

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XV.

AUGUST, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

ZUMPT'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

A Grammar of the Latin Language, by C. G. Zumpt, Ph. D., Professor in the University, and Member of the Royal Academy of Berlin. From the ninth edition of the original, adapted to the use of English students by Leonhard Schmitz, Ph. D., late of the University of Bonn. London, 1845.

By Charles Siedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aurich, in the Kingdom of Hanover.

In order to examine this valuable work from a proper point of view, and to form an estimate of it not merely as a grammar, but also as an indication of the rate of progress made in classical learning, it will be necessary to direct our attention first to other works of a different character, though of a similar design, which preceded it. At a time when nothing was required of the Latin scholar but an ability to write and speak the language as it had been in common use for centuries in the literary world, a lifeless and uniform method, as represented in the Grammar of J. Lange, of which not less than forty-two editions appeared, would meet the demand in elementary instruction. The circle of knowledge was then exceedingly narrow; and besides, the Germans, at that time, possessed no independent national literature. Consequently, reading was rather oft repeated than widely extended; and thus a great intimacy was contracted with the Roman classics, which compensated, in great measure, for the deficiency in

ciety which existed in the diocese of Rochelle for the express purpose of making proselytes to the papal church, and which gloried in its great success at the period when the letters were written, Prof. Voigt 'became perfectly convinced that the bishop, in his letters to himself and Hurter, had merely in view the work of proselyting, and that his panegyric compliments were merely allurements to the only saving church.'

These letters of the zealous bishop may afford us some idea of the means employed by the Romish church for making proselytes in this country and England as well as in France and Germany, and may well increase the conviction that secret arts have been very extensively used to excite and increase the widespread movement in the papal direction. Rome is as wise in the selection of her objects as in the use of her enchantments. Occasionally she may mistake, as in the case of Voigt and of Hurter. But men of feebler intellect and greater vanity, or more superstitious propensities, fall a more easy prey.

ARTICLE VII.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

By Rev. Henry B. Smith, West Amesbury, Mass.

Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte von Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Prof. der Theol. in Basel. Erster Theil. Bis auf Johannes Damascenus. Zweiten Theiles erste Hälfte. Von Johannes Damascenus bis auf die Reformation. Zweiten Theiles zweite Hälfte. Von der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit. Leipzig: 1840-41.

Compendium of the History of Doctrines. By K. R. Hagenbach. Translated by Carl W. Buch. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. [Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Vol. III.] 1846.

Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, von Dr. F. Ch. Bauer, ordentl. Professor der evangelischen Theologie an der Universität Tübingen. Stuttgart, 1847.

No book is at present more needed in our theological literature than a good history of doctrines. Dr. Murdock's translation

of Münscher's compendium is the only work to which our students have had access, and that is too meagre to satisfy the wants of a zealous inquirer, and is too far behind the present state of historical research in Germany to be of any decisive authority. It is remarkable, that while the English as a people are averse to speculation, and much more at home in history and in facts, they have been far less earnest, of later years, in investigating the records of the past, than have their more speculative and imaginative German neighbors. Especially is this the case in respect to the doctrinal history of Christianity, which is almost unknown, even by name, to the English literature, but which has been prosecuted with the greatest ardor and research in Germany.¹

Such a work would be of the greatest advantage to our theological literature in several ways. It would tend to relieve the too abstract character of many of our theological speculations. It would serve to make more clear to our minds the exact position of a particular doctrine in the whole scheme of Christianity; and thus keep us from laying an inordinate stress upon a truth which is of inferior moment. It would be one of the most effectual means of dissipating a too fond reverence for the past; and also of increasing our love to those abiding truths which we should find running through the whole course of the history of Christ's church, and determining its fortunes. Neither Tractarianism nor Socinianism would be possible to a mind that thoroughly understood the course of Christian doctrine. It would serve to make us tolerant of incidental errors, and firm in our belief of essential truth. It would deliver us both from a morbid fear and a morbid love of new theories. We should not be so apt to imagine that Christianity must stand or fall by one particular, and it may be novel, theory on one particular subject. It will bring before our minds the different phases both of truth and error; and both the errors and the wisdom of the past may help to make us wise. Thus our theological systems might become less abstract and more profound; our catholicity of feeling be enlarged; our confidence in the ultimate triumph of truth made more firm. Such a history would also serve

