

of that tumultuous city as the sabbath returns, the stillness of the hallowed day, its sacred associations, its solemn rites and divine instructions enforced by the solemnities of the sanctuary,—these all are a cordial to his thirsty spirit. In the enjoyment of such a sabbath he feels how blessed, above all other days, is the one which the Lord hath made.

ARTICLE V.

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

Translated from the unpublished Manuscripts of Prof. Tholuck of Halle, by Edwards A. Park.
(Continued from Vol. I. No. II. p. 367.)

B. The various Departments of Dogmatic Theology.

§ 24. I. *The arrangement of Proof-texts, and the Dogmatic Theology of the Bible.*

THE first duty of the student in the department of systematic theology is, to collect the *dicta probantia*. The arrangement of these proof-texts, (*τόποι*), belongs to the department of "Topics." The collections which have been hitherto made of such passages are unsatisfactory. They contain those texts only which express a truth absolutely and directly, but omit those which simply involve and imply the same truth.

The department of Biblical Dogmatic Theology is immediately derived from that of Topics. In other words, the system of Christian faith is expressed with simplicity, in sentences which are founded on the proof-texts of the Bible. In addition to the simple statement of the Christian principles, this department will allow an exegetical proof that the principles are taught in the Bible, and also a brief scientific confirmation of them. In this department, as in that of Topics, we have no satisfactory Treatise for students. The older writers, as Zachariae, are prolix and devoid of taste. Storr and Knapp have given us the best works that we have of this character.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, the name Biblical Dogmatic Theology has been used in a different sense from that which is given above. It has been applied to the science which is more properly called Dogmatic History. Certain theo-

logians, who take a rationalistic view of christian doctrine, have considered the various teachings of the Bible, from the time of Abraham to that of Jesus and the apostles, as the product of the human reason in its course of gradual improvement. In this sense, therefore, must the Biblical Dogmatics or Theology exhibit the gradual development of the reason in religious things, as it kept pace with the advancement of the times in which the writers of the Bible lived. There has also been included in this department a representation of the particulars in which the apostles agree among themselves, and also of the particulars in which they differ among themselves, in their respective systems of faith. The Biblical Dogmatics of Von Ammon, De Wette, Baumgarten Crusius, Von Cölln, have been composed in this rationalistic spirit.

II. *Dogmatic Theology of the Church.*

Different men take different views of the contents of the Bible. When any great number of men unite in the same views, they form a distinct creed for the expression of their views. In this way does the one great Christian church divide itself into various branches, which adopt different confessions of faith. The differences between these various departments of the church may be unessential and merely *formal*, as indeed there were diversities among the apostles themselves, in their mode of stating the truth. Churches which are formed in southern latitudes, may be found to give an uncommon degree of influence to the fancy in their views of doctrine and of worship; churches which are formed in northern latitudes, may be found to give an unusual influence to the understanding, etc. Still it is obvious, from the very nature of the case, that the discordant views which men take of divine truth, are in part occasioned by the sinfulness of the heart. Levity of moral feeling, for example, will incline the student to represent the guilt of man as less than it would be regarded by one of a more serious habit of mind.

By the phrase, the Dogmatic Theology of a Church, is therefore to be understood, that representation of Christian doctrine which accords with the views and the developments of a particular ecclesiastical community. With us, at the present time, the phrase denotes an historical science; an exhibition of the theological views which have been adopted by the old Lutheran writers on dogmatic theology. The science is exhibited in this

manner by Hase, in his *Hutterus Redivivus*, by Bretschneider, De Wette, and others. The theologian who espouses the cause of any particular church, is of course required to understand the doctrines of that church. It is especially useful for him to pursue the study of the first two systematic theologians belonging to the protestant communities—Calvin's *Institutes* and Melanethor's *Loci Theologici*. A good edition of the former was published in Berlin, in 1834, 1835, and a good edition of the latter in Erlangen, in 1828.

An acquaintance with the creeds and confessions of an ecclesiastical community, is connected with the dogmatic theology of the same. The science of Symbolics or Symbolism (*die Symbolik*) exhibits the doctrinal views of a church exactly as they are laid down in her authorized standards. It is ordinarily *comparative*, that is, it places side by side the written confessions of various churches. The *Comparative View of the Systems of the various Christian Schools*, (*Comp. Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs der versch. christ. Kirchen-Parteien*.) by Winer, and the *Symbolik* by Guenike, are especially serviceable in this department. The articles of faith adopted by the Lutheran church, are found in the *Christian Form of Concord*, (*Concordien-Buch*.) published by J. G. Walch, in 1750. They are here given in both the German and the Latin languages, and are accompanied with an historical introduction. A Latin edition of this work was published by Hase, in two parts, in 1823. The Symbolical books of the Calvinistic (*reformirten*) church, were published in the German language by Mess, in 1830; in the Latin language, by Augusti, in 1827; by Niemeyer, in 1839. The *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, may be recommended as more deserving of study than any other work of this character, with the exception of the *Confession* itself.

Polemic Theology should be studied at the same time with the examination of creeds and ecclesiastical standards. The *Polemic science* should not be confounded with the *Apologetic*. The latter has respect to the enemies of Christianity; the former, to the Confessions of Christian parties who differ from ourselves. *Polemic Theology* had for a long time lain dormant in modern days, but within a few years it has been awakened from its inactive state. Scheibel and Guenike have defended the Lutheran Theology against the Calvinists; and Möhler has, with signal ability, defended the Catholic church against the Protestants. His Sym-

bolik,¹ a fourth edition of which was published in 1836, exhibits much talent. As antagonistical to the Symbolik of Möhler, there have been published, on the Protestant side, a work of Baur on the Opposition between the Protestant and the Catholic Systems, (*Gegensatz zwischen Protestantismus und Katholicismus*,) 1834, and also a work of Nitzsch, entitled, *A Protestant Reply to the Symbolik of Möhler*, (*Protest. Beant. der Symbol. von Möhler*).

III. *The Scientific Dogmatical Theology.*

The man who is scientifically educated, feels the imperative need of learning the logical necessity and the inward connection of all the propositions, which he believes to be correct. In all ages, therefore, have the men who have enjoyed a philosophical training been sedulous to show the reasonableness of Christian truths, and the connection of one doctrine with another. They have, in a greater or less degree, endeavored to accomplish this result according to those principles of science and metaphysical philosophy, which were current in their day. In the prosecution of these inquiries it is needful, first of all, to examine the grounds on which we may rest our faith in the revelation made by Christ and the apostles. If this faith be shown to accord with the principles of reason, then it is of necessity presupposed, that the contents of the divine revelation are also reasonable; then the teachings of the New Testament are believed, and, after laborious study, are by degrees more and more clearly understood. The scholastic maxim is,—*Credo ut intelligam*; and also—*Fides præcedit intellectum*.

