious gestures will bring you little thanks from them because they recognize the evil demon even when he appears dressed as an angel of light. They will be pleased to be able to turn in the last days to the living Word of their risen savior after the sad judgment process in which you must defend in the midst of so-called Christians your Christian faith jaded by your, from Strauß' and his compatriots dead, written Word. I believe that I can guarantee to you that in the next few days we will celebrate in our Canton and our fellow Christians in other Cantons a death- and resurrection-festival unlike anything that has occurred in years. We leave you over the Easter holiday to graze on resurrected nature and in the process to think, feel, and wish that bad weather doesn't rob you of your joy. May you with your sighs of freedom be conjoined with mild spring air, may you entrust your lamentations to the sublime mountains and cliffs, may a rushing stream of complacency flow out of your heart into your arteries; all that we do not begrudge you in the least. [However,] we need far more for our hearts. We follow on His way to the cross the scorned Son of God and Son of Man. Doing so, His divine love invades our souls; there we find rest for our souls. For we know: the Lord sacrificed Himself for us.

We gather at His grave with all those who have been faithful to Him and take from His written Word the joyful news: See, He is not in the grave; for He is risen from the dead. With childish faith we wait until He reveals to us that He lives, until we can cry out with heavenly bliss: My Lord and my God! We know that when we read or hear with reverence the written Word that the Lord Himself is in our midst, that He Himself interprets for us this Word, and that for us it is like the disciples on the way to Emmaus who said to one another: Didn't our hearts burn as He interpreted the scriptures? Our holy communion, shared with all believers in joy, brings new comfort, strength, and heavenly love into our souls, our homes, our communities, and in our entire Fatherland, and we thank the Lord that He heals so many wounds, which you and other so-called men of freedom have smitten on the Fatherland in these days.

However, I would like to advise you, Mr. Dr.: Forget writing to our people in the future! Your so-called thinking believers already know it all as well as much much more than you are able to say, and they quietly smile at Dr. Henne, who still hasn't discarded so many prejudices and who is not yet a radical man of understanding. Nonetheless, Bible believers, whom you wish to indoctrinate, don't believe a single word of what you say. They don't sell their Bible so readily, and they don't need your observations of nature and history. Their Bible gives them far more delectable nourishment of the heart. For example, in the Psalm, where it is said that in the observation of nature one finds one's God and heavenly salvation by experiencing and thinking about nature as God's creation is of far more worth to the Bible believer than beautiful words in which one sees that they exist only to conceal a poisonous snake beneath the flowers. However, if you want the Bible believer to read history and to see God's revelations, you should preferably let them be led by their Bible to God and to search in history the wonderful guidance of their loving, living God. They hear far more eagerly the stories of their loving Father than the stories of charlatans told for money and relate pleasant words as they wish or what occurs to them in the moment. – If you wish to write something, again, concerning the written, divine Word, I advise you: First ask someone who knows this Word, even the most simple farmer, and you will experience that till now you have spoken of the Bible as the blind speak of colors. May the Lord help you to the light!

Kottinger – Doctor Strauß and His Teaching.

A Free Word to the Free Citizens of Zurich
Handwritten Note on Text: Presumably written by Hermann Markus Kottinger
Motto:
Test everything, and take the good
Paul
[I Thessalonians 5:21]
1839
Printed by Fr. Schultheß in Zurich

Translator's Summary of Kottinger's Themes

1. "You want to know what [Strauß'] 'The Life of Jesus' says? I can only answer that the book is not written for you. It is meant for theologians, as Doctor Strauß said himself. Were I to present to you its content, you wouldn't understand me."
2. "[...] [Y]ou should not accept the opinion that its teaching is contrary to religion and morality."
3. "When it comes to those, who say that Strauß does not believe in God, much less the eternal life of the soul: these I call straightaway brazen liars and slanderers [...] For him, Jesus is both savior and head of the church just as the case with all of you."
4. "[...] [W]hen it comes to such an important issue, you should trust no one but your own judgment."
5. "He will steal neither your faith nor anything else from you. This invisible jewel cannot be stolen! If you want to believe in the Trinity, no one is able to force you in your heart to say, 'No!!' Leave to others their faith! 'Love endures all things.'"

The Text

Table of Contents

Foreword	3 (479)
Part I	
On the Person Doctor Strauß	

1.	First Emergence of Doctor Strauß.....	5 (479)
2.	Persecution of Him.....	5 (480)
3.	Judgment of Him.....	6 (480)
4.	Strauß in Ludwigsburg.....	7 (481)
5.	His Lectures Against His Enemies.....	7 (481)
6.	His Private Life.....	8 (482)
7.	Conclusion.....	9 (482)

Part II

Doctor Strauß' Teaching

1.	The Life of Jesus.....	10 (483)
2.	On the Content of the Book.....	10 (483)
3.	Continuation.....	11 (484)
4.	Defamations of Doctor Strauß.....	12 (484)
5.	For What was Doctor Strauß Ap- pointed...	12 (485)
6.	Will He be a Reformer?.....	12 (485)
7.	Who Called Doctor Strauß?.....	13 (485)
	Conclusion.	14 (486)

Foreword

Dear Fellow Citizens!

In our day much has been said and written about a man who soon is supposed to teach at our university. This is Doctor David Friedrich Strauß with whom you are familiar. He was born in 1807 in Ludwigsburg; his father is a successful salesman in whose house one finds simple morals and religious sensitivity. His mother is a woman of healthy mind and many talents. Strauß attended the schools of Ludwigsburg, Blaubeuren, and Tübingen. In 1830 he was vicar of a cleric and in 1831 administrator for a Professor. At the end of 1831 Strauß went to Berlin, and in March of 1832 he was lecturer in Tübingen until 1833 [*sic.* 1835], when he became assistant rector in Ludwigsburg, which he gave up in 1836 and moved to Stuttgart in order since then to devote himself exclusively to research. The name Strauß, Antistes Füssli says, is known in every hut.⁹ However, he is frequently slandered, feared, and notorious as an unbeliever. Yes, one even says that he believes neither in God, eternal life, nor in Jesus. Is this rumor true? Furthermore, the Education Council, the Governing Council, and even the Ruling Council itself are criticized by many that Strauß has been called to

Zurich. Especially, our highly esteemed Mayor Hirzel has been the focus of the hate by many citizens. In short, there prevails a true outrage in the minds of our people.

Therefore, I've taken it upon myself to write a true account, a well-meaning word to you, dear fellow citizens, in order to show you the true circumstances of this case. I thought to myself: "The man (I mean Doctor Strauß) has so many enemies! No one of our clerics with the exception of a single professor of theology,^[1] dares to defend him. By thousands he is misunderstood and reviled. Why, if you were to present the true witness?" As a result, I wrote this pamphlet. Without darkness and haughtiness, calmly I share with you what appears to me to be the man and his teaching. No, I want to report to you not with semblance but truth. I will articulate solely my own, solid conviction, and I speak only after fully developed reflection. Reflect, then, for yourself, examine everything, and keep what is good.

Let us keep two things in mind:

- 1) -The person Doctor Strauß
- 2) -The teaching of Doctor Strauß.

May my words bring applause from many of you! May mothers and women to whom I especially direct my missive be won for the foreigner.

Part I: The Person Doctor Strauß

1. First Emergence of Dr. Strauß

Doctor David Friedrich Strauß was initially instructor of theology (the knowledge of God) in Tübingen in the state of Württemberg. He had the most talented young men, to be sure, as his students, who were to serve the kingdom of truth. They honored him sincerely and to an unusual degree because of his scholarship and even more because of his fidelity to his profession and untiring engagement. He proclaimed with excitement to them holy truth. His audience clung to his splendid teaching with complete love and devotion. These were beautiful, blessed years. However, shortly they would disappear. A sad period of suffering was about to begin.

1. ^[1] Trans. note: Ferdinand Hitzig, who was Professor of Old Testament Studies since the University's founding in 1833, supported Strauß. Hitzig was the cousin of one of Strauß' closest friends from the time of his studies in Tübingen, Gustav (von) Binder. Binder gave the eulogy at Strauß' funeral.

2. Persecution of Him

A famous work was published: "The Life of Jesus." The second volume of which was at the press as the storm broke over the audacious man. The government of Württemberg informed him that he could no longer keep his appointment as instructor of theology. He was expelled from the pulpit, was called a dangerous man, and declared to be unfit for any public teaching position. So much for religious freedom in educated Germany!

After the highest officials had issued their judgment of condemnation, authors and fellow members of the academic guild pounced on his work, tore it apart, took out pieces here and there, and rained down lightening on the defenseless man. The public split into opposing sides over him. The vast majority approved his teaching and welcomed it with enormous enthusiasm. Many, however, discarded it without being acquainted with it.

3. Judgment of Him

Let us stop here for a moment! Independent of the question whether or not the book contains truth, everyone must agree that his lot was difficult. Think of a man who had to attend school many years in order to become a clergyman. You can easily calculate how much that would cost. How much mental hassle and effort that required! Finally, the man reached the goal. He has become Doctor of Philosophy (love of wisdom) and instructor of Theology. He was called to the office of teaching theology in Tübingen. The most splendid prospects lay open before him. He had reached the strength and prime of his human age. The highest hopes were calculated for his unusual talents, his comprehensive knowledge, as well as his penetrating perspicacity. Precisely these characteristics of the mind were attacked by his fiercest opponents. He was on his way to the highest state- and church-offices. Then the judgment thunders down: "You are no longer an official instructor, preacher, clergyman; away from your teaching position!" – The path to office and honor is closed forever for him. The scholar lives from his knowledge. Tis pen is his plow. This you all know. A friend warned him against publishing his "Life of Jesus" because it would cost him his office and bread. Strauß answered that he felt himself called and unable to do anything else. Should I lose my position, Strauß said, I will leave it up to God who surely will open other doors for me. Those who shunned and hated him the most took it upon themselves diligently to portray to you this martyr of faith. How heartless! How inhumane! I say to you with God as my witness that I speak the truth: If his enemies encountered him as a beggar, they would have showed him no mercy. All the more fame for our people that they have opened up to him an honorable free state. I say intentionally: "Our people," for we, the people are the ones who called Doctor Strauß to the university. Does not the Ruling Council represent all citizens? The Education- and Governing-Council could well have named and confirmed the appointment! However, if the Ruling Council has

exercised its veto, spoken out its, "No!," naturally, Strauß would nevermore set foot in our university!

4. Strauß in Ludwigsburg

Doctor Strauß was discharged. Many tears were shed by the public and students for the revered and loved instructor! He returned to Ludwigsburg, close to his residence, where he lived in humble silence as a private individual. As his King indulged his pleasure, the righteous citizen bled from the arrows of injustice.

His opponents did nothing to hose down their poison. He, who had already lost office, bread, and public honor must daily witness the appearance of new lampoons. Even in our Canton, a "man of love²" made it his business to collect the voices in Germany against Strauß. A sad piece of work! Yes, some even said that Strauß was lucky to escape. He only lost his appointment! One praised the government for its mercy! Admittedly, it acted with more mercy than the Spanish Inquisition's courts in their day: Doctor Strauß would have been burned at the stake! O Christians, when will you learn to be human!

5. His Lectures Against His Enemies

Doctor Strauß let his enemies rage on. With calm earnestness he responded to their allegations, with gentleness he endured their ridicule, with victorious truth he knocked down their slanders. Precious metal withstands fire. Strauß had to suffer, otherwise Europe couldn't have learned of its noble character. I do not know whether he will ever be a Zwingli, whether he will play a role among us. I only know that he exceeds Martin Luther in one respect. Luther was heavy. Strauß is soft. Luther swamped his opponents with invectives that frequently bordered on vulgarity. Strauß even in the middle of conflict never forgot decency and honor. Luther was, finally, incompatible even with his friends, as for example, with our Zwingli. Strauß, in contrast, ignored much of even his friends' impudence. Strauß listens carefully to his opponents. He is pliable.

To this point, we have viewed our man in the public arena. Let us turn to the household circle in the middle of his private life.

2. Pastor *** in ***.

6. His Private Life

"If you don't believe my words, then look at my works!," so said the one whom we venerate as our religious founder. His Word is the standard by which we should measure our man. In this respect, I challenge all of his enemies to point out any stain in his moral life. You are permitted to do so were you to have the occasion, and mortified I want to be silent. I am a man! Why require a litany of words? Friends and enemies have testified to Doctor Strauß' integrity. Mayor Hirzel spoke openly in the Ruling Council of the same; and it was confirmed by all speakers even those in opposition to him. Antistes Füsli, as well, said that it would be a defamation to question Strauß' moral character. A well-known clergyman from Germany³ visited Doctor Strauß with the intent of converting him. The poor man! His efforts failed as was to be expected. Nonetheless, this very pastor acknowledged: "If one were to visit Doctor Strauß with a dagger in his garment to murder him only to meet this serene, sympathetic face filled with trust and the love of humanity: truly, the dagger would drop from his hand; he would be unable to kill him!"