¹ It is a grievous reproach to the theological literature of England, that the two most interesting chapters in doctrinal history which that country has produced are to be found in the pages of Gibbon. The influence of his infidelity would have been greatly diminished had any of the English divines been able to present the results of equal research in a style as attractive as that which marks his narration of the controversies about the Trinity and the Incarnation in the twenty-first and forty-seventh chapters of his *History*.

to increase our knowledge of any particular doctrine in its relations to others, and likewise to make our views respecting it more precise. We should see its various phases, and under what influences these were formed, and be enabled to distinguish the permanent truth from the transient form. Such a course of investigation, too, is absolutely essential to a thorough understanding of the true character and the exact meaning of the Confessions of Faith which are most generally received among us. Single phrases in these symbols are the ripened fruit of ages of prolonged discussion. Both orthodoxy and heresy will thus be illumined by new lights. We may, also, here obtain new help in our defence against error, and, if it be needful, oppose the preponderant authorities in favor of the truth to the scattered opinions which heresy loves to cite. "It is many times with fraudulent design," it has been said, "that men stick their corrupt doctrines with the cloves of other men's wit;" and the best way of opposing this design is not, as this same author would have it, to rely wholly upon our own resources, but rather to show, that if error has its hundreds, truth has still its tens of thousands. For the systematic study of theology, also, a zealous study of the course of Christian doctrines would be of inestimable benefit. It would transfuse a new life into our systems. One of the best accompaniments of a course of systematic divinity would be a history that should trace the progress of each doctrine from the earliest times until now. Nor would such a work answer an unimportant purpose in deepening our faith in the divine and permanent authority of the sacred Scriptures. For, one of the most significant results of such a history is the evidence it affords, that the human race in its whole progress has not gone beyond the metes and bounds which the Bible gives. It is the life of the Scriptures which has passed over into the life of the church, and formed the very substance of all its doctrines. In all discussion and controversy, the human race has not advanced beyond the sacred truths and facts laid down in this marvellous volume.

It is a striking fact, noticed by Kliefoth, a profound inquirer into the idea of a History of Doctrines, that Christianity is the only system of religion which has what can properly be called *doctrines*.

Here alone do we find regular systems of doctrine, and a succession of such systems. No other form of religion which the world has known has ever produced any exposition of its articles of belief, which could for a moment be compared, even as exhibitions of intellectual power, with the theological systems which Christianity

has been always bringing into being. Mohammedism has its Koran, but where are its theologians? The Greek and Roman mythologies had, properly speaking, no doctrines, nothing which might serve as the foundation for a system of theology. As soon as a Greek or Roman began to think, he began to be a philosopher, and not a theologian. Plato did not speculate upon the gods, nor upon the articles of the Grecian faith; but he speculated upon the principles of the human mind, and upon the laws of being and action. The old dispensation, under the Jews, as compared with the new dispensation, also serves to illustrate the same fact. Christian theologians have made, and justly so, the Jewish dispensation a part of their systems of theology; they have shown where it should stand in such a system; but this the Jews themselves never attempted. They had prophets, but not theologians. They had a revelation, but no theology, strictly so called. They had doctrines, but no system of doctrines. Some reasons for this difference between the two dispensations, might be assigned, but we now content ourselves with simply noting the fact.