The attempt to show the rational character of the Christian faith, began to be made in the earliest periods of the Christian era, and has been continued through all succeeding periods. It was commenced by the Apologists for Christianity; it was prosecuted by Origen in his *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, *De Principiis*, which was the first scientific treatise on the Christian system of theology. This attempt, however, to develop the reasonableness of Christianity has ever led to varying results. The discrepancy has been occasioned by the differing tendencies of science, and especially by the diversities in systems of metaphysical philosophy. Those who have adopted views adverse to the Christian faith have, from the times of the apostles to our own day, been excluded from the

¹ Translated into English by James B. Robertson, Esq. and accompanied with a memoir of the author.—Tr.

Christian communion. This is regarded by many as a severe procedure; it is, however, a necessary result of the very idea of a *community*. Even at the present time, the ministers of the evangelical church (of Germany) are obliged to take an oath to defend the doctrines of our symbolical books. Since the reign of Frederic II, however, this oath has been practically disregarded. In glaring opposition to it our articles of faith have been denied, and every form of attack upon them has been tolerated. In this manner have arisen, within the enclosure of the evangelical church itself, a great number of conflicting parties, who in former times would have separated themselves from the church, and would have framed distinct confessions. The characteristics of the parties existing at the present time, will be given in the sequel.

IV. *The History of Doctrines.*

We will in this place consider the history of doctrines as an integral department of Systematic Theology, although it may likewise be treated as one of the historical sciences. It exhibits to us the processes of thought, in which the scientific men of different ages have endeavored to apprehend and to vindicate the doctrines of Christianity. In this point of view, the history of doctrines is needful for the prosecution of systematic theology; inasmuch as the efforts after truth, which have been made in all former times, serve as a basis for our individual meditations. It is an established fact, that the same dogma has been again and again reproduced at different periods, and at each of these periods with some new phasis. By knowing the history of its different phases, we may be the better enabled to understand the dogma itself. The History of Christology by Dörner, is written with the design of thus elucidating the doctrine concerning the character of Christ.

V. *Apologetic Theology.*

This term has ordinarily been employed to denote the science which exhibits the historical grounds for the truth, and the divine authority of Christianity. It has been supposed to treat, in an especial manner, of the miracles and prophecies. The proof of the authenticity and inspiration of the biblical writings has also been often included in the Apologetic department. From the manner in which the department has been described, it would appear to aim at nothing but to establish the divine authority of the Christian

religion. Such a representation, however, is a false one. The Apology for Christian doctrine is given in every theological science which is elaborated in a Christian spirit. Formerly, indeed, the highest degree of importance was attached to the historical proofs of Christianity; and it is a fact that these proofs make the deepest impression upon the majority of men. The Apologetik by Prof. Sack, and the Credibility of the Evangelical History (Glaubwürdigkeit, etc. etc.) by Tholuck, may be mentioned as the chief works in this department.

§ 25. *Characteristics of the chief tendencies of Systematic Theology at the present time.*

The contest which is now going on, in reference to Dogmatic Theology, may be regarded as in part *formal*, in part *material*. It is *formal*, so far as the question is, whether or not we should attach importance to the decisions of the reason and philosophy; whether we found religious truth upon the feeling, or upon the understanding, or upon history. It is *material*, so far as the question is, whether we shall receive or reject the articles of the Christian faith. The controversy in regard to the *material* question is at present designated, as the opposition between Rationalism and Supranaturalism; but these party names do not express with sufficient definiteness the true character of the dispute. That plan of reasoning which we now call Rationalism, was first elaborated in England in the seventeenth century, and was there called Deism, the system of the Freethinkers, sometimes also Rationalism. In Germany likewise, as early as the seventeenth century, the terms Rationalism and Naturalism were used to designate that system which denied the divine revelation; see the quotations authenticating this statement in Hahn, *De Rationalismi vera Indole*, 1827. The name, however, fell into desuetude, and was at first brought again into vogue at the beginning of the present century by Gabler and Reinhard. At the same time, also, men began to designate the principles which stood in opposition to Rationalism by the name, Supranaturalism. Even the rationalists themselves defined their system to be, that which receives so much only of a pretended revelation as accords with the religious ideas; see Wegscheider's *Institut* § 11. The rationalist examines, therefore, the Christian revelation under the influence of these religious ideas; and his decision is, that the morality of the gospel, its teachings concerning God, and the freedom of the will, and the immortality

of the soul, and the state of rewards and punishments, commend themselves to the mind as reasonable; but that the other doctrines are to be regarded as a result of the contracted and erroneous style of thinking which prevailed among the Jews in respect of religious themes. It is also said ordinarily, that there is in the Bible a pure *typus doctrinae* and an impure one; and that the considerate theologian should copy after the former alone.

The rationalists have described Supranaturalism, as that system which receives a supernatural, miraculous revelation on the ground of mere authority, without any application of the individual reason; see Wegscheider's *Institut* § 10. But the rationalists misrepresent, in this case, the system of Supranaturalism, and ascribe to it a feature which does not belong to it. This system has always sought to show the logical necessity of faith in the divine revelation; it has always considered the apologetic science, as at the foundation of this faith. But after it has evinced the divine authority of Christ and of the apostles, it has indeed required, that we repose confidence in their authority; that we believe their instructions to be true, even if we cannot exactly prove that they accord with the decisions of reason.

The contest between these two parties continued from the end of the preceding century until the year 1820 or thereabout. At this latter period the relation of theological parties began to change. The system of the supranaturalists was not in exact accordance with the faith of the church; it had moderated the spirit of the standard confessions; it had given an insipid explanation of doctrine; it involved a tendency toward Pelagianism. Since the year 1820, theologians have arisen who embrace stricter views of the church-doctrine, and who reason on the principles of Augustinism. Men have also appeared, who take the station of mediators between rationalism and supranaturalism. At the present time, therefore, the old rationalistic system is called *vulgaris* or *communis*; and the old system of the supranaturalists is called Historical Supranaturalism. Among the representatives of the rationalists, Ammon and Röhr stand conspicuous. Ammon has given the most skilful exhibition of their system, in his treatise on the Progressive Advancement of the Christian System until it shall become the Religion for the whole world (*Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion*). Röhr has stated his views of theology in his *Letters concerning Rationalism*. Among the representatives of the Historical Supranaturalism may be mentioned, Reinhard, Schott, Hahn, Knapp, Storr, Flatt, and others of kindred sentiment.