He lived the years of examination in silent resignation. His demeanor of loving man and friend was never missed by those in his closest circle. Although he had reason enough to be unhappy with the world, he never reflected it among them. The more he was rebuffed, the more he remained true to them. He never lost his faith in providence. He awaited his fate confidently. He had survived the test of the senses and in action and truth confirmed that he is a Christian – Christian in a far more worthy sense than his enemies who in their happiness bravely totter and in days of unhappiness doubt!

To one of these friends, he wrote on February 10th: "I acknowledge completely the magnitude of the task that you and your fellow citizens have trusted to me, and it would frighten me if I weren't able to promise myself strong defenders and good judges. Only I must fear that you overestimate yet the strength of this hand, and I almost must fear that it would be easier for me to contradict the defaming opinion of my enemies than to fulfil the high opinions of those who support me." Against such a person you wish to petition whose humility and scholarship speaks for itself.

7. Conclusion

Such a person must endure this kind of encounter with a part of our citizenry? Granted, he is not present among us. Yet, he will come. He has accepted the appointment. Perhaps he will come shortly. How will you receive him? It is rumored that some congregations would like to organize Canton-wide assemblies against him. One even

3. Krummacher.

hears that his death is desired. Who are these people who contemplate such things? Do they know Strauß? – Read what I have presented of his person; read it again and again, then answer me: has such a man not earned high esteem and love? May all our clerics think so nobly and conduct themselves as he. Our congregations would welcome him. Yes, perhaps we don't deserve such a one. I declare Strauß to be an honest man [*Biedermann*^[4]! Whoever agrees, he will declare openly his support of him in order that the good goal that is at stake is successfully achieved. He has earned his crown!

Part II. Doctor Strauß' Teaching

1. "The Life of Jesus"

You know, dear fellow citizens, that Strauß wrote a book with the title: "The Life of Jesus." This book has generated the greatest uproar since Zwingli's and Luther's writings. All over Europe Strauß' name is famous. In just a few years it has gone through three editions. As expensive as it is (it costs 10 Fl.), it, nonetheless, is eagerly purchased and read. Is that not already a confirmation of its excellence? It has to have been well received, I want to say. It has delighted millions. Otherwise, it would not have been read. Reading a book means: to listen to someone speak. We listen only to that which we like! No! Some also listen to their enemy with the intent to construct a denunciation. One should not give such people one's trust. Yes, it is well known that the truth has many enemies. Further: what publisher would pay 5000 Fl. for a book if it were not a book of great interest? Without interest there would be neither publisher nor reader ... Or would the Bible be so frequently purchased if it contained nothing to satisfy the needs of humanity? – But just what is the content of this book?

2. On the Content of the Book

You want to know what "The Life of Jesus" says? I can only answer that the book is not written for you. It is meant for theologians, as Doctor Strauß said himself. Were I to present to you its content, you wouldn't understand me. It is a book for the classroom. The meaning of the final sentence of the book can be grasped only after one has accepted the many other truths that it contains. In order to benefit from

4. [□] Trans. Note: Four years after the 1839 revolution, the liberals returned to power in Zurich. Ironically, the professor whom they hired in 1850 to fulfil the role that they had hoped for Strauß was Alois Emmanuel Biedermann – an honest man!

reading the book, one must also know ancient languages. Yes, even with all of these conditions having been met, it is still possible to come to a wrong conclusion. Many of our scholars have everything except a healthy common sense. In the case of others, their heart is in the wrong place, or, even more, they have no heart. What should I say to such people?

3. Continuation

A time will come when even the uneducated should and will know the true content of "The Life of Jesus." However, you should not accept the opinion that its teaching is contrary to religion and morality. Someone who says that it does has not understood Strauß or does not want to understand him. Were his work contrary to religion, one would have to mean by religion that there was once a Jupiter, a Hera, a Venus, who could transform people into trees, etc. When it comes to those, who say that Strauß does not believe in God, much less the eternal life of the soul: These persons I call straightaway brazen liars and slanderers. With such claims, these people only want to do Strauß harm and to bring discredit upon him. I, too, have read Doctor Strauß' book seriously from beginning to end, and I assure you by my honor, yes, by God Himself: No one believes more strongly on God and eternal life than the esteemed author of "The Life of Jesus." – "But," I hear you say, "he doesn't believe in Jesus!" If that was the case, would he accept a teaching position in a Christian faculty? Do you trust him to have so little a conscience? Remember the character of this man, whom I described in Part I above! Can one speak of integrity or whatever noble characteristic without a belief in God, eternal life, or high esteem for the prescriptions of our religious founder in agreement with the same in life and ministry? Doctor Strauß explicitly says that he has not attacked faith. His book is concerned only with the stories of the Bible. For him, Jesus is both savior and head of the church just as the case with all of you. Those who know otherwise and call Strauß an atheist should step forward openly with their names in order that one can respond to them.

4. Defamations of Doctor Strauß

Because Strauß' opponents find nothing about his person that they can attack, they turn to his teaching. You already know their charges. Are they worthy of belief? Paul says, "Test everything and take the good!" Those of you who have not read "The Life of Jesus" are incapable of testing or of judging and should be silent! "But the pastors say thus and so?" First, I want to hope that this is not a claim for all pastors. The judgment of a fanatic is not taken by you as biblical truth? My advice is that, when it comes to such an important issue, you should trust no one but your own judgment. One and the same can be said about something from many perspectives. "Test everything!"

5. For What was Doctor Strauß Appointed?

Pay attention, as well, to the goals that were the reason for calling Doctor Strauß. He is not to teach in a particular congregation but at the university. He is called to work with theologians, not the people. He will not be our pastor but our professor. It is enough when he fulfils his duty as professor. The determination of whether or not he does must be left up to the judgment of others! You, my fellow citizens, can calmly perform your tasks. There is order in a state when each citizen performs his calling. Should Strauß educate pastors whom you reject, your right not to accept them remains untouched. Those who claim that Strauß will damage the reputation of the university only demonstrate that they have not read or understood his work or have alternative motives. Should it come to the point that, in the case of Strauß' coming, congregations petition the Governing Council to close the university: then I wouldn't know what to do with the empty buildings except to incarcerate in them those shrill voices from each congregation and put a sign above the entrance, "School of Fools."

6. Will He be a Reformer?

Some of our church institutions need improvement. Otherwise, why is it that the churches are so poorly attended? Among those who do attend, why is there so little participation? Why has the status of the pastors declined? Why have thousands left the state church to join separatist churches? Reforms are necessary, no one can doubt that. For that reason alone, Doctor Strauß is not to be feared, by far. Yes, it would be a true shame, as Antistes Füsli publicly has said, were all pastors to fear one individual. The authorities will prescribe, what the man is permitted to do and not do. His own reason will instruct him. Or did Zwingli in his day reform only on the basis of his personal will? Was he not also called from abroad? We will not allow a religion to be forced upon us? Freedom of religion is guaranteed for us. No matter what may occur, no one will retaliate against us when we act on the basis of Paul's advice: "Test everything and take the good." As long as Strauß lectures in the classroom, we are able to remain calm. He will steal neither your faith nor anything else from you. This invisible jewel cannot be stolen! If you want to believe in the Trinity, no one is able to force you in your heart to say, "No!" Leave to others their faith! "Love endures all things."

7. Who Called Doctor Strauß?

Finally, do not forget what authorities called Doctor Strauß to us. The call occurred, as we have already said, according to your will by the Ruling Council where a significant majority voted for him. The Education Council selected him to be professor, and the Governing Council confirmed the selection. The highest authorities of the land,

therefore, have spoken in favor of him. Does this circumstance have no weight in your eyes? Are not the men who hold these offices highly worthy of your confidence? Over a long time and carefully they deliberated about this step: it can only be to your benefit. These authorities deserve recognition and thanks in this manner: especially, Mayor Hirzel, the untiring promoter of the education system. You ought to be filled with indignation over every step taken against him, who has earned the mayor's crown rather than ridicule.

Conclusion

Do not permit yourselves to be led astray by some impassioned voices! You especially, fellow citizens on the lake shore and in those other communities, swear to yourselves that you will not be awakened by the fearful lion of civil strife! Let Strauß calmly come! Our laws protect his academic freedom. No one has the right to place barriers before him when it comes to the performance of his duties. He offers his talents: to you comes the opportunity to make use of them. Our market of life is available to him. There, where so many theological babblers are allowed to bring their embarrassing wares, it must be allowed that a famous physician of the spirit can make known his secrets for the healing of those in need. May he be the right physician for our religiously sick age! And it is our people who receive him. Germany, educated Germany, has violated its great son: free Zurich has accepted him! You were till now always the protectors of the rights of the citizenry as well as in religious matters. As Ulrich Zwingli 300 years ago was misunderstood and cursed abroad, Zurich opened its doors to him. In return, he gave us eternal fame. Once [Ulrich von] Hutten, the defender of faith and public freedom, was protected by Zurich and the residents of the lake communities on the Ufenau. Arnold of Brescia, the early religious instructor, was concealed under the name "Leemann" for a long time from papal persecution in 1130. It appears that the lake this time wants to leave to another jurisdiction the honor of protecting a great man. May Master Friedrich Strauß follow in the footsteps of the unforgotten and his name ring out like that of Zwingli's hundreds of years ago. To your fame! You owe Strauß free activity, a worthy professional circle, and a secure future. The one pursued till now on all sides will be protected and respected in your midst. Who is not pleased and honored by these thoughts? May you be praised, you free citizens of Zurich! –

May Strauß soon be called fellow citizen among us! Let us stand strong with him just as our highest officials have already done! Test everything and take the good!

Wirth – Epistle to the Author of the Pamphlet: Dr. Strauss and His Teaching

from K.M. Wirth, Lutheran Pastor in Rappersweil
"Doctor Strauss and His Teaching"
and
the Zurich People

Motto:

[...] no one can lay any foundation other
than the one already laid, which is Jesus
Christ."

Paul

[I Cor. 3:11]

Zurich
Print and Publisher von Fr. Schultheß
1839

Translator's Summary of Wirth's Themes

1. Moral Life not enough to be Christian.: "He is far from being a Christian who makes the effort to live morally [...]"
2. Belief in God not enough to be Christian.: "The scriptures say that devils believe in God and tremble."
3. Strauß is not called to be a philosopher of ethics but of faith.: "We respect and honor him and allow him his faith, but he should not teach his faith to our pastors."
4. Not clear whether Strauß' God is the Christian God.: "[...] [I]t is still to be confirmed whether Strauß' God is the Christian God, or the Hegelian God, 'who has not yet reached complete self-consciousness.'"
5. Strauß is not rational – because the people say that he is not.: "Is Strauß' teaching rational? What do you say? In the face of the entire citizenry, I cry out.: "No!"
6. Wirth's antidote to the corruption of Christianity by worldly wisdom is that academic freedom, which "is authentic [and] leads back to faith." "It is now the

task of theology to present the eternal truth, which is objective, as also rational, and the church should form it in everyone for life."

7. Strauß' Christ is a Teacher not a Redeemer.: "No confession of faith sees in Christ only a teacher but a savior who by his holy, sin-free life, by his death and resurrection (do you even understand the latter?) wants to elevate humanity again into life partnership with God."
8. Strauß offers only "worldly wisdom."
9. "Does Strauß teach a special perfect revelation of God in Christ? Does he believe that he is the one who must come, and that we must no longer wait for another? [...] The exact opposite is his teaching, and for that reason he can be a man of wisdom and a scholar, but he is not a teacher of Christian faith!"
10. Strauß does not recognize the "positive faith" of the Protestant church.: " Its foundation is the Holy Scriptures. The standard of its interpretation is not singular, ludicrous capriciousness but the universal mind of the church [...] With the Reformation arose a time of literal reading."
11. Wirth's explicitly Augustinian Christology is "salvation from sin:" "[...] [T]he history of the Christian church [...] is not concerned [...] with a pair of concepts but that it entirely permeates human beings to become a new person, saved from sin [...]"
12. Wirth, too, wishes for reform in the churches.: "If one wants to reform, one should become positive; give the arts a larger place in worship, the congregation more involvement in the liturgy; more deeply engage and depict the Christian faith; make the scriptures, including the historical scriptures (which are mere fables in your opinion) better known; more religiously train the youth and protect them from pedagogical perversities. This is the reformation that is needed, and whoever in the 19th century wishes to introduce some other kind of reformation, he belongs to be placed with others where the sign reads.: 'Apply here for the Madhouse.'"
13. Wirth rejects violence and political subordination.: "Never tread on unlawful paths! [...] A Christian does not turn to weapons when things don't go as he wishes. He is subordinate to all human authority according to the will of God."
14. Wirth defends the university.: "Do not call for the closing of the university! Honest, honorable men, whom you can trust, work there! There are still professors there from whose hands you can accept your pastors [...]"
15. Wirth criticizes the press [fake news].: "The radical press of all the Cantons looks with fury at the events in the Canton of Zurich. They, thereby, demonstrate what the press is. For the press the cry for help of a people whose innermost marrow has been infringed upon is only a blind clamor of clerics. It sees in the commotion only what is corrupt (which often, unfortunately, occurred), but it fails to see the noble foundation. The press shows that, for it, positive Christianity is an institution that no longer belongs in our age. With the leaking of abuses, the press

wants to throw out everything with the exception of a few cheerless notions of a falsely enlightened reason.”