What is true of Christianity in regard to preaching, is also true in regard to theologizing: it is the only system of religion which has produced preachers and theologians. As it is only here that we find sermons, so it is only here that we have systems of theology. But not only is it a distinctive characteristic of the Christian religion that it has its doctrines, which are matters of faith, and its system of doctrine which have grown out of the doctrines themselves; but it has likewise had a *succession* of such systems. Each age, each "dogmatic period," as it has been called, will be found to have had a system of doctrines, or discussions upon certain doctrines, peculiar to itself. In one point of view, we may say, that there has been a perpetual flux, an unceasing change. The system of theology which satisfied John of Damascus, would not satisfy the "angelical doctor." Luther was a lover of Augustine, but the central point of Luther's system was different from that of Augustine; Calvin was an Augustinian, and yet the *Civitas Dei* was quite inadequate to satisfy the wants of the immortal author of the *Institutes*, or the wants of his times. Jonathan Edwards would not disdain the name of Calvinist; but Calvin could not have written such a treatise as that on the Freedom of the Will, nor such an essay as that on the Nature of True Virtue. No council of bishops from the whole Christian church of the first five centuries, could have drawn up such a Confession of Faith as that of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, nor would it have

issued such decrees and anathemas as are those of the Council of Trent. The terminology of the ancient church is no less strange to our ears, than would be ours to them. We find it difficult to understand their systems of subordination ; they might be as little at home in our speculations upon free-agency. If they contended for an *iota* in respect to the doctrine of the Son, do not we for a dot in the deciphering of a manuscript ? If they, for abstractions in respect to the Godhead, do not we for abstractions in respect to decrees ? They defended Christianity against Judaizing ceremonies, and Hellenistic sophistry, and Gnostic reveries ; but a different attitude of defence must be assumed, when it is opposed by philosophical deists, and rationalizing critics, and Romish superstition, and pantheistic transcendentalists.

In the different periods of the history of the church, it will be found, either that a different circle of doctrines is discussed ; or, that the same doctrines are viewed under different relations and in new aspects, and exposed to the brunt of a fresh class of opponents, assailing it with a new series of questions. Thus Neander, in his History of the Church, has shown with admirable skill how the doctrinal questions which agitated the church of the first centuries were quite different from those discussed in the middle ages ; the former having most to do with *theological* subjects, in the strict etymological sense of the term, with the relation of the Son to the Father, and of the Holy Spirit to both ; while the latter were chiefly concerned with anthropological inquiries, and with the conflict about nature and grace. A new series of problems was introduced by the Reformation, described by one author (Kliefoth) as centering in the doctrine of Redemption (Soteriology), while Hagenbach, looking at the subject from a different point of view, describes as the age of "polemico-ecclesiastical Symbolism." The same writer designates the times in which we now stand, as "the age of criticism and of speculation, in which faith and knowledge, philosophy and Christianity, reason and revelation, are held up in contrast with each other, and their reconciliation attempted." "The very existence of Christianity is at stake ;" and all present discussions "are preparing the way for a new period, for which history has as yet no name." The tendency of all present discussions, it has been said, is towards the questions connected with the nature of the church, and, still further, towards the union of all the separate churches in one great body. Whether we accede to such very general statements, or not, whatever we may think as to the entire applicability of such broad descriptions,

yet no reader of church history can fail to feel that they are of value in distinguishing one epoch from another; and, though they may express only a part of the truth, yet that part is what is too often neglected in our ordinary estimation of history. One set of doctrines is more fully discussed in one age and another in another. Centuries may elapse before there is any perceptible advance upon the decisions and conclusions of a given epoch, in respect to certain questions; but, meanwhile, the church has not been idle; it has entered upon a new series of investigations on other points. By and bye, the acts upon the former subjects, long since supposed to be closed, are again opened; the same doctrines reappear, yet never, or hardly ever, are they discussed in the same way. The terminology is altered; new questions are raised. The principles and results of intervening discussions are applied to this revived circle of doctrines. How different the Trinitarian controversy in the English church, in the latter part of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, from the Trinitarian controversy in the age of Athanasius! We are discussing the same doctrines which were in contest between Augustine and Pelagius, and yet who would now be content with the weapons then used, or the answers then given?