Since the year 1820 or thereabout, the theology of Schleiermacher has gained an important influence. Its fundamental principle is, that the essential part of religion is not the intellectual view, not the action, but the state of the religious feeling. It is the immediate feeling of dependence on God. Doctrines are nothing more than those imperfect reflections, in which men endeavor to make the state of their own feelings clear to themselves. Philosophy has nothing to do with religion. It develops the ideas on the ground of a necessity in the order of the thoughts alone, entirely independent of the feelings. Schleiermacher knew the experiences of the religious life of a Christian; and he felt a powerful reality in them. In many of his speculations he coincided with Spinoza and Fichte, but feeling was for him a stronger reality than speculation. He believed that philosophy is as yet far from attaining its true end; and he drew himself back from it, and retired into the province of Christian experience. This experience he vindicated in his *Systematic Theology*, with the aid of a fine-drawn and eloquent system of dialectics. On the other hand, the rationalistic tendencies of the day in which Schleiermacher commenced his labors, the style of criticism too which then prevailed, his own philosophical studies also, particularly his study of Spinoza, undermined his faith in many parts of the orthodoxy that has ever been prevalent in the church. Hence it is, that he defended the great doctrines of Christianity, and at the same time, abandoned many portions of truth, many parts especially of the historical revelation. See Gess's *Analysis of the System of Schleiermacher* (*Auseinandersetzung des Schleiermacherschen Systems*).

A large number of theologians, influenced by the genius and labors of Schleiermacher, now came forward, and exhibited more or less of Christian earnestness in defending the weightier doctrines of Christianity, but at the same time favored the cause of rationalism in many respects, and particularly in their style of criticism. Baumgarten Crusius, Hase, Lücke, are representatives of this school. Other disciples of Schleiermacher, however, have adhered more closely to the teachings of the Bible and of the church. Such men, for example, are Neander, Nitzsch, Twisten.

It was about the year 1830 that the Hegelian philosophy began to exert its influence upon the public. The right wing of the Hegelians proceeded from the following principle in their reasonings: only that can be regarded as true by a rational inquirer, which must be believed in the necessary process of thought. That pro-

cess of thought is necessary, which accords with a certain *method*, and the only true *method* is the Hegelian logic. In the application of this method, it is found that philosophical truth lies at the foundation of the Christian history and doctrine. Marheinecke is considered as the representative of this right wing of the Hegelians, in the department of dogmatic theology; but he does not adopt, even in a speculative form, the true system of Christian doctrine; he denies it rather, and that directly, in some of its essential articles. He withholds assent not merely from the doctrines of our own individual immortality, of the resurrection of the dead, and of the last judgment, but also from the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ.

The error of the *rationalismus vulgaris* consists in the fact, that the rationalist lays the basis of his system in an idea of the sound reason, but does not antecedently prove that his own idea is one of the sound reason. He says, the sound reason is that which is rightly educated; and the right education is, that which is imparted by a sound philosophy; but the question perpetually occurs, What is a sound reason and a sound philosophy? At first the Wolfian philosophy was regarded by the rationalists as the sound one; then the Kantian; and afterward other systems. But since the promulgation of Schelling's and Hegel's philosophy, which has charged the rationalistic system with shallowness, and has sought to prove that a deeper idea is involved in the doctrines of the gospel than has been admitted by that system, it has been asserted by Röhr, that the reason to which the rationalists make their appeal, is not that which is peculiar to any philosophical school, but is the universal reason, that which is found in every well educated man. By taking this ground, the rationalists have renounced every philosophical basis, and have adopted the sound understanding, the common sense of man, for their law and criterion of truth. It has, however, been proved by Hase, that this standard is arbitrary; that different ages and different classes of men have sanctioned altogether different principles, as the principles of common sense; and that the investigations of philosophy develop a higher category, which the rationalists have no right to disregard. See Hase's *Streitigkeiten*, No. 1. p. 41.

The theory of the religious feeling, as propounded by Schleiermacher, is none the less destitute of solid foundation. Religious truth must be truth for all men; it must, therefore, in the processes of thought, as well as in feeling, commend itself as the truth. The fact that my emotions are religiously affected in one

mode or in another, gives me no certainty that this affection is a sound one, and in harmony with the laws of my being.

The system of Hegel seems to leave no room for any distinctive science of theology; for according to that system, philosophy occupies the whole ground of theological discussion; it decides, altogether independently of other sciences, with regard to religious doctrine; and the highest service which theology can perform is, to express philosophical truths in biblical phraseology, so as to spread the knowledge of these truths through more extensive circles of society. Since every system of philosophy is nothing more than a philosophy of the time in which it was written, it cannot afford to the theologian any knowledge of absolute truth. We must, therefore, consider the only sure basis of dogmatic theology to be that principle which recognizes the Revelation from God, and points out the harmony between the contents of this revelation and the decisions of human reason. The most intimate relation in which the investigator of theological truth stands to Christianity is an historical one; the church being an historical institution, recognizing the authority of the scriptures, and therefore acknowledging that an historical record lies at the foundation of the ecclesiastical community. According to these principles, the very foundations of systematic theology are laid in those researches, which, agreeably to the modern classification, belong to the Apologetic department. This department canvasses the credibility of the evangelical narratives. It includes three distinct processes of inquiry: it examines the proof, first, that these narratives proceeded, originally, from the apostles and their disciples; secondly, that these men were competent to narrate the truth; and thirdly, that they were disposed to narrate it. The authenticity of the second, the third, and the fourth of the gospels, is as far removed from reasonable doubt as the authenticity of any other historical writing. With regard to the gospel of Matthew, it may be satisfactorily proved that a Hebrew original lay at the foundation of our present Greek copy;¹ but it cannot be proved that our Greek copy is a mere translation of the original Hebrew. The inquires into this subject have assumed a great degree of importance in modern times; for while the former effort of rationalism was, to divest the Bible of its supernatural records by explaining away their real meaning, its present effort is, to accomplish the same end by maintaining that the discourses of our Sa-

¹ See a discussion of this question in *Am. Bib. Repos.* Vol. XII. Art. vii.

viour and the narratives of his exploits have been interpolated. Such an interpolation, however, can be supposed only on the ground, that the authenticity of the evangelists may be reasonably denied.

The cardinal inquiry which is now proposed for theological discussion is, What opinion shall we form of the character of Christ? Even the most skeptical writers admit the historical fact, that the Saviour uttered, with regard to himself, such words as we find in Matthew 11: 27. 28: 31, etc. We must, therefore, of necessity, adopt one of the three following suppositions. First, it may be supposed that the real fact is, as these passages declare it to be. In this case, the Saviour is specifically different from all other men; he is a super-human being. Secondly, it may be supposed, that in his exaltation above others he said altogether too much in his own praise; he said more than propriety allowed. In this case, he was a fanatic. Thirdly it may be supposed, that he designedly expressed more than he believed in honor of his character and office. In this case, he must be considered as an intentional deceiver. We cannot avoid this dilemma by saying, that the high claims which Jesus put forth for himself were made in accommodation to the popular feeling which existed at that time among the Jews. It is by no means a fact, that the Jews ascribed to a prophet the power of forgiving sins, or the right of professing to be the radiance emanating from God. Schaller, in his work entitled, "The Historical Christ," committed a great mistake in asserting that the Jews entertained an opinion favorable to such exalted claims. No nation on the earth imagined so great a distance to exist between God and man, as was imagined by the Jews. They went even so far as to cast stones at Jesus because he made himself equal with God; see John 10: 33.