16. "There is nothing in common between Christ and the world.”

The Text

Foreword

Just as the author of the pamphlet "Doctor Strauß and His Teaching.: A Free Word to the Free Citizens of Zurich" felt driven to write in order to portray the true state of affairs surrounding the call of Dr. Strauß, the author of this pamphlet feels induced to write and hopes to report, not like him with his mere make-believe, the truth. The present author, also, will express his own strong convictions. He directs his comments to the author of the text referred to above with clear words.: you promise to speak truthfully but often present what is other than truth. He addresses, also, the people of Zurich to show them that they correctly are enraged and offers them a pathway to show that out of rage can come salvation and blessing.

The following will be investigated:

1. -The Person Dr. Strauß
2. -The Teaching of Dr. Strauß
3. -The Call of Dr. Strauß
4. -The Proper Fight Against Dr. Strauß

So, listen to my words that you may not be blind; O opponent, who provoked me, listen, as well, and if I distort and exaggerate as you, so take me to be just like you. Otherwise, I protest against this honor of comparison with you.

1. The Person Dr. Strauß

This individual has been portrayed, good people, in very different ways. You must learn to know him impartially. I do not want to fight for a good cause with bad weapons.

It is true that this Dr. Strauß is a scholar and an astute man. Abroad in Tübingen, his students loved him because he taught them according to his convictions. To be sure, now one says.: because he proclaimed sacred truth. It is already decided in Zurich that he has found the Philosopher's Stone. However, Dear Opponent, what

do you mean? You certainly have researched the entire depths of truth in order now to say just what the truth is. No one other than Christ said it.: I am the truth! You say.: Dr. Strauß proclaims sacred truth. Yet, we will come back later to this truth. – When Strauß wrote his famous book, he was discharged from Tübingen. However, there was no blood- and heresy-court that damned him. Mr. Opponent, in light of the fact that you have read Strauß from beginning to end, you surely know that he himself said.: "Whoever is of my opinion, he must either elevate his congregation to himself, but, because this will surely fail, he must carefully conform to the manner of thinking of the congregation, or, finally, to the extent that he, also, here inadvertently betrays himself, he must resign from the pastorate." He says further.: "It doesn't help to say, he should step down from the pulpit and, instead, climb to the lectern of the professor's chair, etc., because he whose educational formation required that he reject the pastorate now only has students to educate who are made incapable of being pastors; in this way, the bad would only be turned into worse." This is what Strauß said himself.^[1] He recognizes the right of officials, yes, even their duty, not to let him take a professor's chair, still less the pulpit, and you present him as a martyr!

It is not true that Strauß has suffered persecution. Many publications have appeared against him, but most are purely academic and far from condemnation. Strauß

1. ^[1] Trans. Note.: Wirth is correct, of course, that this is what Strauß wrote. However, Strauß goes on to write already here in the *LJ*: "We have [...] admitted the difficulty with which the critical and speculative views are burthened, with reference to the relation of the clergyman to the church; we have exhibited the collision into which the theologian falls [...] But this collision is not the effect of the curiosity of an individual; it is necessarily introduced by the progress of time and the development of Christian theology; it surprises and masters the individual, without his being able to guard himself from it. Or rather he can do this with slight labor, if he abstain from study and thought, or, if not from these, from freedom of speech and writing. Of such there are already enough in our day [...] But there are also a few, who [...] freely declare what can no longer be concealed—and time will show whether by the one party or the other, the Church, Mankind, and Truth are best served." (*LJ*, 784) Having made clear that he was writing for scholars but had to use the language of his opponents for them to engage his work and cannot be held accountable for the 'excessive curiosity' of untrained lay readers, Strauß says of the relationship of the pastor to the congregation: "When it comes to the relationship of the clergy to the congregation, nowhere did I claim that the mythical view of gospel history should be applied first." *Streitschriften* I: 89 Strauß adds in response to the Tübingen School theologian, Johann Christian Friedrich Steudel, who found Strauß' presentation of the alternatives facing the theologian and the pulpit to be Strauß' acknowledgement of the uselessness of his 'mythic' interpretation for the church and laity: "I have only hinted at how [professional dilemma confronting the 'critic'] has partly already undeniably taken shape, and partly could take shape in the near future. It cannot be denied that this view, if it spreads among theologians and also among educated members of the congregation, will for the time being change nothing essential in the form and content of church preaching; but the clergyman, depending on how he [*sic.*] knows to reconcile it with his conscience, will either adapt himself to the traditional form in such a way that he tries to put into it what he considers to be its true meaning, or he will think of withdrawing from the office of preaching. Of the parishioners, however, those who are still in the old faith, provided they are not incited by sectarians, will be content to hear from the clergy the old faith undiminished. Those who are infected by criticism, however, will either take the clergyman's speech, like himself, only figuratively, or withdraw from public service." *Streitschriften* I: 89–90.

himself must recognize this, and, if one or the other is a little too unruly, it is already chastened enough. Strauß has not earned the martyr's crown. However, this is the case.: You and those of your ken cannot endure that someone fights against Strauß with another, Holy Truth. Even a Neander, whom you admittedly don't know, because he possesses a different Holy Truth, must bow down and pray to the Holy Truth of Ludwigsburg. Aren't you ashamed to call the worthy writings of Tholuk, Harleß, Hofmann, and Zeller in Stäfa (one is able surely to name them) thunderbolts and lampoons against the defenseless one?

The defenseless one! Read again, dear chap, Dr. Strauß' polemics, learn from him about his academic opponents, and ask him for forgiveness that you have called him defenseless! –

Here the martyr stands in line. What he himself acknowledged as correct is what cancelled his theological professorship, but that didn't cost him his livelihood. He was appointed to another position in Ludwigsburg, which he soon left of his own accord. He received a magnificent honorarium from a book dealer. Oh, what a martyrdom! To suffer what an academic loves and over which he is thrilled. He can fight for his point of view because worthy and scholarly theologians with honor and erudition have risen up against him. Do you think, O people, good people, dear "fellow citizens," that the honest citizen has bled from the arrows of the unjust (who are recognized as right)?

Dear Opponent, is that your truth that you are reporting? Woe to Strauß' Holy Truth if it is even close to the truth that you claim to speak!

So much is certain when it comes to the person Dr. Strauß.: He is no martyr. Now as for his character:

It is true that his private life is untouchable. What is not often the case, though, is that with him the error and unfaith does not come from an evil heart but from his erroneous school of thought. He has done nothing externally wrong. However, is every honest and educated man [*Biedermann*²] best to be a professor of theology? "You will know them by their fruits!" You bet! We clearly see Strauß' fruit, and it gives us little reason to trust him. However, listen, great representative of modern education!.: He is far from being a Christian who makes the effort to live morally, a bit more is needed.: a pious, religious sense that lives in and with God and is able to be free by that which makes one truly free. Yet, you [Dear Opponent] can't be satisfied by this. Such words are for the uneducated.

In spite of Strauß' unquestionable and not unbelievable moral worth, we protest against his having been chosen to be professor of theology. We respect and honor him and allow him his faith, but he should not teach his faith to our pastors. You know, he is not called to be professor of ethics but for the teaching of faith. Don't forget, one wanted to make him actually a reformer. However, one needs more than ethics to be

2. [] Trans. note: See footnote 4 in Kottinger, "Doctor Strauß and His Teaching: A Free Word to the Free Citizens of Zurich."

a reformer. For that one needs, among other things, faith, and, indeed, a constructive, not destructive, faith.

2. The teaching of Dr. Strauß

In your little writing, dear Opponent, in the second paragraph, the shining brilliance of holy truth is to be found. I allow myself to examine more closely some of these truths, before I portray, in my way, Dr. Strauß' teaching.

"The Life of Jesus from Strauß," you cry out with enthusiasm, must have found applause among millions! The evidence.: otherwise, it wouldn't be read! Of the million instances (or perhaps half-million because perhaps by twos they acquired it), how many actually read it? Don't you agree that the book will be most adequately read only by theologians and other academics? Indeed, many school teachers have purchased it and – read the Foreword and Conclusion, and a few pleasing hits in the gospels, etc. However, do you believe that of the reflective readers perhaps half were pleased? Those happy ones whose hearts were so quickly opened for the "Holy Truth!" – And still yet a word! The book is already in its third edition. Do you also know that the Life of Jesus from Neander in six weeks already had a second edition published even though the first had 3,000 copies!?

Now, with respect to the book's content that pleased a million readers: Cleverly enough, you don't articulate it. The public doesn't understand it. Oh, the consequence! Here among us, people of your ken for years have preached Strauß' teaching among republicans, now one should be silent about it. Now you merely assure us.: Strauß' believes in God, eternal life, and in Jesus. Now you say merely.: Strauß doesn't touch faith, he explains it. (Here the pen wants to give you due recognition!) For him Jesus is savior and head of the church.

Look, I am no revolutionary. Therefore I only want to respond to what was already challenged by force in many ways. If then you, or a member of your new community of faith, again and again, provoke against it, then, I promise you, literal passages from Strauß' *Life of Jesus* will be printed.

Someone who believes in God is not, for that reason, a Christian. The scriptures say that devils believe in God and tremble. By the way, it is still to be confirmed whether Strauß' God is the Christian God, or the Hegelian God, "who has not yet reached complete self-consciousness." Even someone who believes in eternal life is, therefore, still not a Christian. For that matter, it is doubtful whether Strauß' eternal life is the Christian teaching of eternal life, or the Hegelian.: according to which the individual's spirit returns to the "One Spirit" and disappears like a drop in the sea. Look, Dear Chap, if you praise to the heavens so highly and dearly Strauß' belief in God and eternal life, you must be very skilled in discerning the heart. I am careful not to say more. Perhaps on another occasion I will say more, when I have enough time to expose a few of the tricks performed by such a friend of the people as you. I will

say this, though.: when someone says hay to straw and, thereby, means that his straw is hay, that is deception. Words are cheap, and one can conceal a great deal with words.

Strauß believes in Jesus! Here, Sir – I am not sure whether I can call you Doctor, as well – here you are a subtle man. Yes, he believes in Jesus but not in the way that all the Christian confessions of faith believe in him. Now you are leading the people around by the nose, O viceroy of the Holy Truth. For Catholics, Greeks, and Protestants, Christ is God's son; and no matter how much you laugh that is as rational as Strauß' teaching! Is Strauß' teaching rational? What do you say? In the face of the entire citizenry, I cry out.: "No!" In Strauß' teaching, Christ is no true savior. He is only a teacher. No confession of faith sees in Christ only a teacher but a savior who by his holy, sin-free life, by his death and resurrection (do you even understand the latter?) wants to elevate humanity again into life partnership with God. He not only brought a teaching but also life itself. However, permit me along with the entire Christian church to believe that Strauß' Christ cannot say in truth.: I am the way, the truth, and the life!

Nonetheless, according to your claim, Strauß is concerned in his book only with the stories of the Bible. Apparently, you want to say.: the New Testament. That he rejects everything historical with the exception of a dry skeleton does not concern you. For you, Strauß is no atheist. That's enough! Sir, you are either narrow-minded or malicious if you believe that in order to be a professor of Christian dogmatics it is enough that one is no atheist. So much for the shallow, superficial education of our day. You take as the essence of Christianity a few general concepts that, admittedly, Hottentots and Eskimos also accept. Their god is common sense that only recognizes the everyday. They know nothing of Mind [*Gemüt*] and the deeper grasp of the whole person and his needs. You have slept already for years and, having awoken just a quarter-of-an-hour ago, you have no idea what time it is. You are not sophisticated. You are unaware of the true dispute of the day and the serious wrestling with truth. You grab onto what comes first, the favorable book of frivolous and superficial goings-on of the times, and fall to your knees and cry.: Great is Diana of the Ephesians!^[3]

Whoever turns history into fable and turns the apparitions of ideas into reality, he himself should be capable of holding onto ideas? In other words.: Strauß robs Christianity of every Christian foundation. Christ was probably there, but one knows little of him with certainty. Of the teaching that one finds in the gospels, only the smallest portion was ever said by Him, but, nonetheless, He's the savior! Sir, you are dreaming! What are we left with other than human dreams when the gospels are robbed of their content (i.e., the texts are unhistorical)? If you wished, you could know that the pillar of Protestantism consists in.: the sole authority is the Holy Scriptures. What remains of its foundation when the authority, which is the scriptures, itself becomes fable? One can no longer speak of religion but only of worldly wisdom. This is what you and your companions wish to substitute for Christianity. You can do so

3. ^[1] Trans. note: The idol worshipped 'throughout all Asia' whose temple in Ephesus was finally destroyed as the consequence of Paul's preaching.

for yourselves, but you should most kindly allow us other, simple men to hold onto positive Christianity.