But the history of the changes, and differences of theological opinions, is not the most important or satisfactory part of their history. Where we see only change, we long for rest. Councils affirming and councils denying the same truths, combatants equally eager on both sides of some great question, doctrines with shifting phases from age to age, constant struggle succeeded only by a renewal of struggle, controversy after controversy, controversy within controversy and controversy about controversy, all this may be seen and disparaged by the most unpractised eye. Such an endless multiplicity of conflicting details, were this all, might indeed make a reader of church history faint-hearted and disheartened. Any one might be led to seek for relief in indifference or in devotion to some other pursuit. And the current modes of representing these doctrinal discussions, have helped to make men averse to the study of the history of doctrines. They are presented in scattered notices and fragmentary hints. They are given in the form:—such a man thought so, and another man thought otherwise. The most extravagant notions of the best and worst of men, the vagaries of the orthodox and the paradoxes of the heterodox, have been most diligently served up. And so, many a

sound divine has been made willing to forget that the doctrines he is discussing have been ever before discussed, or to remember past controversy only so far as it gives him help in a present emergency. And the best of Christians have been glad to close the book of controversy, in order to come back to the book of authority; to shut their eyes upon the spectacle of human passion and infirmity, in order to open them to the clear light of the divine Word. The Fathers have been more quoted in detached passages, than examined in their whole spirit; and many have ridiculed who have not read them; the schoolmen seem to be flitting about in a thick darkness, where no ray of light has penetrated, and where no research will discover more than a penumbra; the Reformers have received more adulation than examination. When any of them are known to be for us, they are quoted and praised; when they are not for us, if quoted they are reviled; and when they are neither for us nor against us, they are neither quoted, nor praised, nor reviled. And when they are quoted, it is in isolated sentences, for polemic ends, and too often without regard to the different characteristics of different ages, to the differences in the usage of the leading terms, and in the general bearings of their theological systems. And thus the whole history of doctrines, (if indeed even the notion of such a history has been made clear to the mind,) is looked upon as a vast collection of unconnected discussion, as an endless repetition of pleas and rejoinders for just the same truths, in the same form, from one age to another. And so many might be led to agree to a remark which an excellent minister once made, that he did not want any other history of doctrines than what the Bible gave him.

It becomes a question of some importance, then, whether there be a wiser way of looking at the changes in theological opinion. Have these ceaseless discussions answered any valuable end? Have they made truth more clear, and error more manifest? Has there been any progress, any permanent result wrought out by these prolonged and reiterated investigations? Can we find any law of order in the midst of the discord; any principles of stability in the midst of the fluctuation; any growth which is superior to decay?

That man is hardly supposed to be a rational believer in God's providential government of his church, who doubts that in the church itself as a whole, as an institution established among men for the redemption of the race, there is such progress and order and growth. As against the world the church has made ad-

vances; struggle and conflict indeed there have been, but there has also been victory. Even when it has seemed inactive, this may not have been indolence so much as repose. Even when it has seemed to retrograde we are ready to assert that "a masterly retreat" often displayed the most consummate generalship. And upon the whole, looking at the church through all the periods of its outward history, while we find it militant, we also find it to be progressive. And its external history as compared with the history of any other institution, or with the history of any nation or empire, is the most wonderful, the most pure, the most triumphant, the most progressive history, which it has been given to man's experience to know, or man's pen to write.

If it is so with the external fortunes of the church of Christ, what might we rationally infer would be the fact with its internal growth? The true life of the church of Christ is indeed a hidden life, it is hid with Christ in God; but the expression of that life is in its articles of faith, and its systems of doctrine. The truest history of the church is to be found in the history of its doctrines. Its external form has been derived from these; its external changes have by them been determined. The corruption of the church has been through corruption in its doctrines; the reformation of the church has been produced by reformation in its doctrines—the energy and illumination of the Holy Spirit being, of course and necessarily, always presupposed. The external history of the church can be written—can its internal history also be written? The former is a history of its growth in the midst of changes; is then the latter only a history of aberrations, without advance, and of eccentricities, without an orbit? The former is a history which lies at the very foundation of all modern history, and which has strangely influenced, if not determined the destinies of the nations in which the church has had its seat; has the latter, then, produced any influence upon the world of mind, and modified the opinions and speculations of mankind? And has it done this constantly and progressively? We believe that this can be shown to be the fact; that the doctrines of the Christian church, have a real history, and that it is a history, which yields to no other in its interest, its importance and its probable influence. And, while the very name of such a history is almost unknown among ourselves, while the English theology has studied the records of theological opinion almost solely for polemical ends, the patient and far-sighted and speculative German mind has entered into these researches with the most thorough investi-