Our opinion concerning the miracles which Christ performed, will aid us in deciding the question concerning his personal character. If he did in fact perform miraculous works, they must be regarded as corroborating the expressions which he makes concerning himself; and on the other hand, these expressions concerning himself confirm the reality of the miracles attributed to him. It must be expected of such a person as he describes himself to be, that he will have a dominion over nature. It is with this meaning that Rosencranz says, "It would have been wonderful if Jesus had not performed wonders." In order to avoid the admission of Christ's miraculous agency, the most dissimilar processes of argument have been pursued by rationalists at dif-

ferent periods. Several English deists, and also Reimar, the author of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, have ventured to account for the miraculous appearances on the ground of imposture. The German rationalism has betaken itself to forced explanations of the passages, that record any supernatural occurrence. About the year 1820, men began to be satisfied with simply uttering a "non liquet" in regard to such events; but this is not an allowable mode of dismissing a scientific question, when we possess all the data which are needful for deciding it. Strauss has broken through this indecision, and has advanced the principle that all narratives of miraculous agency are mythical, are tales arbitrarily originated, resting on the basis of a religious idea, but devoid of all historical truth. He further admits, that this method of explaining away the record of miracles cannot be adopted, unless the authenticity of all the gospels be disproved. But if this should be done, and if all the miracles recorded by the four evangelists should be laid aside, still other supernatural events would present themselves for our consideration; and these we should be required to explain. The Acts of the Apostles present the same difficulties as are found in the Gospels: Paul speaks of miracles performed among the early Christians, as if they were of daily occurrence; see 1 Cor. 12: 9. ch. xiv. He says that he himself had performed miracles; 2 Cor. 12: 12. Rom. 15: 19.

The prophecies of Christ must also be added to his miraculous operations. Many of his prophetic sayings have indeed been thought to be interpolations of the sacred text, or to have been changed from the form in which he uttered them. Still, even De Wette admits the genuineness and authenticity of certain expressions, in which the gift of prophecy is implied beyond a doubt; see Matt. 21: 43, and 8: 11, 12. Thus at a time when not a single heathen had been converted, when his disciples were straitened in the last degree, Christ asserted, definitely and confidently, that the gospel would make especial progress in the heathen world, and would there gain for itself a sure foothold.

This historical and apologetic proof secures faith in the higher dignity of Christ, and also in the authority of the apostles, for it confirms their narratives. If, therefore, Christ is the Logos who became man, the inference follows that the doctrine which was taught by himself and the apostles must, in an absolute sense, be conformed to the principles of reason. If it do not appear so to us immediately, it will yet assume such an appearance, when the reason shall have made a gradual advancement. Therefore Her-

der says, "Our reason is educated by the divine revelation, and the well educated daughter will not strike her mother in the face." Paul himself speaks of Christianity as *σοφία* in the view of the world, 1 Cor. 1: 21; but he says, at the same time, that for the *εκκλησία* it is nothing but *σοφία*; 1 Cor. 2: 6. Col. 2: 3. The Christian, therefore, comes with this confidence to the doctrinal teachings of the Bible; and this is the sense in which we may sanction the scholastic phrase, *credimus, ut intelligamus*. In evidence of the fund of instruction which the human reason discovers in the Bible, we may refer to a remark which was made by Goethe, "There is no book in the world on which the mind of man has developed itself so richly and so variously, as on the Scriptures." If now the Christianized portions of our race are the most rational and the most accomplished of all men, should we not, therefore, form a favorable judgment of the Christian religion, which has exerted so favorable an influence upon the world?

We cannot here anticipate what belongs to the department of systematic theology, but we may adduce one example of a doctrine, which is thought to be more repugnant than any other to the sound judgment of man, but which may be shown in fact to be a postulate of the human reason. This is the doctrine of the Trinity. The Socinians and also the rationalists have thought this dogma to be sufficiently refuted by referring to the logical contradiction which it is supposed to contain, by showing that three cannot be one. To this objection it was replied, long ago, by Augustine, by the schoolmen, and afterward by Leibnitz, that a logical contradiction arises only when the judgments, which are expressed with regard to a subject, are opposed to each other in the same relation of that subject, and that there is no contradiction when the dissimilar judgments respect dissimilar relations of the same thing. Thus it involves no contradiction to say of man that he is mortal, and that he is immortal. Now the doctrine of the church in regard to the Trinity is, *Est unus secundum essentiam, est trius secundum subsistentiam, or, modum essendi*. So it is said of the human spirit, it is one and simple in its nature, but is triple in its modes of expression or of subsistence; in perceiving, willing, feeling. We are able, however, not only to refute the objection in this manner, but also to prove that a personal God can be conceived of only as triune. We must reason on the admitted principle, that without an "I," there can be no "Thou," (that is, without a consciousness of my own personality, there can be no conception of the personality of another.) It is

equally true, that without a "Thou," there can be no "I;" that is, I cannot arrive at the consciousness of my own personality, unless I have a knowledge of the personality of other beings. I and thou are correlative ideas. If, therefore, the Deity had been an abstract unity throughout an eternal duration, then he would not have been a personal existence, he would not have been an "I," he would have been destitute of all consciousness of himself as a distinct person. Thus also he would never have come to the act of creating the universe, (for this act presupposes the conscious personal existence of an intelligent Creator). The Deity must, therefore, have existed from eternity as an "I" and "Thou;" he must have been to himself an object as well as a subject; he must have looked upon himself in a "Thou," which is his image, Heb. 1: 3. Without having, in this manner, an object within himself, without being an object to himself, God could not have exercised love. The definition of love is, the finding of one's self in another. But if God be an abstract unity, then he cannot love, for there is no other person in whom he can find himself. He therefore must have an object in himself, in his own perfect image, which is called his Son. But our reasoning cannot stop here. The same principles lead us to the further conclusion, that if there were only the Father and the Son, the one and the other; if the Father only knew himself in the Son, and if the Son only knew himself in the Father, then the two persons would be distinct and separate. God must know himself, therefore, as the union of the Father and the Son, and this Union is the Spirit.

We have still to answer the question, how far it is possible for man in his present state, to attain an adequate knowledge of Christian truth. The entire history of theological doctrine, has shown the endeavor of the human mind to bring the teachings of Christianity within the comprehension of the reason; or in other words, to perceive that Christian truth is in entire and strict conformity with rational principles. Science is constantly approaching nearer and nearer to the attainment of this end; still it makes as yet nothing more than an approximation. The perfect fitness to understand religious doctrine, is an attainment which belongs to a higher sphere than the earthly. The Scriptures distinguish faith from sight, see 1 Cor. 13: 12. 2 Cor. 5: 7. The sight which we shall enjoy hereafter is different, in various particulars, from the knowledge which we enjoy here. First, our knowledge always has respect to single points of truth, and never to the total unity of it. Sight, on the contrary, embraces all the points of knowledge in

one united whole. Secondly, our knowledge is derived from imperfect data, is obtained from a disadvantageous point of view, because our inward experience is yet imperfect; that is, our feelings and volitions are not yet perfectly united with God. In consequence of this imperfect experience, our knowledge, which is founded on this experience, must be of course incomplete. On the other hand, sight is the state of a soul whose feelings and volitions are perfectly at one with God; of a soul to which God is all in all. From this point of view, therefore, the truth can be perceived fully and definitely.