Sassily, you still say.: Strauß doesn't touch faith. Perhaps he doesn't touch your faith, but that's no longer the Christian faith. Had you ever in your life read one of Paul's letters without bias and viewed without "presuppositions" ["*voraussetzungslos*"] the history of the Christian church, you would know that one is not concerned in Christianity with a pair of concepts but that it entirely permeates human beings to become a new person, saved from sin. Yes, it elevates the person to the status of a child of God through Jesus Christ, who has gone out of God in order to bring the world to the Father. You would know that this Jesus not only preached wisdom but also that He revealed God in Himself, that He was in God, that the divine appeared in Him, and that He is truly the Son of the suffering God.

Does Strauß teach a special perfect revelation of God in Christ? Does Strauß believe that he himself is the one who must come, and that we must no longer wait for another? Does he believe that outside of him there is no salvation and that without him no one can come to God? Does he believe that in religious prayers humanity is united for all time in the One and only One, who was completely perfect and above whom no one can go? Answer.: "No!" and again "No!" The exact opposite is his teaching. For that reason he can be a man of wisdom and a scholar, but he is not a teacher of Christian faith! Such teachings may appear now to you as antiquated superstition – but in this ancient teaching there is more. There is also here a wisdom with which this faith is entirely compatible. Were you even once to make the effort to hear a sermon from Professor Schweizer, then you could at least see that such a Christian teaching is compatible with a higher education than you yourself apparently possess. Yet, one cannot see if one does not want to see. Day for bats (who take themselves to be eagles because they can flap their wings) is night because they cannot endure the light of day. It is the same for you and the Christian faith.

Enough of Strauß' teaching for the time being!

3. The Call of Doctor Strauß

You can well imagine what we will say about his call to Zurich. We call it a *coup* that its authors can hardly defend. It is perfectly obvious that it did not occur only on academic grounds. Let's be clear! Among the powerful in our Canton, there has long been a dislike of the church and its faith. It was hated because their pseudo-wisdom on its own wasn't sufficient. What from the seminar in Küßnacht^[4] could have been so beneficial and have had an impact on everything unrelated to religion was, instead,

4. ^[1] Trans. note: The teacher-training seminar under Ignaz Thomas Scherr, whose life-time appointment as director by the Liberal Government was revoked following the 1839 revolution.

entirely poisonous. The teachers' opposition, apparently directed against the pastors, was really against the Christian faith of the people. The false, shallow Enlightenment of the waning century was to be disseminated among the people of Zurich from below.^[5] What was to be begun in many schools was to be completed by future pastors. That was the poorly concealed plan. That is the reason Strauß was called. One wanted to move a reformation a little faster than just by means of the education of the youth; without which some public benefactors [Trans.: a reference to Thomas Scherr, Superintendent of Schools?] would not have been able to achieve the reputation of reformers for posterity. You yourself, Mr. Opponent, still want a reformation. Admittedly, you cannot say exactly how, or you are not permitted to say. Like Zwingli and Luther, Strauß should come and found a protestant-protestant church. Oh, a free, beautiful, bright church where one would celebrate Christmas in Zurich no longer as the birth of Christ but only the spiritual birth of the wisdom of our day; on Easter, no longer the true resurrection of Jesus Christ but only the resurrection of humanity out of the old, blind faith to the new religion of Zurich; on Pentecost no longer the sending of the Holy Spirit to the first Christians but the appearance of the Holy Truth from Ludwigsburg – where every old superstition still remaining from the half-way Reformation from Catholicism would disappear before the new light of the world, and the great, sublime truth would sit on the world throne next to Christ or in place of Him of His throne.^[6]

I won't speak of the laughable arrogance of wanting to dictate from above a Reformation by professors' chairs in the 1830s. There is much that needs improvement but in a very different sense than what you think! You ask.: Why are the churches not well attended? Answer.: because some pastors are neither lively nor excited and pious enough to proclaim Christianity and its gospel! Why have thousands left the state church? Answer.: because frequently Christ and the authentic, old, perfectly healthy Reformation faith is not preached! Or do you seriously believe that, were Strauß to come and our young theologians were to become Straußians, church attendance would increase? The separatists would return to the church? Happier is he who has such comforting dreams! You are truly a lucky fellow!

5. [□] Trans. note.: Ironically, the school of theology/philosophy to which Strauß adhered at the time of the *LJ* was itself anti-Enlightenment and anti-Kantian. See Hegel's "Glauben und Wissen oder die Reflexionsphilosophie der Subjektivität in der Vollständigkeit ihrer Formen als Kantische, Jacobische und Fichtesche Philosophie" in *Kritisches Journal der Philosophie*, FWJ. Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel, eds., I/1 (1802): GW II: 287–433.

6. [□] Trans note.: Dogmatists frequently assert that teaching contrary to the dogmatist's own teaching consists in 'elevating the philosopher onto the throne of God'. The charge overlooks that there is not a single religious conception from Animism, Polytheism, Henotheism, Monotheism, Pantheism, Dipolar Theism's Pan-en-theism, to Mysticism whether concerned with (a) Personal God, an Immanent Deity, or an ineffable Unity that isn't grounded in anthropomorphic analogies. Immanuel Kant offers the one exception for whom the anthropomorphic analogy is not taken to be literal. He acknowledges that it is impossible to avoid anthropomorphism but insists on 'figurative' anthropomorphism because of the limits to reason.

If one wants to reform, one should become positive; give the arts a larger place in worship, the congregation more involvement in the liturgy; more deeply engage and depict the Christian faith; make the scriptures, including the historical scriptures (which are mere fables in your opinion) better known; more religiously train the youth and protect them from pedagogical perversities. This is the reformation that is needed, and whoever in the 19th century wishes to introduce some other kind of reformation, he belongs to be placed with others where the sign reads.: "Apply here for the Madhouse."

You ask in order to protect your great reformation, whether or not Zwingli reformed in his day on his own? Was he not also called from abroad? Here your understanding drives me crazy – please, forgive me! Zwingli and all the other Reformers did not reform out of themselves and also not because a mayor with 98 Canton Councilmen commanded it but because the people demanded it. The Reformers were only the agents of an omnipresent movement that had been in preparation for centuries. Yet, to people like you, all history is myth. The account of a people trembling and wrestling with faith and salvation is for you without question only a glorification of the Reformation in retrospect. In other words.: the Mayor and Councils of Zurich only wanted to free themselves from the yoke of Rome.

The call of Strauß was a *coup* that for the time being has been prevented by the uproar of the people at least with respect to the primary goal of reformation.

One could say a lot more about this call. One could unpack the speeches in the Upper Council; could demonstrate more thoroughly the striking differences between Protestant teaching and Strauß' that would be violated by his call to church and state. However, we must stop here after adding the following.: You Sir, who tests everything and only takes the good, have the opinion that a true Pope [the people], who is opposed to the calling of Strauß, has either not read his work, not understood it, or has only alternative motives. The author of these lines has read it more than you have recognized; whether or not he has understood it – –, at least he is permitted to believe that, when it comes to ancient and contemporary theological and philosophical education, he is as familiar as you and people of your ken, who, despite all merely apparent wisdom stands at least with one foot in earlier centuries. He rejects any hint of ulterior motives, whether or not you believe it. However, do you know that he is a coward, who doesn't dare to speak his mind? If he were to fear a radical inquisitional trial, he would have earned even your contempt.

I am finished with you for the time being. Should you wish, call – I will answer.

4. The Proper Fight Against Dr. Strauß

Now at the end, a short word directed to the dear fellow citizens of the Canton of Zurich!

You have spoken out against the call of Dr. Strauß with an overwhelming majority and made it perfectly clear to your leaders.: We want to keep our faith and will not permit that our future pastors proclaim the gospel filled with doubts instead of certainty. It is good that you have spoken so clearly and loudly. Now, because you can well believe that I wish to hold on to Christ and his Holy Scriptures as irrevocable truth, listen to my well-intended words. Never tread on unlawful paths! Send petitions to the Upper Council as often as you wish; demand the removal of Dr. Strauß calmly and sternly! Should that not be enough – adhere to the decisions of the constitutional authorities. A Christian does not turn to weapons when things don't go as he wishes. He is subordinate to all human authority according to the will of God. Therefore, no insurrection, no rebellion, should Strauß come!

Do not call for the closing of the university! Honest, honorable men, whom you can trust, work there! There are still professors there from whose hands you can accept your pastors; and it is good when your sons can obtain their education in the Fatherland and not have to go abroad. The university is worthy for a free people! If you topple it, you will rob yourselves of the possibility that ever more truth, Christian light, and true, Christian scholarship will be disseminated among you. The cost is not as great as many believe. You must have an institution, though, in which pastors can be trained and another for physicians. Have nothing to do with destruction! Build!

Should in the end Strauß come, there will be other measures that you can take to protect all that you take to be valuable and sacred.

Above all, demand of the Upper Council that it reform the schools; that you be guaranteed that your teachers obtain a religious education. However, even here you should not be destructive but, rather, improve that which is erroneous. The new educational system has accomplished a lot that is good. Is it not good and redeeming that you have capable, well-educated young men in all the congregations? One needs more education these days than earlier otherwise one falls behind. Nonetheless, religious inclination is truly the foundation for everything. Hence, demand another frame of mind in the seminar, and, if not, create another. It will quickly be superior to the old and will be established as the Canton seminar.

Brothers, don't let solemn, good time pass without winning enduring blessedness by means of it! Agree among yourselves, furthermore, that another professor of theology can be called in the case that your desire be unfulfilled that Strauß not come. There are many who measure up to Strauß who not only are sagacious but also have a solidly grounded and joyful faith. Such a person can defend successfully the proper, Holy Truth and our church by means of faithful servants whom he will educate to lead to an ever more beautiful and effective life that you all and your descendants can continue to insist on the one foundation, which has been laid, Jesus Christ.

Above all, demand that a synod be elected in which, in addition to pastors (as the natural and scholarly representatives of the church) also lay persons have a place and a vote. If only from every congregation one or two church-minded, Christian men united with pastors were to confer with respect to the most important affairs of

faith and church, then you will be secure in front of this violent destruction; however, the guarantee will also be given that the church, without diverging from the eternal, unchanging faith, achieve timely progress in liturgy, teaching, and discipline. Then, no longer will a profane hand undertake any action that the combined will of the people decisively would deplore. Only so will the church of a free people stand secure and be able to progress by means of a true association with a rational and Christian government.

One frequently has charged pastors that they don't want any progress. In many respects that is true because with respect to most things no progress is possible because faith is unchanging.: "Jesus Christ, yesterday and today, the same for all eternity;" and his teaching is not His but the teaching of Him, who sent Him. God's teaching cannot be revised. In the cultus, in liturgy and catechism, one is able to, and will, move forward; but only if properly understood, in the correct sense of forward. Such is better achieved by a mixed synod.

In this manner, fight for eternal truth but in a Christian manner. Overcome the un-Christian world with weapons of the Spirit.

Conclusion

[Trans.: On the Untrustworthiness of the Press]

I have yet a great deal to say! One could write an entire book about the events of recent days. A hundred hearts have been exposed – there will be yet more. The radical press of all the Cantons looks with fury at the events in the Canton of Zurich. They, thereby, demonstrate what the press is. For the press the cry for help of a people whose innermost marrow has been infringed upon is only a blind clamor of clerics. It sees in the commotion only what is corrupt (which often, unfortunately, occurred), but it fails to see the noble foundation. The press shows that, for it, positive Christianity is an institution that no longer belongs in our age. With the leaking of abuses, the press wants to throw out everything with the exception of a few cheerless notions of a falsely enlightened reason. In much that has occurred, the dominance of the flesh is clear that doesn't want to acknowledge anything of a spirit higher than merely the human spirit. The lazy stain of today's modern education is truly clear to all, which clothes humanity in tattered rags, and pleased with them, smugly cries out.: Here is Christ, the true Christ! Others, above all the editor of the St. Gallen newspaper, wants to accept what is comfortable; but God's written Word they no longer need. They want only a living Word (that is, a Christianity generated by scholars and cravings of the noble on the basis of the spirit of our age) without considering that the written Word still can and should be living in every Christian soul, which in turn can create a comprehensive life

of the church. However, what is most sad is that countless persons no longer recognize sin because of delusion, pseudo-education, or Jewish self-righteousness, and they have no need of a savior. The consequence is especially the flattening of Christianity into mere ethics, and thus is proven the deeper wisdom of the Apostle's words [I Corinthians 1:23]: "The gospel of Jesus Christ is a stumbling block to the Jews (the self-righteous) and foolishness to the Gentiles (the educated)." With such there can be no reconciliation. There is nothing in common between Christ and the world. Here, no Strauß can help. The church is not able and may not abandon its positive faith – even the Protestant church can't. Even it is positive! Its foundation is the Holy Scriptures. The standard of its interpretation is not singular, ludicrous capriciousness but the universal mind of the church. Strauß does not come out of this church. He is a representative of modern education that has come into conflict with piety. The common mind of the church is entirely different. With the Reformation arose a time of literal reading of the Bible. New life was stirred, but it was only one-sided. With common sense but not with the complete, full, human being, one engaged the written Word and the documents of religion, which is not merely understanding but inner life. For that reason, the Reformation had to be transformed. In recent decades, a fresh spirit of faith and scholarship has blown through the church. However, it doesn't want to tear down, and Strauß, who is only a man of scholarship, and one-sided scholarship at that, is not part of this wind that builds up. It is now the task of theology to present the eternal truth, which is objective, as also rational, and the church should form it in everyone for life. – This remains certain: If it wants to remain Christian, theology can never surpass Christ as the Son of the living God. That means to say: as He in whom God Himself is completely revealed and manifested to humanity eternally. Church powers and constitutions may want to change it and reform the liturgical service of God, but "the Word you should let stand!" Scholarship is free; when it is authentic, it leads back to faith. This doesn't claim that Zurich should fight over everything in its midst. One could have remained silent, even been able to believe the honest and calm ones in the country whom one wished. However, then one would have had to talk differently in the Upper Council! Conceal it as one now might: the intention was a reformation.