gation, and brought out results of the most surprising interest. Germany already has a literature upon this subject, which, though just beginning to bear its riper fruits, is one of the most admirable products of German scholarship; and is equally distinguished for the accuracy and diligence of the examination of details, for the comprehensiveness, not to say boldness, of its general principles and results, and for the thoroughness and philosophical character of its processes.

To exhibit the evidence for this position would require a larger space than our present limits will allow. It would be interesting to inquire what is meant by a History of Doctrines; how far the works we have, correspond with the true idea of such a history;¹ and how such a history stands related to the doctrines themselves, to the immutability of truth, and above all to the divine records of our faith. The latter is a point which perhaps most of all requires a detailed examination; for it is one which in the German works with which we are acquainted has received the least attention; and yet it is one which would have the greatest influence upon the shape which should be given to such a history. Some seem to assume that the Bible is only the beginning, as it were, the seed of a new development, just as the works of Locke, for example, are of a new order of things, in the history of philosophy. With others the Scriptures express only the state of the "Christian consciousness" at the time of their appearance, even as the body of the present German theological literature expresses the present state of that same "consciousness" in Germany. Few or none seem to look upon the Bible as the source and the law of the whole history of doctrines; as being both the beginning and the end of the whole course of doctrinal discussion and progress. Yet this is the place which we believe this book ought to take, and which, by history itself can be vindicated for it. But we leave all further consideration of this subject, and also any further account of the different German works upon this branch of theological science, in order to give a general statement of some of the leading points which should be embraced in such a history, and a more particular account of the works we have placed at the head of this Article.

It should be the object of a history of doctrines to give in the truest possible manner the order in which divine truth has been unfolded in the history of the church. It must trace down the

¹ Kliefoth's *Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte* (1839) is designed to answer this inquiry, and ably fulfils this purpose.

whole course of doctrinal discussion, give the leading characteristics of each epoch, as distinguished from all the others, and at last show just where the world now stands in the discussion of the problems which Christianity has presented to it. It should be a faithful mirror to the whole doctrinal history of the church. It must interpret each writer according to the sense of the age in which he lived, and not bring in subsequent views and modern notions to explain the meaning which an ancient writer gave to a phrase or dogma. It must show what are the points of difference in the reiterated controversies about the same doctrine. It must carefully distinguish the theological and systematic spirit of the different ages of the church, and not force a subsequent development upon an antecedent era. It must bring out into clear relief the influential personages of each age, and, in exhibiting their systems, distinguish between the peculiar notions of the individual and the general spirit of his times. It must show how controversies about one series of doctrines have modified the views held respecting other doctrines; how each doctrine has acquired a new aspect, according to its position in the mind or system of an author, or in its relation to the leading controversies of the age. It must show when a dogma was held strictly and when loosely; when disconnected from a system, and when embraced in a system. It must carefully guard against the error of supposing that when a doctrine was not carefully discussed by the inquisitive and discriminating intellect, it was not really cherished as a matter of faith. This is an error into which many have fallen. But we might as well suppose that men did not believe they had understanding, until they discussed the operations of this faculty, or did not trust to their senses until they invented a theory of sensation. Such a history must show the influence which councils, confessions and systems have had upon their respective eras, how preceding times led to such expositions of the faith, and subsequent times were affected by them. It must exhibit clearly the ruling ideas, the shaping notions in each system; and how each predominant idea has modified the component parts of the whole system. It will not neglect to notice the influence which national habits and modes of thought, which great civil and political changes, which the different philosophical schools, have had upon the formation of dogmas; nor, on the other hand, will it fail to notice how the Christian faith has itself acted upon and influenced these in its turn, if, indeed, the latter be not the point of view which should have the precedence.