‡ 26. *Remarks on the method to be pursued in the study of Systematic Theology.*

The question arises, In what order are the various systems of Dogmatic Theology to be studied? In answer to this question, it may be said, that we should begin with those systems which are positively Christian in their spirit. The necessity of directing our first attention to systems of this evangelical character, is evident from the fact that we cannot thoroughly understand those writers who oppose the orthodox doctrine, unless we previously have a thorough understanding of the orthodox doctrine itself. Besides, the distinctively Christian theology has in its favor the authority of eighteen centuries, and moreover it is yet acknowledged to be the prevailing system of the church.

In the study of evangelical theology, the inquirer is first obliged to prove the articles of his faith by the teachings of the Bible. It will be useful for him to collect for himself the *dicta probantia* for these various articles of belief, while he is pursuing his exegetical study. This is the more necessary, because we have no manual which exhibits a good arrangement of the proof-texts for scriptural doctrines. At the very commencement of the theological course, it is in the highest degree useful to begin the study of those lighter treatises, which serve as an introduction to the Dogmatic branch of the science. Such treatises are, Ullmann on the Sinlessness of Christ (*über die Sündlosigkeit Christi*); Sartorius's Lectures on the Person and Work of Christ (*Christologische Vorlesungen*); Tholuck on the Doctrine of Sin and the Redeemer (*die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner*), and Stirn's Apology for Christianity (*Apologie des Christenthums*).¹

¹ Of the above-named works, those of Ullmann, Sartorius and Tholuck have been translated into English.—Tr.

The next step is, to examine the systems of theology which are adopted by particular churches. What is commonly called among us the Church-Dogmatics, may be most successfully learned by the collateral reading of Melancthon's *Loci* and Calvin's *Institutes*. Intimately connected with this study, follows the scientific vindication of the Church-Dogmatics. Among the recent works which are designed to establish the doctrines of our church, Twesten's *Dogmatik* is especially to be recommended. The next object of examination is, the systems of theology that deviate from the standards of the Reformation. It is better in this department to follow the historical method, and examine each divergent system according to the order of time in which it was originated. The student should read, in reference to this subject, Röhr's *Letters on Rationalism* (*Briefen über den Rationalismus*); Wegscheider's *Institutes*, Ammon's *Progressive Advancement of the Christian Scheme* until it shall become the Religion for the whole world (*Fortbildung*, etc.). The system of rationalism is critically examined in the acute little treatise of Sartorius, entitled, *Religion without the Bounds of the Pure Reason* (*die Religion ausserhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*), 1822; also in Sartorius's *Contributions to the Defence of the True Faith* (*Beiträge zur Vertheidigung der Rechtgläubigkeit*), 1825; Steiber's *Critical Examination of Rationalism* (*Kritik des Rationalismus*), 1830; Hase's *Controversial Writings against Röhr*, in three Parts.—The most successful method of gaining a knowledge of Schleiermacher is, to begin the study of his system with the work of Gess, (which gives a synopsis of Schleiermacher's views). The examination of Schleiermacher's *Sermons* should be connected with the reading of Gess. These sermons impart much information in regard to the dogmatic system of their author. His *Orations or Discourses on Religion* (*Reden über die Religion*) should also be studied at the same time. The system of theological doctrine which is constructed according to the Hegelian method, may be learned from the writings of Marheinecke and Daub.

§ 27. *The Science of Morals.*

Ethical science is the system of Christian love, or rather of the inward and outward life of Christians. It therefore takes cognizance, first, of man in his moral relations without the influence of Christ; secondly, of man as he lives under this influence; and thirdly, of the mode in which the Christian morality is developed

in the life. In contemplating our race, as they live under the influence of Christ, we are bound to consider how far he is their Redeemer in a moral respect. He is their Redeemer, in the first place, because he has brought into the world an absolutely perfect law of morals; in the second place, because he has imparted to (some of) them such an impulse of love, that they fulfil his law with freedom of volition. Without a knowledge of Christ, they are left ignorant of a perfect moral standard. The Saviour has therefore redeemed the human reason in this regard. Christian morality insists on the command, Love God above every other object; and sets this up as the highest of all commands, as the principle of all, and derives all other duties from this one.

It is admitted, that the Christian requisitions are more rigid than those of all other moral systems; see Matthew 5: 20. If, therefore, Christ came into the world for the mere purpose of teaching a stricter system of ethics than had been previously taught, it follows that he cannot in truth merit the appellation of a Redeemer. If any one increases the pressure of the demands which are made upon me, without augmenting my power to fulfil them, he is not my benefactor. The moral redemption, accordingly, which Christ has effected for us does not consist in the fact of his perfecting our rule of duty, but rather in the fact of his so awakening the feelings of love within us that we fulfil the law with freedom of volition. Christ has exercised so great a degree of kindness toward us, that he excites the liveliest reciprocation of affection from us toward him; and consequently his commands are obeyed (not slavishly but) from the principle of grateful love. While therefore the requisitions of Christian morality are stricter than any other, still the exclamation of John is reiterated by all the true followers of Jesus, His commandments are not grievous, hard to be borne.

Every other system of Ethics leaves it doubtful, how far men can advance toward a oneness with God and his will. But the system of Christian Ethics reveals the prospect of an entire union with the Deity and with his moral government; see Rom. 8: 29, 30. 1 Cor. 15: 28.

Among the ethical treatises which are worthy of study, that of Reinhard is conspicuous. It is written in five volumes, is very rich in materials for thought, but is deficient in spirit and energy. Praise is also due to the work of Schwartz on Morals. It is in two volumes, and is particularly valuable for the force of thought which it exhibits. The ethical treatise of Daub is elaborated in

the strictly philosophical method. (That of Herdians is compressed, and breathes a Christian spirit.)