Christ once said.: I did not come to bring freedom but the sword. That is clear today. For that reason, one does not fear the fight. Yet, instead of earthly weapons, one wields the sword of the spirit!

There is a whiff of spring blowing new life into the church of our country. May it bring forth blossoms and fruit! May what is noble not be destroyed by undulating crowds. May the pastors not stir up unlawful actions but preach Christ, the crucified and resurrected in spite of republican and all enemies of free speech and all superficial and half-educated screamers! Easter is near! We all want to celebrate the truthful resurrection festival of Christ, for only each individual can truthfully celebrate that One, the Christ!

Enough for now! The author of these words is armed for the fight and will speak next time, if it is necessary, even more clearly. "Let us not deny the Lord; soon the rooster will crow!"

Scherr – A Free and Instructive Epistle

by the
Superintendent of Schools in Zurich, Scherr
to the
XXII Members
Of the So-called Committee of Faith

Recommended for consideration on the part of all good Christians from a
friend of truth, especially shared from the pedagogical perspective

1839

Translator's Summary of Scherr's Themes

1. Too little attention to religious instruction in the public schools. Real issue: not lack but kind of religious instruction
2. Call for a closer relationship between the schools and religion
3. The amount of time for religious instruction in primary schools ought to be clearly set
4. Call for an instructional book designed to plant deeply the central truths of faith in the hearts of students: the Ten Commandments, Apostles Creed, and Lord's Prayer
5. The Church council is naturally concerned about the religious instruction materials
6. A call for the dismissal of the superintendent of schools (Scherr)
7. If Scherr has engaged in malfeasance, he should pay the price
8. The superintendent of schools possesses an exaggerated power outside of the Education Seminar
9. The director of the Education Seminar should not be a member of the Board of Education
10. More time should be devoted to religious instruction in the Education Seminar for preparing of teachers to teach religion

11. The main allegation: Scherr voted for the calling of Dr. Strauß
12. A call for a public, church synod consisting of freely elected representatives
13. A third of the Board of Education should be chosen by the church synod
14. A two-name shortlist for the religious instructor in each school should be established
15. Zurich is paying disproportionately for the Canton university
16. 40,000 by their universal acceptance of the Committee of Faith's petition oppose the appointment of Strauß and Scherr
17. The Committee of Faith charges Scherr of arrogance, claiming unlimited authority, doubts his religious convictions, and that he acts aggressively
18. The Committee of Faith calls into question the newly established prestige of the teaching profession
19. Misrepresentation of the teaching staff at the university. There is more than one professor on the theological faculty: "One never said that in Zurich there is a pious believer and humble Professor Ludwig Hirzel and an intellectually stimulating Ulrich, and further an Alexander Schweizer, a Hitzig, and even – oh, for those who doubt about piety!! -instructors such as Pastors Schinz, Zimmermann, including one of your special choice, the even so well-educated as active Pastor Usteri, all involved in the training of young pastors. It is a true disparagement of these men that one doubts that so a Schwabian Strauß would not be quickly driven back by them into the desert of unbelief."
20. On questioning Scherr's religious convictions: "Who gives to you the right to elevate yourselves to judge matters of faith? What do you know of my faith? Who among you is capable of examining my thoughts? You don't need to place yourselves between me and my God – I don't need such middlemen for the salvation of my soul. This attempt at heresy-hunting fills me with outrage."

The Text

Epistle

by the Superintendent of Schools in Zurich to the XXII Members
of the So-called Committee of Faith

Gentlemen!

You have delivered a judgment to the entire religious community of the Canton concerning the spirit of the new public education system, about the schools, and about my point of view and objectives. I am exercising the right to respond in kind in that, hereby, I state openly to the world my judgment concerning your actions and statements primarily with respect to those expressed points that fall within the purview of my responsibilities. I do this now in the very moment in which you're

enjoying, unpunished, the glory of grandeur; for it appears to me unworthy to wait to undertake procedures against you when the dishonest flood that you have invoked comes back to clobber you although it won't be able to wash off the stains by which you so unfortunately have been tainted.

You charge the new public-school system with giving too little attention to religious instruction. Empty declamations for and against such things do not lead us to truth. I take up the struggle with you on the field of impartial examination and strict investigation. Thereby, I publicly recommend to you: 1) Let us examine, on the one hand, the required religious curriculum of the new educational system and, on the other hand, the religious curriculum of the old system. Select, then, a commission of pedagogues and pastors from other Cantons, who can decide whether the earlier pedagogical materials are better and more effective or whether the new instructional materials don't conform to the spirit of Protestant teaching. 2) Let us allow this commission to implement the old and the new curriculums by instructors trained for each curriculum respectively. 3) Let us examine the pedagogical sequence of the new curriculum, the distribution of content across the school year, and, then, look carefully at the structure and sequence that dominated in the old system. The commission should then decide between you and me.

Gentlemen, this is my suggestion! I am certain of the outcome. If you desire to call yourselves sincere Christians, you will be left in the end with no other choice but to confess the injustice that you have done to the new public-school system. – Yes, I was able to experience the old school system with its religious orientation that one laudably elevates over today's. I saw how eight- and nine-year-olds spelled out for the instructor and aired dogmatic question that are barely understood by the higher-educated. Do you call this the sowing of religious seeds? – I heard how the older students without exception had no choice over what was to be read in the New Testament: concerning the adulteress, in Paul's letters of prostitution and unnatural lust, and in the Book of Revelations concerning the great Babylonian prostitute. I've seen how two days a week were devoted to memorization of un-understandable passages without a word of explanation from the teacher. This is the sin against the Holy Spirit that was promoted by the followers of the Reformation and tolerated for three hundred years. Listen to what a pastor of the Canton of Bern, a true servant of Christ, said about this form of religious instruction: "Those were the good old days when one learned religion in school and only religion, and when one for the sake of religion didn't know what religions was; when one couldn't see the forest because of the trees; when one embalmed children with catechism and the rod as long as they were in school, convinced that the devil could not gain control over them outside of school, regardless of what they were planning and doing! Yes, that's right! That was a blessed time when adults caned with the rod, the school principal greeted students with the rod, when one had witches rather than angels, when one was terrified of ghosts in the night and had ten times more respect for the devil than for God before whom one either quavered oneself or made others quiver." – (*Baurenspiegel*.)

I now turn to some points from your epistle. You demand "that there be a closer relationship between the schools and religion" (p. 4). How! You dare to generate suspicion among the people of Zurich as if now the schools currently had no religion? – Is that possible? Nonetheless, most of the members of your Committee know that in the public schools we are required by law to use the following as instructional materials: a) a booklet of biblical sayings, b) a booklet of religious songs, c) a school songbook of church music, d) and the New Testament. You know that presently schoolteachers receive special training in the practical skills of religious instruction – in how to catechize. You know that the teachers have printed instructions for the religious pedagogical materials prepared by a Zurich pastor under guidance of the Board of Education! –

My Dear XXIIs, you talk as if there was a complete separation between church and state, and, yet, you know that §1 of the law for public schools identifies the pastor as the chief of the school board; that §1 of the law for the district school system establishes two pastors for this role at the district level; that currently almost only pastors are among the leadership of the district school boards and the secondary school boards. Or can it be that some of you are unaware of that? To be sure, it is possible that there is confusion among some of you. However, most of you know this, and those of you who do know have acted contrary to your knowledge und conscience, which is improper for someone who presents himself as defenders of the Christian religion.

Nonetheless, the petition that you have submitted to the people states what you demand to be the relationship between the church and the schools. You propose to make the free school, once again, a school of slaves. This is your demand. The great incivility and arrogance that the Board of Education has suffered under from some pastors has increased the eagerness for control over it, and what was a convenient pretext, you have turned it into a swift offensive. Oh, don't believe that the people will persist long in such infatuation! The free public schools have accomplished more in eight years than the schools accomplished in three hundred years shackled by the oppression of the church. You might be victorious for a moment. With extremely rare exceptions in this time of hard testing, the Zurich teachers have demonstrated themselves as tremendous, noble, and strong. The parents won't permit them to be stolen from them, and these teachers will not allow themselves to be subjugated.

Perhaps as victors, you yourselves will turn back the clock to when a man, powerful out of respect and trust in terms of his status among teachers, with a strong hand was able here and there to prevent errors of judgment and to nip evils in the bud.

"The amount of time for religious instruction in primary schools ought, also, to be clearly set;" is your demand on page 5 of your epistle. What problem do you wish to solve by egging on the people with such unclear, thoroughly unfounded, demands? Isn't it already determined in the existing regulations and laws: The elementary schools are to have religious instruction 3 hours per week; middle schools 2 hours per week; review students 1 hour per week; religious tutoring 2 hours per week in

a half-year. Is this not a clear determination of time? Actually, you want the church congregations to petition for more time to be devoted to religious instruction. Tell me, though, how long did it take the Lord to convert a thief to Christianity? How long did it take the Apostles to convert a whole community? How long for those pious men of Ireland to convert entire ethnic groups to Christianity?

Is a ten-year education with at least 600 hours of instruction not enough to enliven hearts with Protestant teaching? Such an expectation clearly contradicts the message of our Lord. It constitutes an antagonism against the proliferation of Christianity. Precisely this endless gobbledygook destroys the religious, emotional atmosphere. This thousand-fold repetition dulls attention. This incessant duplication leads to pharisaic mouthing that flares up holy zeal against Christ.

You demand: "Necessary is an instructional book designed to plant the central truths of faith deeply in the hearts of students, namely, the three primary elements of our faith: the Ten Commandments,^[1] the Apostles' Creed,^[2] and the Holy Lord's Prayer^[3]!" – (p. 5)

Tell me, now: Where do we find central claims of religious faith? Hopefully, in the Bible! And yet, from the Bible we have, prepared by a Zurich pastor, a collection of biblical sayings that contains primary religious truths – required to be used in our schools –, and we've placed in the hands of the teachers an extensive, printed handbook for this purpose. Out of the Bible we also have a collection of historical truths for obligatory instruction along with a handbook – in this case, too, written by a pastor. Do you really not know this?! – In this respect, you deserve in the eyes of the people a sharp blow of the rod. Listen, Mr. President and Protestant XXII! You are trying to convince the people that the Holy Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments are not in our curriculum. Yes, that's what you're doing! And you know that the Holy Lord's Prayer is printed in italics in our obligatory instruction materials and in the obligatory collection of biblical stories, that is, it is found twice in our school materials. – You know that the Ten Commandments are present in their entirety in our curriculum. Why didn't the Educational Committee include the Apostles' Creed in the curriculum? For the reason that this confession should be taken only once the confirmees have an understanding concerning, and a conviction regarding it and that the instruction in confession no longer belongs in school but in the church. Are not the pastors themselves in their church synod agreed on this point!! – However, you want a religious instruction of things that won't be understood. How? You could promote a Jewish, mere mouthing of words, against which Christ himself protested;

1. [1] Translator's note: Scherr doesn't ask which set (Exodus 20 or Exodus 34).

2. [2] Translator's note: The so-called 'Apostles' Creed' is not in the Second Testament. It emerged in Rome in the anti-Gnosticism movement around 150 CE.

3. [3] Translator's note: There is more than one version of the prayer in the gospels (Matthew 8:9–13 and Luke 11:2–4).

or you could promote an empty blind faith. No, I don't really believe that you want either!

"That the Church council has raised its voice about the religious instruction materials is natural;" so you say on p. 5 of your epistle.

I ask: Who created the religious instruction materials? Answer: Zurich pastors including members of the Church Council, for example, a Salomon Vögeli. Who checked over the religious instruction materials? Answer: Commissions of clergy members of the Church Council and the Board of Education. – Hence, in fact, the Church Council has already voted on the religious instruction materials. – Cross your heart and ask your conscience: How could you spread the notion in the congregations that the Holy Lord's Prayer and the Holy Ten Commandments are no longer being taught in the schools and that the Church Council has had no voice when it comes to the religious curriculum? Truly, truly, something far worse is going on here than merely ignorance and error!