Such a history must, finally, present before our eyes a picture of a real historical process, just as it has been going on, and the more faithful it is to all the leading facts of the case, the more philosophical and complete will it be as a history. By such an exhibition, the whole doctrinal progress of the Christian church being set before our eyes, we shall, in comparing its results with our own systems be able to see, wherein we are defective, one-sided and partial; wherein our systems need to be reformed, filled up or chastened; how they may be animated by a new life and gather better nurture; and, by comparing the results with the Scripture, we shall be able to see, what parts of its sacred truths have been least discussed, what problems yet remain to be solved, what is still to be done in order that our divine system of faith be wholly reproduced in the life of the church; in order that all its truths and doctrines stand out as distinctly and majestically in the history of the race, as they do in that Revelation which was given to control and determine this history.

To produce a work that would in any degree answer to such claims were no easy task. Before it could be brought into any reasonable compass there must have been a series of independent investigations upon all the leading eras, men, doctrines and general intellectual, moral and rational tendencies, which should in the work itself be presented in the form of concise and pregnant results. Such a preparatory labor has been going on in Germany for many years, and one of the best results of it is seen in Hagenbach's *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*.¹

This work is probably the best compendium which we have upon that subject. The author belongs to that school of German theologians, already large and constantly increasing in numbers and influence, which is giving a new direction to historical investigations in theology. To Neander undoubtedly belongs the high praise of being the "father" of this school. Though it sounds very like an anachronism to call him, as he has been called, the "father of church history," that title having been already conferred upon one who lived some fifteen hundred years before him, yet he has an unquestionable right to the honor of having given the most decided impulse to the profound and extensive researches of the modern German school of historical theology. The secret of the power and influence of that school lies in sev-

¹ Since this Article was written we have noticed an advertisement of a new edition of the first volume of Hagenbach's book. Mr. Buch's translation was made from the first edition, which is also the only edition we have seen.

eral causes. It is thoroughly critical; not a phrase nor a fact is suffered to escape its notice; not a document can be found which is not examined and re-examined. Step by step it is pursuing its toilsome course backward into the history of the past, illuminating its records and making its men to live and speak and act again, and giving to all its controversies and speculations an air almost of present reality. It is also a school which is more deeply imbued with the Christian spirit than was that Rationalism which preceded it. It is not content with holding a negative, much less a hostile position, to the great facts and doctrines of the Christian revelation. While it has not yet attained to the height of the former German and our present orthodoxy, while it is averse to the precision both of the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions; it is also still more opposed to the reduction of all articles of faith to their lowest possible terms, to the emasculation of Christianity into a mere republication of what some men are pleased to call natural religion, to the confounding of theology with morality, and of the person and offices of Christ with the mission and duties of a moral teacher. Schleiermacher, with all his serious defects, did yet recall the men of his times from such an empty faith, to a higher appreciation of the reality, and the experienced reality, of the leading points in Christianity, considered as a redemptive system; and with the views of this great and generous theologian all this school are deeply imbued. The consciousness of sin, and the conscious experience of redemption through Christ; these are the two poles of his theological system. And although he gives it too subjective a character, and measures doctrines too much by experience, yet it is a subjective character wholly different from that of the antecedent rationalism. In him it is the heart, the Christian heart, which speaks, rather than the cold and lifeless understanding. And so his system has life, and his followers find that life expressed in the history of the church, in its doctrines and controversies, its usages and changes. This school, again, is animated by a truly philosophical, as well as by a general Christian spirit. While it is one of its distinguishing characteristics that it keeps the provinces of theology and philosophy strictly separate—for this was one of the leading distinctions, always carried out, in the system of Schleiermacher; yet it has not disdained to learn something even from the wise men of this world, even from the speculations of the modern German philosophy. Its attitude in respect to the results of the philosophies of Germany is hostile; but while it is exposing the in-