C. Historical Theology.

§ 27. *The true Idea and the various Departments of Church History.*

We may, at the outset, define Ecclesiastical History to be, in the popular acceptation of the term, the narrative of the changes through which the church of Christ has passed on earth. But every scientific narrative of a course of events, must have one leading idea, which imparts a unity to the whole. The idea of the kingdom of God, is the leading thought in the history of the church. This kingdom of God is an ideal communion of the redeemed in a state of perfection. In this state every man is so far pervaded with the spirit of love, that each makes the will of his neighbors his own will, and all subject themselves entirely to the good pleasure of God; so that knowledge attains, in this state, to the possession of absolute truth, the will becomes absolute holiness, and the feelings are made the abode of perfect blessedness. Now it is the province of Church-History to show the extent to which the Christian church, at different periods of her existence, has approximated to this state of ideal perfection. It is accordingly evident, that none but a theologian can write a narrative of the course of ecclesiastical events. As soon as ecclesiastical history is deprived of the guiding idea of the kingdom of God, the words of Herder become applicable to it, "The history of the church, written without constant allusion to the Spirit of Jehovah, is the huge body of Polyphemus, from which the eye is thrust out." The practical benefit which a clergyman may derive from the study of church history is, on the one hand, that of encouragement; on the other hand, that of warning. His mind is elevated to the consideration of Christ's victorious agency, examples of which have been given in all periods of the church, and have verified the predictions which are given in Matthew 16: 18. 28: 20. The preacher is also led to meditate on the continued warning which comes from the history of the church; for errors in doctrine and wickedness in practice have been nearly the same throughout the whole Christian dispensation. In his pulpit discourses, also, the preacher may make very frequent use of the admonitions conveyed by narratives of ecclesiastical events. Milner's *History of the Church* is well fitted for this practical applica-

tion of historical truth. So likewise are Neander's *Memorable Events in the History of the Christian Church*, (*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Kirchen-Geschichte*), and Godfrey Arnold's *Portraiture of the first Christians*, (*Abbildung der ersten Christen*). There are some branches of Church History which are treated as distinct departments. These are, first, the History of Christian Doctrines; secondly, the Archaeology of the Church; thirdly, the Geography and Statistics of the Church. There are likewise particular periods, which are treated as separate departments of study. These are, first, the age of the Apostles; secondly, the times of the earliest Christian writers; thirdly, the period of the Reformation; fourthly, the various periods of missionary activity. (The word *Patrology* is sometimes used to signify the record of the life and exertions of the Christian fathers; the account of their doctrines and writings is called *Patristics*. This last term is also used, in a more general sense, to include *Patrology*.)

‡ 28. *What is required in the treatment of the History of the Church.*

The reader may consult, on this question, Herder's *Letters on the Study of Theology*, letter 48, and also Ullmann's *Essay on the Position of the Ecclesiastical Historian at the present day*. This Essay is found in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 4th No. 1829.

The first remark to be made in answer to the question above proposed is, that in order to become a worthy historian of the church, a man must consult the original authorities. Unless he derive his information from these authorities, he will fail to give an ideal presence of the scenes which he describes, and will also misunderstand some particulars of the history. The second requisite for an historian who would be master of his art is, that he exhibit individual facts with individuality of style; that he describe times and persons in detail rather than in the general. The writer of a Church History should not merely say, that the age was corrupt, but should adduce examples of this corruption; he should specify certain instances of a whole class. He should not merely say, that the cause of learning was depressed at a particular period, but he should rather describe the institutions of learning, the instances in which they were perverted, the excrescences of literature which were seen at that period. In the department of *Profane History*, Gibbon has obtained a masterly power of this vivid delineation. John Müller has also a talent for

the same picturesque description. Among the ecclesiastical historians, Schröckh and Staudlin are destitute of this faculty, to an extent which we could not have anticipated. Neander also exhibits only a small degree of such vivid individual portraiture. It is almost entirely wanting in Gieseler's History, and yet his extracts from original authorities make some compensation for this defect. Guericke, in his Church History, describes the age of the Reformation in a vivid and individualizing style. Hase has developed a greater power of historical painting, than any other theological historian. Still he has published only a short compendium of history, and has therefore not been favored with much opportunity for displaying this power.

It is particularly important, that the ecclesiastical historian should describe, more extensively than has been common, the individual incidents of civil and domestic life. One important result of this familiar delineation would be the assurance, that there has been, in all ages, more of Christianity and more of piety in the world, than a general view of ecclesiastical history would lead us to believe. This is altogether natural; for both in the history of the world and in that of the church, there is a prominence given to those individuals only who occupy exalted stations; and according to the degree in which persons are elevated in society, is the difficulty of detecting their earnestness of religious feeling. Ambition easily crowds forward to the highest places in life, and true virtue remains unobtrusive and unnoticed. Accordingly it has been well said by Herder, "As the most beautiful acts of the individual Christian will be those of which the world have no knowledge, so the most interesting operations of Christianity will be those which are unnoticed in general history, those which are performed in the quiet circle of family friends."

A third requisite of the ecclesiastical historian is, that he have no party prejudices, but still that he have his party preferences. The historian who has no party preferences, feels no more interest in one religious persuasion than its opposite, no more sympathy with one theological school than with another. - Now it is true, as Ranmer says, that "he who begins with the principle of making all religions equally important, will soon end with the principle of making them all equally unimportant." But a history, written with this feeling of indifference toward the various religious parties in the world, will be colorless and lifeless. The truth must have a party in its favor, and we ought to feel an interest in this party. Still, the preference of one style of think-

ing above another, is different from an undistinguishing prejudice for one and against another. The historian who has a party prejudice, is one who has lost the power of seeing any good in the school which is opposed to him, and any evil in the school whose cause he has espoused. That false species of candor, which consists in an indifference to all theological peculiarities, has been carried so far by some ecclesiastical historians, that they have considered a history to have the right shape and character, when it afforded no sort of indication that it was written by a believer in the New Testament. Gieseler is remarkable for his display of this false liberality, consisting in a neutral position. Neander, on the other hand, manifests a noble and true freedom from blind partizanship. It must be confessed, however, that Neander is sometimes too desirous of exhibiting impartiality, and is therefore more favorable to the heretics whose character he describes, than the truth will warrant. Guericke manifests an unjustifiable prejudice, in his Church History, against the Calvinistic party.

A fourth requisite for an ecclesiastical historian is, that he accompany his narration of events with a reference to their causes and consequences, and that he make this reference on psychological and religious grounds; in other words, that he display a psychological and religious *pragmatism*. He is said to give a psychological explanation of the causes of events, when he describes the mode in which these events result from the character, and the individual peculiarities of the persons to whose agency they are ascribed. He is said to make a religious reference of events to their causes, when he refers the events to the directing providence of God, and to some definite moral and religious final cause. Neander is remarkable for his reference of all things to their religious grounds; to the overruling providence of Heaven. Planck, particularly in his History of the Reformation, excels in explaining the psychological antecedents of the narrated occurrences. Both Neander and Planck, however, are too one-sided. The former, in many instances, treats the human causes and conditions of things with too much disregard. The latter describes the Reformation, as if it were undertaken by Martin Luther according to a definite plan which he himself had formed, and as if it were not particularly connected with the providence of God.