"However (so it is stated on page 5 of the epistle), the cry has been raised all over the country that the present superintendent of schools should be dismissed from his position." –

Actually, I've heard this call echo through my own apartment. When you wish to say with the claim "all over the country" something other than that certain people and the papers of their party have carried this cry through the entire country, then you are claiming an untruth as a vote in the congregations would confirm. You are speaking, My Dear XXII!, of an earlier, particular aversion to the superintendent of schools. I wish to more carefully describe this to you. Look, I was actually called to my position to serve as the driving force to achieve a thorough transformation of the school system according to the laws of the land. In this respect, for me, office and duty stood above everything else. When I learned that the construction of a school was being hindered by the influence of the thievery of a village official, I undertook everything in my power to remove the hindrances, and when the struggle didn't end in official action, I didn't hesitate to pursue the issue publicly. When I learned that, in this or that community, crude, unconscionable parents wanted to prevent their children from going to school, I pressed for punishment of truancy. When I saw in the course of my inspections that self-interestedness consumed the youth's energy, I raised my voice publicly to protect the suffering children. When I learned that a president of the school board fulfilled none of the obligations of his office and duty, I charged him officially and publicly. – These actions, Gentlemen, are the source of the special aversion, and, in fact, in many places these particular events have been generalized as a complaint. Such is entirely natural. You know yourselves that at the moment those people for whom education and religiosity are foreign to one another are the people screaming the loudest and are the actual, leading voices of the movement. These people with whom you yourselves would be ashamed to be associated now cry out with vehement zeal: "Scherr must go!" and the great masses have joined in. The best example in

this respect you can see in Küsnach⁴ itself. In this church congregation they have not only cried out in the general assembly: "Scherr must go!" – but also on the select committee 9 out of 12 have voted in this way. Do you want to know why!? Those in the church who screamed the loudest were elected to the committee. There were tradesmen who earlier had worked for me whom I had fired because I believed that they were asking too much money for their work. There were neighbors who were angry with me because I, as user of a shared well, claimed access, which they illegally tried to prohibit. There were cooks who hated me because I fulfilled my duty as director. – You see, Gentlemen, these are some of the so-called religious reasons over whose outcome many pastors are pleased. To these results belong also the coarsest, most cowardly nighttime knavery and shameful defamations meant to damage the reputation of most trusted servants. Already, many are ashamed over this cowardly crudeness and childish knavery, and their voices are slowly gaining influence. The time will come when the tables are turned, and then, Gentlemen!, the dark nakedness of your cause will ignominiously hang over many communities. – See, that is what you call now a general aversion, and you won't dare to deny that in every village there is a significant number of men who are filled with indignation over this wild screaming. Who are these men? Doubtless those whose voices have great influence. – If you exclude this large number of educated, noble-minded men, I will gladly put up with you saying of me: "This man has lost the confidence of the people." Office and duty are placed by me incessantly higher than the praise of the uneducated, the selfish, and the power greedy. I will never demean myself just to vie for the praise of the masses; even less, bring offerings of any kind to these tin gods out of conviction or duty.

However, now I come to a point in your epistle that completely justifies a more tough tone and the formulations of a disgusted temper. You say with respect to my person: "If he himself should have engaged in actual malfeasance, he should have to pay the price." (p. 5) What are you doing here? You are spreading among the populous a universal suspicion of the likelihood of malfeasance. You aren't at all ashamed to let this suspicion be read before the entire Christian congregation in the church. The whole affair constitutes a shameful blot on your undertakings. I continue to do what I have always done: I challenge you upon your honor to openly and in detail to back up your suspicions with facts. – It appears that your conscience with respect to these matters is shifting because you seek to redress me by acknowledging "partial merit." In that respect, I say: Seriously, it's as if someone broke into my apartment and stole a part of my possessions and wished to comfort me by acknowledging that he recognizes in part my rights of possession. Do you think that I would find that acceptable? Certainly, not! Now, however, just like someone who is justified in protecting his earthly possessions, I believe that one also should seek to maintain his intellectual possessions with everything in his power. For that reason, I am not satisfied with the

4. [Trans. Note: The reference is to the township where the new Education School is located.].

"partial merit" that you extend to me. I am addressing what I deserve. I possess the proud and sublime sense of self that the reform of your school system is primarily my accomplishment. Let the dark storm of a rebellious reaction steal my official title and external reputation, I take with me an earned title from the treasure of my intellectual accomplishments that sickly jealousy can ridicule but can never take away from me.

The superintendent of schools possesses an exaggerated power outside of the Education Seminar, you say on page 6. – It appears to me that you have no sense of decency and turn mere "gossip" into motives. Indeed, you will have a different opinion when you become acquainted with the laws governing teacher education. I would eagerly greet an investigation of the power of the director outside of the Education Seminar. Surely you do not consider it an exercise of power if the director of the Education Seminar is allowed to visit schools with the older students for practical training? You will not consider it an exercise of power if the director of the is obliged to inspect schools or to conduct examinations on behalf of the Board of Education. – I beg you, Gentlemen! If you're going to speak again to the people, take a look in advance at the situation and the laws before you defend such an important claim. – However, at this point we come to a completely amazing contradiction. You say that, because the director of the possesses an exaggerated power outside of its sphere, he can devote no small part of his time to external affairs. Oh, the poor church congregations, who can solve such a riddle!? I will! However, my voice is no longer even heard in this gathering. With this extraordinary claim, you wish to say nothing other than that the director should be forbidden to participate in the discussion of public issues. The pedagogical observer is for many, many people objectionable. Gentlemen! Yet, visit the Education Seminar and get a report of how many teaching hours the director has been absent! However, should it be that he has fulfilled all of his official duties in his working hours and, then, evenings when others go to the theater, dances, and associations, he gladly writes about pedagogy and other articles on public education – that, Gentlemen!, no one can forbid him to do with any petition. At least, I doubt it.

Yet, you show your true colors when you propose to the church congregations: "The director of the Education Seminar should not be a member of the Board of Education." Had you consulted with one of my most bitter opponents in this matter, a legal scholar and former commissioner of the Constitution Committee, you would have been advised that the fulfilment of this wish is entirely impractical because the constitution says explicitly: "The director of the Education Seminar belongs on the Board of Education" as one of its most important members. This appears to be the strong opinion of the legislators themselves, who mandated that, in the event that the director was not a member, he was required to attend all of the Board of Education's sessions. A director who first needed to ask the entirety of teachers with respect to the needs of each individual school and to ask of the entire school system what its situation and operations were would be no better informed than any other person in the country. In other words, he would be no real director, and, if he fulfills his duties appropriately, it is silly not to want the Board of Education to build on its strongest

supporter. Do you even know when the Board of Education meets? Saturday mid-day after the school day is done! In other words, the director isn't neglecting his duties. In the Cantons of Aargau and Luzern, the director is a member not only of the Board of Education but also the Upper Council, and no one takes any more exception to it other than people who have no understanding, for example, of a business operation wanting to hinder a business. The prohibition of the director's voting participation on the Board of Education is contrary to the principle of the Zurich constitution, and, for that reason, it should not be allowed.

Because I am now speaking of the director, I would like to address one of your most absurd demands: more time be devoted to religious instruction in the Education Seminar itself for proper preparing of teachers to teach religion in the schools. Any more than you know when the Board of Education meets, do you have any idea how much time is devoted to religious instruction in the Education Seminar? If you don't know, then that is confirmation that your demand is a most reprehensible flippancy. If you do know, it is a confirmation of your foolish outlook. The following is a list of religious instruction in the Education Seminar in K nsnach: I Class, four hours of which three are specific to classrooms and one is in an assembly; II Class, five hours, four specific, one in assembly; III Class, three hours, 2 specific, 1 in assembly; and there are extra hours for confirmation students. Visit all of the schools in the world and all schools of education. See if any one of them devotes a similar proportional amount of time to religious instruction. In Karlsruhe's [in Germany] Education Seminar, whose director is a profound Pietist, the totality of religious instruction is six hours in the week; in Lausanne in the same circumstance there are also only six hours per week. – I want to be entirely out in the open with you on this point. I believe that we have too much religious instruction in Zurich's seminar. Remember, the students already have had 600 hours of religious instruction before they start in the Seminar. In the course of the following three years: I year $45 \times 5 = 225$ hours; II year $45 \times 4 = 180$ hours; III year $45 \times 3 = 135$ hours for a total of 530 hours. For heavens sake! What happens if that is not enough religious instruction? Yes, it is more than enough, a great deal too much religious instruction! As a consequence of even more, students would necessarily encounter Jewish archaeology and critical exegesis; where the one appears to be merely didactic, the other allegorical, and the third mythic and, therefore, more doubts are raised than answered. In this respect, I have done something entirely differently when it comes to religious instruction with my, in part, intellectually developed but blind students in Zurich. First, I ensured that they obtain an adequate knowledge of biblical stories so that my hours of religious instruction are more edifying than simply instructive. We pray and sing, and then we read a religious meditation, a good sermon, or (and that happens frequently) a chapter from the *Devotional Hours*, a good religious poem, or the biography of a noble

and pious man. Pastors as well as secular people observed⁵ these religious hours, and every one of them was edified, which had a great, ennobling impact on the students. – However, required instruction by memorization and exams of all kinds of irrelevant information, that is what hinders rather than encourages religious education. Once more, then: There's too much religious instruction at the seminar.

By the way, it is surely noticeable that none of the religious instructors have been able to adequately satisfy the wishes of the pastors. – Take, for example, Mr. Eduard Dändliker, a legally certified professional and a man of unquestionable good repute. However, he was unable to satisfy the demands of the pastors, and in the parish chapter in Andelfingen questions were raised concerning his orthodoxy and competency. – Then comes Mr. Wild, parish vicar, a man of complete faith and enthusiasm, pious enough for even the Protestant church newspaper. However, he appears not to have been satisfactory for the New Protestant party. – Finally, Doctor Haupt, a warm-hearted, scholarly theologian to whom the Zurich Church Council confirmed with highest praise for Confirmation instruction and preaching. However, even this man appears not to have achieved enough. The director did not interfere in the work of any of these men, not one faced any obstacles, and not one complained over the students or the curriculum plan. What, then, was the problem? – The problem was that not enough pastors supported their work, but, rather, they spread seeds of distrust.

By the way, Gentlemen of the XXII! I do not believe that the Education Seminar has achieved perfection. Some of you perhaps remember how I wanted to establish a school in which both teachers and students lived together, and I would have gladly moved the Education Seminar to Embrach, Kyburg, or Greisensee – renouncing the communities on the beautiful shores of the Lake of Zurich and interaction with the educated and enlightened residents there. You know that I engaged in a difficult struggle over the writing of the new education laws and that only the influence of the Upper Council, which I couldn't ignore, kept me committed to the institution. You should know that, for many months, I pressed for an institution that appeared to me essential and necessary for the education of young students and the professional education of older students. Precisely, this ruthless engagement for the institution, precisely this, Gentlemen of the XXII!, in part stirred up the sentiment of opposition to me on the Küsnach committee. Here I remain steadfast in maintaining that the Küsnach Education Seminar accomplished more than any other element of the Canton's schools; more than most in all of Switzerland. Even when I was not happy with everything that happened, all possible pedagogical strategies in every fashion were applied and, as a consequence, with ever more success.

I come now to the main allegation, the real motive, for which you condemn me. This is: "He, the leading teacher of all our public teachers, voted for the calling of

5. For example, frequently, Mr. Muralt in Schönenhof.

Dr. Strauß” (p. 5)⁶ Here, too, you blend together the most disparate elements! I did not vote as Superintendent of Schools but as member of the Board of Education. I voted according to my conscience and conviction and all this uproar has not disturbed my tranquility in the least so that I would vote the same a second and a third time. That is something that you must leave to me and my God. It has nothing to do with the German language and pedagogy in the schools?! I voted for Dr. Strauß for his coming as a teaching scholar, and I am convinced that he would have performed this duty quite differently from that of a penman. However, you have damned the man before you have heard him. I call that a contradiction of true Christianity. One who is portrayed to the unknowing masses as if in Zurich there is only one single master to teach the youth; which is about the same as if one learns to be a wood planer with a master carpenter. As if because of this one professor, Dr. Strauß, it will be possible for future, young pastors only to preach as Strauß preaches to them. That is the trivial opinion of the masses. One never said that in Zurich there is a pious believer and humble Professor Ludwig Hirzel and an intellectually stimulating Ulrich, and further an Alexander Schweizer, a Hitzig, and even – oh, for those who doubt about piety!! -instructors such as Pastors Schinz, Zimmermann, including one of your special choice, the even so well-educated as active Pastor Usteri, all involved in the training of young pastors. It is a true disparagement of these men that one doubts that so a Schwabian Strauß would not be quickly driven back by them into the desert of unbelief.

I have already explained that in my epistle I wanted to restrict myself primarily to the concerns having to do with my sphere of activity so that I touch on other points only briefly. A public church synod of freely elected representatives is a modern institution, and your wish will prove to be popular. Yet, why not take the decisive step at this opportune time to establish a free church? The state should fund every congregation a sum of some 800 Frkn. per year, and, then, the church as an independent institution can set its own goals and train its own servants. That would be the true, meaningful way of salvation [*Heilsweg*]. –

Most of your other desires arise out of error or misunderstanding, and some demonstrate a literal ignorance of our Constitution as I have already demonstrated. You demand that a third on the Board of Education must be chosen by the church synod. – Good, then we demand that a third of the Church Council must be chosen by a school synod. You demand that the school superintendent may not be a member of the Board of Education. Good, then we demand that the professor of practical theology [pastoral training] may not be a member of the Church Council. You demand

6. A correspondent of the Burkli newspaper also leveled this charge against me. As a consequence, he compounded further his lie in that he attributed to me the assertion: The church must be devoured by the school. It is amazing what all ignorance and suspicion can generate. A pious pastor, Harnisch, director of schools in Weißenfels, said to his primary school teachers: If the church does not progress along with the schools, it will be devoured by the latter. I presented this position some seven years ago in the presence of Pastor Koller (i.e., in Basel) – as a report.

on behalf of the Church Council that there be a two-name shortlist for the religious instructor in each school. Good – we demand on behalf of the Board of Education a three-name short list for all catechetical and [pastoral] assistant positions. – By responding to such nonsense with nonsense, we achieve a parallel nonsense. Your zealotry for the preservation of the university is laudable; only you shouldn't have forgotten those improvements that were required in order to establish it on a solid foundation. Yet, you are able to actually say that the elimination of the university doesn't belong to the many of your special wishes? The more it is shouted: "Scherr must go!" or: "the university must go!?" – the university, Gentlemen of the XXII, was stabbed in the back by your efforts. What exceptional teacher will remain there in light of such events or will consider coming? Your calculation has often been misunderstood in a very unfavorable way, namely in such a way that the crowd thought that all the sums listed belong as special items to the expenditures. Here, too, you have been reported to, and have reported, erroneously. The present budget shows this quite clearly. The allocation of the 20.000 Frkn. from Zurich purely to the college is prohibited [*unzulässig*] – and then: have you heard nothing about what Winterthur wanted to do for the Cantonal university?

You will perhaps cry out: How dare this single individual stand up to the opinion of some 40,000 citizens? I answer: I am of the opinion that, with the exception of the removal of Dr. Strauß, actually not even 4,000 citizens have even thought about what you want to have the church congregations to petition. I think that you will actually agree with me. Tell us, though: Have voices of the people even once spoken for an open church synod with free representation? Or have the people bothered about the election of the Board of Education and the Church Council? Or whether or not the school superintendent ought to sit on the Board of Education? – None of these are expressions of the desires of the people. A zealous man from Stäfa spoke out in Mänedorf: "Strauß must go, the university must go, the Education Seminar must go, everything must go!!" Another says: "Beer must go, taxes must go, streets must go!" A third: "Bring on the veto! Pastors and school teachers must be re-elected every six years!" – You see, these are actual desires of the people. What concern is it of the people when it comes to voting principles, etc. Yet, you respond that the people have accepted the petition unanimously. Indeed, but that proves very little. The citizens were stirred up in great agitation. Here one could not speak of careful reflection or discussion. Whoever didn't follow along in the wild storm was cursed or abused. In most congregations, reasonable men stayed away; the shy conceded everything that you wanted because they hoped that the discontent would die down; and, finally, the greatest number didn't even understand the epistle and your petition. To this part of the citizenry at such times one can present what one wants, it will accept everything wholesale.

These are the reasons why I believe one must attribute little weight to perhaps half of the many thousand votes cast. Furthermore, I believe that even the Upper Council

would accept these grounds. – From the whole affair, then, one can expect very little (or very little good) to come out of it. That's my opinion.

I could end here my response because I've spoken to just about everything in your epistle. However, Gentlemen!, you have actually raised more serious complaints against me. You wanted to bring these issues to the church congregations, and they are actually well-known from public pamphlets. I don't know whose conscience you wanted to appease by not including them. It is enough that I know what you were thinking and said. For that reason, I have yet a serious word to address to you.

You wanted to charge me of "arrogance." You can calm yourselves. In this respect there is nothing that is more egregious now than your epistle to the government is published. You have supplied the masterwork of arrogance, and there's hardly anyone who can exceed you. The cry of indignation over you that has been raised by all educated and honest citizens has delivered its judgment of you: You are not capable of speaking about decency and ethics.

You charge me with "unlimited authority." What a laughable, silly phrase. My authority is grounded in lawful regulations, and precisely these regulations limit it.

You spoke about doubts over my "Protestant faith." I leave your doubts to you, but such a generalized suspicion is a disgraceful debasement of the good task that you have set for yourselves. Who gives you the right to elevate yourselves to judge matters of faith? What do you know of my faith? Who among you is capable of examining my thoughts? You don't need to place yourselves between me and my God – I don't need such middlemen for the salvation of my soul. This attempt at heresy-hunting fills me with outrage. Truly, you cannot hold it against me when the most powerful doubt arises in me with respect to your Christian beliefs.

You still want to accuse me of "aggressiveness." Yes: I did fight when in 1832 Dr. Niederer called me and the new school system the most wretched concoction. I did fight when Dr. Bluntschli attacked me with weapons of the crudest injustice. I fought when the schools were pushed in a ruinous direction. I fought and still fight against malice and power grabbers by those who want to rattle and ruin the new school system; who want to steal from me and my charges our honor and good names with the most shameful slander – and be certain of one thing: as long as I am in this position [Trans.: Scherr was appointed school superintendent "for life"], I will fight with all that is in me. Should my opponents ever be victorious, their victory will not be easy.

You also want to stain the new status of teachers. You spoke of the "conceited immodesty" of many Education Seminar students. Gentlemen of the XXII, the present tempest has had at least one good consequence, namely, that the status of the public-school teacher has been legitimated over against the denunciations of its opponents. In this period in which so many pastors have spoken out in such a belligerent way against the schools, the Education Seminar, and the Board of Education, I have insisted upon documentation by official testimonials. Take a look in the law office of the Board of

Education and examine for yourselves these testimonials. Stop offending the status of teachers who at such times and by such testimonials are so meritoriously defended!⁷ Perhaps you have given way to gossiping about rumors as is the case with Mr. Bürkli. I want to help you track down these rumors. Not so many years ago, the schoolmaster in most communities was an uneducated farmer or handworker. The schoolmaster was humbled by his dependence on the favor of the pastor or community leader, the physician, or some other respected individual. He followed the cloak and collar of a pastor, was his day-laborer, and the schoolmistress was the obliging maid of the pastor's wife. The physician, president [of the bank], and the industrialist treated the schoolmaster like a marginal person, and their children berated him. This is how it was in many places.

Then, the new teachers came; dressed like gentlemen – already that was an affront. They could write better than the venerated gentlemen in many cases. They even believed themselves to be true masters in the school. Yes, much more, they believed themselves permitted to speak their own opinion over against the venerated gentlemen. That is when the theme of conceited teachers arose, and it spread like wildfire. Such Philistinism could be found in all countries wherever the status of teachers rose above the status of debasement. It is really sad, my Gentlemen of the XXII, that you have wanted to let yourselves be a voice of such Philistinism. Granted, you have chosen not to broadcast the point, and for that reason I won't rake you over the coals for it. I hope that in the future, though, you won't fail the teachers of Zurich who have proven themselves to be truly responsible through all of this.

I have done what your epistle gave me the right to do. I have no personal hate for you, but I am a long way away from forgiving in the least your violence against the rights that I possess as a free citizen.

In the hope that, when it comes to your drawing conclusions in the future, you will more carefully examine the situation in advance, I conclude with Plato:

Were the mind not free, it would be a great idea,

That a sovereign of ideas rule over the soul.

Küsnach, March 12, 1839

7. I wanted to report the statements with respect to the education school and the reputation of teachers in the general press with measured expressions, but their incorporation was disallowed. When the fight occurs in a way that the exculpation is sealed up, we are concerned with an infamous villainy.

Report on the Activity of the Aid Society for the Good of the Victims of 6 September 1839

Presented
by the Society
to the
People of Zurich

Zurich,
Printed by J.J. Ulrich
1840

The Aid Society, which was established immediately after the events of 6 September 1839, feels itself to be called and required by the Christians of Zurich, whose joy and generosity is marvelously represented by this situation, to present a thorough report on its activities as far as possible.

The crowds of thousands who set out from the countryside for Zurich in a solemn and peaceful manner in the night of September 5th to 6th in order to await the outcome, finally, of the long-brewing sacred aspirations of the people had barely entered the city as suddenly injuries and death catapulted upon them. Immediately after the painful events ceased, all the people were overcome with powerful emotions. First and foremost was the feeling of shock whose consequences could have been devastating were our citizens not to have maintained their indwelling Christian spirit. This was followed in the hearts of all by the feeling of thankfulness to God that the tide toward ruin was transformed into benefit. Especially vigorous was the feeling of sympathy that arose in the hearts of everyone. There are victims: "They died for us, for our sacred cause," everyone said. – "If there ever was a time when persons were worthy of our assistance, it is now with these seriously wounded and the parents, widows, and children of those who have died." Donations were made already on the evening of that first day. The very first charitable gift was 10 Schillings that was handed to a pastor of the city by a shabbily-dressed man.

The enormous, universal willingness to provide aid required without question the formation of an Aid Society. At a meeting in the Neumünster on the evening of September 10th, the citizens of the city established a group consisting of the following six persons to take on the task of fulfilling this purpose:

Antistes Füsli

Dr. Rahn
 Governing Council Member Spöndli
 Deacon Fäsi
 Deacon Pestalozzi
 Martin Usteri

The Society quickly assumed its task of assistance as soon as it was publicly announced. Donations poured into its coffers, especially on the Day of Repentance on which several hundred designated their participation. We express our deep thanks to all who donated! It is not merely the amount dedicated to this goal that is worthy of thanks but, far more, the joy with which you gave it. It is the most certain guarantee of a blessed success. It is the mite of the poor received from the many that makes for a harvest of blessedness; especially, it is what brings benefit to its recipients. Ever since then, the joy of giving was sparked in ever more hearts, the savings accounts of children were opened, small and large donations were made that were dedicated to a social benefit. Clubs sent donations, students delighted their teachers, confirmation students their pastors by the paying of a tax of love for the victims of September 6th. We received one donation from Ottenbach with the following lines from a student:

As expression of our heart, in recognition
 Of your fate, poor orphan,
 This mite is dedicated to you.
 May God grant that it pleases you!
 Fate hit you hard on the day
 Of Struggle, great was your lament.
 Yet the fight was unspeakably sacred
 And that is to our and to your benefit.

May we also strive solemnly,
 To incessantly live according to Christ's example;
 So that the reward of those fallen
 Is received also by us before God's throne.

What especially increased the quantity of donations was the love tax that was sent in by some civic groups and entire congregations. Many poor people donated in this manner! How many households sacrificed their own needs! – Receive our thanks for your generosity, Christian brothers! The one who received blesses the giver! Your mite grew to a large sum. According to the account that follows, this sum added up to 7835 Francs and 5 Schillings.

As its success pleased and inspired the Aid Society greatly, it also can't be denied that this extraordinary trust made the fulfilment of its task more difficult. The task was the distribution and application of the entire amount in a most just and beneficial manner. Only when this goal has been achieved can our country be pleased with its work. However, this is anything but easily accomplished. Where one is concerned with individuals, the task can be achieved, perhaps, with little concern; even more so when these individuals are all adults and established in a profession. This is the case for some of our recipients but not for the majority. Entire families faced the brink of,

or collapsed into, poverty by the sudden death of a father, spouse, son, or brother. One was in the process of building a house when he was torn away by death. In order for his widow with her children to remain in the house, part of the construction costs needed to be covered. The head of the household with huge expenses had his financing terminated at the end of 1839 and had just received the notification when his early death occurred. The Orphan Administration explained that it was not in the position to address the problem without the receipt of immediate and hefty aid. A third person with the assistance of a talented and industrious son had purchased merchandise that promised a lucrative return when suddenly the death of this son brought the collapse of the investment. The Aid Society had to seek a way for this afflicted father to avoid catastrophe. Another man who died on September 6th left behind a sick and psychologically ill widow. Understandably, the unexpected blow made her circumstances even worse. The household collapsed; the only child, a 14-year-old girl, was sent to be cared for by a group of benefactresses, and a place in an asylum had to be arranged for the widow, all of which could not occur without significant financial assistance. Older parents lost the vigorous support of a hard-working and faithful son and underage children their father – and the consequences of their horrible loss had to be addressed. When it came to wounded survivors, there needed to be a scale of aid established that extended from those who recovered completely to those who lost a limb! Right from the beginning, each individual family required unique attention and tailored assistance.

A detailed, official accounting of the individuals and families with their special circumstances can perhaps best demonstrate what the Aid Society confronted. At the head of the list are those honorable, fourteen men and youth who lost their lives in the sacred cause.