‡ 29. *Various Departments of Ecclesiastical History.*

A. *History of Doctrines.*

When this is treated as a department of ecclesiastical history, it shows the degree in which the kingdom of God, at any definite period, has attained its end in respect of religious knowledge. In this manner, the department gives a discriminating view of the spirit which has characterized different periods of the church. In the *Histories of Doctrine* which have as yet appeared, there is an extraordinary want of philosophical analysis and explanation. Different religious views are described, one after another, without any due regard to their internal relations. There is, however, a masterly work in reference to a single doctrine, the work of Dörner on the *History of Christology* (*Geschichte der Christologie*). But there is not one of the regular treatises on the *History of Doctrines*, which can be recommended without qualification. The following are the principal treatises which have appeared: Müncher's *Handbuch der Christl. Dogmengesch.*; Müncher's *Lehrbuch der Christl. Dogmengesch.*;¹ Augusti's *Lehrbuch der Christl. Dogmengesch.*; Bertholdt's *Handbuch der Dogmengesch.* (edited by J. G. V. Englehardt); Baumgarten Crusius's *Lehrbuch der Christl. Dogmengesch.* There are also works on the same subject by Gaab, Lange, Wundemann, Münter, Hagenbach, and others.

B. *Archæology of the Church.*

This department of study is much and very wrongfully neglected. Its object is, to describe the mode in which the spirit and character of a people or of a religious community have impressed themselves upon outward objects. The Christian life of a community has stamped itself upon the forms of government, and the ceremonial observances adopted in the church. The systems of ecclesiastical discipline and worship are modified, according to the modifications which appear in the religious character of the people. The *Archæology of the church* records the various methods, in which the Christian feelings of men have thus expressed themselves in polity and in rites of worship. These methods may

¹ Translated into English by Dr. Murdock of New Haven. Perhaps there is no work more needed in the English language, than a well elaborated history of the various forms and phases, which Christian doctrine has assumed in different ages and countries.—T.

be made obvious by a comparison of the architectural styles selected for different systems of religious service. The temples of the heathen are bright and cheerful, and give free entrance to the light of day. The churches of Christians, on the contrary, exhibit a grave and serious character. The rites of burial afford another instance of the manner, in which the inward character is impressed upon outward forms. The system of heathenism represents this life as the day, the life to come as the night; but the Christian scheme represents this life as the night, and the life to come as the day. The heathen, accordingly, performed their funeral obsequies by night, mourning women went before the corpse, the ashes were collected into an urn, deposited in a solitary place, etc. On the other hand, the early Christians buried their dead at sunrise, the day of their death was called *dies natalis*, they were clothed in white apparel as they accompanied a deceased friend to his resting-place, they sung psalms on their way, and strewed flowers over his grave. The corporeal framework they consigned to its mother earth; and as the faithful had established with one another a communion in life, so they were assembled together by death into one place, and that was the spot which surrounded the house of God. The dead were accordingly always united with the living who came to the place for prayer. Hence the burial ground was called the churchyard, and also the Lord's ground. The word *κοιμητήριον*, which had signified a dormitory, came to denote a cemetery, where all was peace. Among the old pious Germans the burial ground was called the field of God, the peace-court. Almost everything was, in this manner, converted by the ancient Christians into a symbol of religious truth. The picture of the flame of celestial life, was painted upon their lamps. The image of Christ as the true vine, was engraved upon their vases of wine. And similar representations of religious sentiment were carved upon many other of their ordinary utensils.

The most extensive modern work on Ecclesiastical Archaeology is that of Augusti, entitled, *The Memorable Things of the ancient Christian Church* (*Denkwürdigkeiten der alten christlichen Kirche*), in twelve volumes. This work contains rich materials, but is superficially executed. Augusti's *Manual of Christian Antiquities* (*Handbuch der Alterthumskunde*), in two volumes, published in 1836, is a selection from his *Denkwürdigkeiten*, and is a highly serviceable compend. The work of Rheinwald (*die Kirchliche Archaeologie*), 1830, is also a useful one; so likewise is the *Archæology of Böhmer*, published in 1836, in two parts. Other

works on the subject are, Schöne's Historical Inquiries concerning the church-usages and regulations of the Christians, published in Berlin in 1819—22, in three volumes; Locherer's Manual of Christian Church-Archæology, published in Frankfort, in 1832.

†30. *The Literature of Ecclesiastical History; also the Method of pursuing the Study.*

The most comprehensive work in this department is the Church History of Schröckh, in thirty-five volumes, extending as far as to the time of the Reformation, and continued by Tzschirner in ten additional volumes. This work is still serviceable as a book of reference, but is destitute not only of a proper degree of system in the treatment of its diversified topics, but also of the appropriate measure of force in its conceptions, and of the proper fascinations in its style.

The second great work in this department, is that of Henke. It is in eight volumes, and an abridgement of it has been issued in three volumes. The author was a man of talent, but has exhibited in his works a spirit of hostility to the Christian religion. This hostility led him to give especial prominence to the faults of eminent Christians whom he was called to characterize.

The two greatest of the more recent works in this department, are those of Gieseler and of Neander. Both of these are at present unfinished. The work of Gieseler is the result of very thorough investigation, and its notes contain highly valuable extracts from ancient authorities corroborating the statements made in the text. It exhibits, however, a want of warm and inward sympathy with the subjects presented to view, and also a neglect to combine the recital of events with the leading idea of the kingdom of God. The Church History of Neander is attractive in the highest degree by the glow of feeling which it displays, by the sympathy with which it enters into all the facts relating to individuals and communities, and also by its constant reference of insulated events to the overruling agency of a divine Providence. It may be said in the words of Hase, that Neander's Church History is a family treasure. It has some faults however. It does not accurately point out the progress of improvement in the various stages of society. It does not develop principles in a concrete form, nor describe events in a vivid and compressed style. The work would be es-

pecially improved, if it contained more extracts from original authorities, confirming the statements of the text¹

Among the compends of Church History which deserve attention, those of Hase and of Guericke are conspicuous. That of Hase is brief; it may indeed be pronounced enigmatical in consequence of its brevity. The author evinces piquancy, and in occasional instances, originality in his modes of conception. In his style of presenting a subject, he is distinguished for solidity of argument and activity of imagination. His work is of especial service, in aiding the student who has already completed his circle of historical investigations, to take a rapid and cursory survey, a final review of the entire department. The Historical Compend of Guericke is more comprehensive than that of Hase. It is so arranged as to impart a distinct general idea of the history of the church. It is rich and minute in its references to authors, and is pervaded by a truly religious spirit. It is one-sided, however, in consequence of the writer's narrow partialities for the old Lutheran church; in consequence of the style of criticism which is occasioned by his attachment to pure Lutheranism. His compendium appears to be more useful than any other, as a manual to be employed in connection with the lectures which are heard or read on ecclesiastical history, in the course of theological education.