1. Hans Jakob Kägi from Plakten, parish Bauma, 56 years old at his death, was a tirelessly industrious, honest, thrifty man who rose out of poverty. He owned a piece of land, but it wasn't capable of supporting cattle or the planting even of potatoes. He was a cotton spinner, and, when he lost that work, he undertook trading with little success. He left behind a four-and-a-half-year, older widow who, like him, was industrious and thrifty as well as a son and daughter both of whom married; and they, too, have an excellent reputation.
2. Hans Jakob Tucker from Haselhalde, parish Bauma, died of a head-wound at 53 years old, without a house but worked the land of his still-living 75-year-old father. He, too, had the reputation of a quiet, industrious, and honest man; he left behind a widow with three children. The oldest son is 25 in the meantime as the consequence of strenuous work as farmhand and chauffeur is unable to work because of an enduring medical condition; the older daughter of 17 is emotionally disturbed and unable to work. The household enjoys the best of reputations.
3. Hans Rudolf Spörri from Allenwyl, parish Bauma did not die in the conflict itself. He died late on the evening of September 6th as a consequence of an abdominal

wound. He was a bachelor of 21 years, the only child of Heinrich Spörri. The shattering death of the courageous son had the consequence that the separated parents were reunited.

4. Jakob Bleuler from Zollikon, 40 years old, bachelor. He survived as a day-worker in Zurich, joined the group from his country people, and died. His body was unrecognizable. He was mistaken for Heinrich Tobler from Hinterbalm, and with this name he was buried. However, the error was quickly learned. On the basis of clothes found at the hospital, it was determined that he could be no other than Jakob Bleuler, who had been missing since September 6th (see the Governing Council's edict of 23 November 1839). His geriatric mother is still living. She lives with an unmarried daughter in the community of Seen.
5. Hans Jakob Weber of Vorderbalm, parish Pfäffikon, 51 years old. He was wounded twice on the back of the head by blows of a sword. He leaves behind a widow with three children, two of whom are underage. He ran a weaving business with his oldest son and was a poor but very virtuous man. As a member of the Brethren church in Hofhalden, he was the leader of a good choral group at their Sunday evening services. He had just built a house that exhausted his economic resources by which there remained debts for construction materials and the payment of workers.
6. Hans Jakob Boshardt from Ohwachs, parish Hittnau, 55 years old, born in Auslikon, parish Pfäffikon. He left behind a wife, who for years was psychologically ill, and a 14-year-old daughter. He was poor but enjoyed a good reputation.
7. Bartholomäus Diem from Hersau, Canton Appenzell Ausserroden. He was shot in the abdomen and died at the age of 27. He worked for many years as a hard-working, devout servant in Metzikon and in the last three years as a cataloger in Robenhausen. His older, deaf, charity-recipient father, whom he had supported, suffered especially with his death.
8. Conrad Marthaler of Oberhasle, was 34 when he died, a bachelor, and worked as a farmworker in Zymikon, in the community of Volkenschweil where he joined the crowd as it moved through his area. His parents are no longer living; his seven siblings are all adults.
9. Hans Heinrich Egli of Robenhausen, parish Metzikon was struck on his left thigh and died on the evening of September 7th at the age of 21. He was the second son of upright but poor parents who took pleasure and comfort in his moral behavior.

These nine men (with the exception of Heinrich Egli, who was laid to rest in his home town) were buried on the evening of September 8th in the cemetery of the Predigerstadt parish. Several thousand participated in this solemn hour. Soldiers of the Fatherland carried the bodies of their fallen brothers. Emotions ran deeply as the hymn "Sacred are Heaven's Inheritors!" was sung. So it was, then.

1. Heinrich Schnurrenberger from Kohlboden, parish Sternenbergr died on September 12th from a shot-wound through his right eye at the age of 20. He was the

sole son of elderly parents. As an obedient, humble young man, he was the joy and support of his poor parents by his ceaseless dutiful efforts. He was buried on September 14th on the evening before the Day of Prayer and Repentance.

2. Jakob Diggelmann of Pfäffikon, 20 years old, was wounded on the right shoulder and died on September 17th. He was a bachelor, lived with his father who earlier faced great difficulties because of the disastrous fire in Pfäffikon, and helped him as cobbler handworker. He was very poor but honest and courageous. He was buried on September 29th along with
3. Jakob Dietliker of Kempten, parish Metzikon, resident of Auslikon. He died on September 18th as the result of a wound in his abdomen. He left behind a widow who is greatly respected by all and three underage children. This is not an entirely poor family because as carpenter he had cared well for his household. As the following table shows [not reproduced here], the [carpenters'] association had already helped this valiant family.
4. Hans Heinrich Müller from Hofhalden, community of Hittnau received a wound in his left leg with the consequence that it was amputated below the knee. He died on September 20 at the age of 54 and left behind a widow and five children, one of whom was underage. He was an industrious man, but his resources were slim. The Brethren congregation in Hofhalden took him to be one of their most important members, a man who edified them with his loving words. His painful hospital time gave moving testimony to the strength of his faith. "And when I," he said on one of the last days of his life as the pain had reached its fevered pitch, "and when I once more must endure all of this pain for the victory that we have won, I would do so again." He was buried on September 22nd.

All of these men with the exception of Heinrich Egli of Metzikon are in a grave in the cemetery of Predigerstadt parish. A simple cross marks the location of their communal rest.¹ One finds on the cross these words:

"Here rest twelve men who fell on September 6, 1839
Revelation XIV, 13"

1. Hans Jakob Lattmann of Uerschen, parish Bauma was shot through the left foot. Although the wound was dangerous, he recovered quickly, and everyone hoped that in a short time he would return home healthy. However, he was hit by a chest-fever, and his condition worsened ever more seriously. He suffered bitterly, as well, from homesickness, and he died. His incessant request to be buried in his home town had to be observed. He died in the hospital at 10:00 a.m. on October 16th and was buried at 9:00 p.m. in his home town three hours after his arrival. The deceased was 25 years old and married. His widow gave birth to a daughter on February 16, 1840, who was baptized in the church in Bauma on February 23rd

1. A collection of funeral addresses has been printed by David Bürkli. 2nd ed. November 1839.

with the name Barbara. He was poor but had a good reputation. His parents are still alive.

The following are the names of the wounded:

1. Heinrich Kreis from Altikon, living in Myla, was hit by a bullet in his right thigh. He was born in 1809, a poor day-laborer and weaver; he is not yet recovered. He will probably need a spa-visit next summer.
2. Johann Jakob Spörri Delers from Lenzen, parish Fischenthal, born in 1819, bachelor. He was wounded on the right cheek and lives with his poor parents. The honest household is maintained by cotton weaving. The victim is now satisfactorily recovered.
3. Heinrich Meier from Hinterwaberg, parish Bärentschweil; born in 1814, was seriously wounded in his right shoulder and is still suffering. He is married and father of an underaged child. He lives with his parents and is employed part-time as a weaver, part-time as an estate gardener. The family is not poor but also not rich. They have a good reputation.
4. Georg Weber from Auslikon, parish Pfäffikon, brother of the fallen Jakob Weber, is married and father of two children. He received a head wound but was released from the hospital already on September 10th without adequately recovering, as it turned out. He has a good reputation.
5. Heinrich Bär from Theilingen, parish Weißlingen, born in 1814, bachelor, lives with his parents on a small estate that is cultivated, primarily, by the son. He was seriously wounded on the right hand and continues to suffer from the injury. He has a good reputation.
6. Conrad Boller from Balm, parish Pfäffikon, thirty years old, is married and lives with his completely impoverished father. He has one child of his own and four step-children. He was released from the hospital on September 27th.
7. Heinrich Keller from Kellersacker, parish Turbenthal, born in 1798, bachelor, father of an uneducated child, is poor. He received a gunshot wound and, as a consequence, his right leg was amputated above the knee. Only by hard work and frugality was this dauntless man and his wife able to endure with honor. He survived the operation. His return home in December was celebrated, movingly, by a large number of friends and acquaintances. According to the latest reports, though, he still suffers greatly.
8. Johannes Gubler from Pfäffikon, bachelor, 32 years old, lives with his impoverished father. He lost his left eye and was released from the hospital on September 27th. He enjoys a good reputation.
9. Johannes Würgler von Uster, living in Hottingen, born in 1787, widower since 1827, father of six grown children. His left leg was crushed, but it quickly healed without lasting consequences.
10. Hans Rudolf Müller, non-commissioned officer, from Hofhalden near Hittnau, born in 1780. As his comrades fell, he attacked the military with his staff and

defended himself bravely until he suffered slashes from his opponent. He received three head-wounds and a bayonet wound in the abdomen. Nonetheless, he was able to drag himself to Fluntern where he stayed in the house of a friend. At the moment, he is convalescing. He is generally esteemed for his religious conviction and impeccable behavior.

11. Johannes Kägi from Seewadel, community of Bauma, born in 1816, married, father of one child. He is without means, works as pamphlet printer and has the reputation of an engaging, thrifty, and honest man. His parents are still living. After he was wounded, he stayed for several days in the community of Neumünster where he received medical attention.
12. Johannes Hofmann from Kloten, born in 1820. He was in the midst of the crowd when he was wounded. The bullet entered in his spine and exited from his right elbow. He lay for several weeks in the house of his foreman, Mr. Kratzer, under the best of care, and then returned to his parents in Kloten. After a very exhausting and painful stay in the hospital, he is now so improved that he can do limited cabinetwork for his foreman.
13. Johannes Boshard from Steinenbach, parish Wyla, received a bullet wound in the thigh on Münsterhof. He was cared for by a physician in a private home and dragged himself home with great effort where he spent the next six weeks recovering. His father is still alive, he has four siblings, and enjoys the reputation of a quiet, industrious, and hearty young man. He is 19 ½ years old.
14. Kaspar Enderli from Bysikon, parish Illnau, 54 years old. On September 6th he was in the midst of the crowd and was lightly wounded by a sword blow on his left hand between the thumb and index finger.²

What is presented here is the true presentation of an official report. What we are able to say from this witness regarding our fallen and wounded brothers contradicts more strongly than all words the hateful claims of vehement pamphlets that the men who advanced from the mountains to the city were a mass of rabble. They were poorly clothed, we grant, but under their shabby clothes beat pious Christian hearts for a Fatherland.

As far as the Aid Society was able to determine, donations came from all sides immediately after the events, some small, others large, according to character and circumstances, in part to the houses of those who lost a father, brother, son, or husband in order to reduce the first needs, in part to make it possible for the wounded to achieve the necessary means for their recovery. What we intended to accomplish, we achieved. Those left behind feel relieved and consoled and request that thanks be expressed to their pastors and church leaders. We have not earned this thanks, but you, this Christian community, made possible the reduction of this need of the

2. Still other citizens were wounded: Jakob Rüscher, cabinet-maker, applicant Wirz from Zurich, and student Freuler from Glarus.

afflicted. The degree of suffering of our wounded has also been diminished. Some are completely recovered; others are on their way to recovery under the guidance of competent and charitable physicians.

The most important question, by the way, that the Aid Society had to answer consisted in what direction to take once all monies had been collected. Two main alternatives came to the fore: One option was to distribute all the funds to the afflicted according to their circumstances, and, thus, close down the society. The other option suggested not completing the complete distribution now but only when the individual and family circumstances of those concerned were determined yet more clearly and with certainty.

The Aid Society has chosen the second form, and, although it is known that there is a desire on the part of some for the distribution to occur now, this wish couldn't hinder the Society from holding to the conviction that would best, essentially increase the effectiveness of its work. When we examine the family circumstances of those who died, they are the ones who have suffered the most. Only in the course of time will it be clear in what respects and in what amount the society should assist them. In other cases, where it is already clearly evident that the best for a family requires that it receive now its portion that conjecturally it should receive, the Society has done so to the best of its judgment as the calculations of its report indicate. With respect to the accumulated interest of the money invested by the Society, it will take into consideration how best to disperse it to equitably assist those families and persons who received only small assistance amounts.

With respect to the wounded, many, of course, are recovered. However, some are at the time of this report still recovering, and it is not yet possible to determine whether and what enduring, negative consequences will arise with respect to their health and professional lives. It is not to be overlooked that some of the wounded whom physicians report as healed will suffer future issues with their wounds in the future.

These are the reasons that bring the Aid Society to postpone the final distribution of its resources until the 1840 fourth quarter endowment assessment and to present a report and new distribution of funds at the end of that year to the affected persons or families.

In the meantime, the amounts that we have not yet expended will continue to collect interest. Those recommended to our custody will not in the least lose anything of what they will receive. The earnings are guaranteed.³

Incidentally, we are convinced that we have acted responsibly to humanity as well as to the Lord with respect to our charge. All donations humbly were made in His name for our wishes and accomplishment! He has given us the insight always to

3. In order to safeguard the entirety of collected funds, we asked the present government whether or not it would assume the cost for the printing of our report as well as some other small expenses, and it readily agreed to our request.

see what and how everything ought to be done that it bring a blessing. He blesses everyone who has worked in the spirit of love and faith on behalf of our sacrificed brothers! With their deaths, they served to achieve victory for a holy cause. Never forget that, brothers in Christ! Pray with us to God that He might send our Fatherland the one thing necessary, the steadfast clinging to His Holy Word. If so, we will preserve freedom, and never again will days return like those that we have had. Never again will a chasm develop between the government and the people. For where for everyone that which is sacred is held sacred, there one is easily reconciled over that which is less important, and with the power of this unity our country's welfare will flourish!