In respect of the method in which the study of church history should be pursued, it may be said that the first step should be, to take a general survey of the whole department. This may be done by a cursory perusal of appropriate lectures upon the subject, or by the study of Guericke's Compend. The second step is, to pursue the study of particular periods of the church. The appropriate lectures in reference to certain periods should be read first; and immediately afterward, the account which has been given from these periods in some one manual of history, or in several different manuals or treatises. The student is saved by this process from adopting any one-sided view of a subject; his interest in the theme is very much heightened by the diversified forms in which it is presented to his mind. This diversity of representation is also of essential service, in impressing the memory with

¹ The Church History of Gieseler has been translated into English by Rev. Francis Cunningham of Dorchester, Mass. A translation of the first volume of Neander's Church History has been published in England by Henry J. Rose, B. D., but a much better translation of the new edition of the History is expected from Prof. Torrey of Burlington, Vt. It will probably be published, soon after the forth-coming edition of the original German shall have been received in this country.—Ta.

the facts which are studied. The third step is, to read a monograph relating to the specific period in which the student is interested, or to read an original production of some author who flourished in that age of the church. The last step is, to examine the characteristics of the same period as they are delineated in the *History of Religious Doctrines*; and also, if the student have the requisite leisure, as they are described in *Profane History*. It is also important, in addition to the foregoing processes, to make use of the tables which give a bird's eye view of the synchronical events in ancient ecclesiastical history, and which are very serviceable to the memory; also to be familiar with Möller's *Atlas of Church History* (*Hierographie, oder topographisch—synchronistische Darstellungen der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche in Landkarten*), 1822, 1824.

The spirit of the Christian Church in the times immediately succeeding those of the apostles, may be best learned from the *Epistles of Clemens Romanus*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*. The life of the early Christians may be learned from the *Apologcticus of Tertullian*, and the *Octavius of Minutius Felix*. The work of Clemens Alexandrinus, entitled *Λόγος τῆς ὁ σωζόμενος κλήσεως*, and the work of Chrysostom, *περὶ ἱεροσύνης*, are highly attractive. The *Confessions of Augustine*, the product of the fifth century, will be worthy of perusal at all times. There is a small treatise of Anselm on the question, *Cur Deus Homo?*—which belongs to the literature of the middle ages, and can be recommended as developing the characteristics of the scholastic writers. The most exquisite beauties of the mystics who flourished in the middle ages, may be gleaned from *Tauler's Sermons*, from *Thomas à Kempis* (*De Imitatione Christi*), and also from the small volume entitled, *The German Theology* (*die deutsche Theologie*). Among the writings of the Reformers, great praise is due to the *Commentaries and the Institutions of Calvin*, works which no theologian can rationally neglect. Of Luther's exegetical productions, the most highly prized are his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, on the *Sermon on the Mount*, and on the *Penitential Psalms*. Of Melancthon's works, the most valuable are the *Loci Theologici*, and the *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*. The *Pia Desideria* of Spener may be recommended, as happily illustrating the characteristics of the seventeenth century.

The following monographs are worthy of especial attention: *Neander's Memorable Things in the History of Christianity*, his *Life of Chrysostom*, and also his *Antignosticus, or Description of*

Tertullian; Ullmann's *Life of Gregory Nazianzen*, published in 1825; and Möhler's *Life of Athanasius*, published in 1827. The most important monographs—in regard to the Middle Ages—are, Neander's *Life of St. Bernard*, published in 1833; Liebner's *Life of Hugo à St. Victore*, published in 1831; Ullmann's *Life of John Wessel*; Adolph Müller's *Life of Erasmus*, and Mayerhoff's *Life of Reuchlin*.—The best monographs for the study of the Reformation are, Marheinecke's *History of the Reformation*, in four volumes, and Ranke's *History of the same period*. The following Biographies cast additional light upon the whole subject of the Reformation: Melancthon's *Life of Luther*; Pfizer's *Life of Luther*, which work, however, is not sufficiently fundamental; Ukert's *Life of Luther*, which is, throughout, devoid of the requisite energy and life; Mathesius's *Sermons on the Life of Luther*, which give, in many respects, a better view of the great Reformer than can be found in any other volume; the *Life of Melancthon* by Camerarius, and a recent *Life of the same* by Galle; the *Life of Calvin* by Beza, and a more modern one by Henri, published in two volumes in 1837. The *Life of Farel* by Kirchofer, in two volumes; the *Life of Bullinger* by Solomon Hess. Ullmann's work on the Reformers who preceded the Reformation, is also valuable.—The best monographs relating to the 17th and 18th century are, Hossbach's *Life of John Valentine Andreae*, and also Hossbach's *Life of Spener*, in two volumes; Guericke's *Life of Francke*, and Varnhagen's *Sermons on the Life of Zinzendorf*. Besides the above-named monographs, there have been written some descriptions of ecclesiastical establishments and usages, existing at the present time. These narratives afford much instruction in the department of Church History, and stimulate the mind to the more extensive study of it. Such, for example, are Kernberg's *Account of the National Church of Scotland*, published in 1838, and Fliedner's *Narrative of a Journey to Holland*, published in 1831, in two volumes.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE VI.

ORIGINAL LETTER OF PRESIDENT EDWARDS.

[THE subjoined epistle of President Edwards, is one of the latest communications which are preserved from his pen. It was written about six weeks before his conclusion to accept the presidency of "the college at Princeton," and about four months before his death. The meaning and force of the letter may be in some measure illustrated, perhaps, by a brief notice of the character of the gentleman to whom it was addressed. This man was Major Joseph Hawley. He was born at Northampton in 1724. He was grandson of the celebrated Solomon Stoddard, and his mother was sister of the mother of Pres. Edwards. He was graduated at Yale college in 1742. After leaving that institution he studied divinity, was for several years a preacher, but never an ordained pastor. He was for some time chaplain of the provincial army, and was present at the siege of Louisburg. He afterwards studied law with General Phineas Lyman of Suffield, then in Massachusetts, now in Connecticut. "Few Americans," says Dr. Dwight, "have a better claim to the remembrance of posterity, than this gentleman (General Lyman), and the history of few men who have been natives of our country can be more interesting." An affecting sketch of his life is given in Dwight's Travels, Vol. I. p. 307--316. His law-library, though small, contained some valuable ancient works, which came afterwards into the possession of Major Hawley. It was not far from the year 1749, that Major Hawley commenced the practice of the legal profession at Northampton. He soon acquired high distinction, as a counsellor and an advocate. Himself and Col. John Worthington of Springfield were, for many years, at the head of the old Hampshire bar, which included some of the worthiest citizens of Massachusetts. These two barristers exerted a perceptible influence in elevating the character of the legal profession, enlarging the circle of its studies, and reducing its practical details to a judicious system. Among the distinguished pupils whom Major Hawley instructed in the science of law was Caleb Strong, afterwards governor of Massachusetts. In the year 1767 or 1768, Hawley had the misfortune to be publicly censured by the Judges of the Superior Court, and was suspended from practice at their bar. His offence, however,