sufficiency of these systems to solve the problems of the Christian faith and firmly opposing their pernicious and pantheistic results; it does this with far other weapons than those which are at the control of many, the severity of whose denunciations is equalled only by the extent of their ignorance, and who neither know nor care anything about that whereof they affirm; and who are only careful to make their affirmations of repugnance so indiscriminate that they really become unmeaning; who are as when one beateth the air, and is eager only to strike a heavy blow, not knowing nor caring whether he hits anything or everything.

But the German evangelical theologians are placed in a different position, and adopt a wiser course. Planted upon the fundamental truths of the Christian faith, as contained in the sacred Scriptures, and tracing the course of its doctrines down through the long series of its centuries, and finding in their own souls attestation and confirmation of the great leading features of the Christian redemption, they reject any philosophy which is at war with a faith whose origin is so divine, whose history is so wonderful, whose effects are so beneficent and unceasing. But even their philosophy has taught them better to understand the profundity of the Christian revelation, more thoroughly to investigate the cause of its history, more skilfully to trace out the connection of the different elements of the Christian faith and the sequence of its protracted controversies. It has forced upon them the necessity of so bringing out the fair and wondrous proportions of our divine religion, in contrast with the pretensions of a philosophy which claims to be universal and absolute, as to make it manifest that it is superior to the wisest and profoundest schemes which man has ever fashioned; and in doing this they have been obliged to study its doctrines and write its history in a more philosophical and comprehensive spirit. In doing this the modes of investigation, both analytical and synthetic, which these philosophers have applied to the human consciousness, have been also made serviceable to the defence and confirmation of their faith.

The same use which American theologians make of the philosophy of Scotland, do the German divines make of the systems which their own land has brought into being. The same tendency to universality, to minute analysis, and to bringing all phenomena under the influence of all-comprehending laws and processes, which is seen in the German philosophy, their theologians have carried with them from their schools of philosophy into their

treatment of theology. But the way in which their philosophy has had the most important bearing upon their researches in the history of Christianity still remains to be mentioned. One of the tests which a German considers of valid and necessary application to a system of philosophy is, that it shall be able to explain the phenomena of history, the course of thought, the rise and fall of religions and systems; that is, that all historical changes shall be seen to be the development of the principles and laws which are contained in their philosophical systems. This must be the claim and position of every system which aims at universality, which declares itself to be absolute. To history, then, they must go, and show that its unfalsified records will confirm the principles of their schemes. This the German systems, especially that of Hegel, have attempted; and this is the way in which their abstract schemes have led to one of the most remarkable features in the present literary condition of that country, that is, that it seems to be giving itself up to the study of history with as fervent a zeal as ever it engaged in the discussion of metaphysical problems. The effect of this in drawing down the pride of their philosophic speculations, in compelling them to test the reality of their pantheistic abstractions by the realities of history and of life, and thus of showing the insufficiency of any pantheistic system to explain phenomena which not even one who denies the existence of matter can deny to exist, has been most signal and auspicious. Especially has this been the case with the application of the system of Hegel to the doctrines and history of Christianity, and most especially in its attempted solution of the problems contained in the person and work of our Lord. This was the rock upon which it fell and was broken. This is the reason why both Hegelian and Evangelical are engaged so earnestly in the study of history. This is one of the reasons, in addition to others connected with the whole character of the Lutheran theology, which has led to those more careful and profound investigations in the history of Christian doctrine, which have already produced a literature unrivalled by any on the same subject in any other land. All this is, indeed, in one point of view, a reaction from, but, in another point of view, it is a necessary consequence of, their daring attempts after a universal and absolute system. And the more history, and especially the history of Christian doctrines, has been thus studied the more deep seems to be the conviction of the German mind, that the historical problems are greater than are the problems of mere speculation, and

that no system can be true which perverts or disallows the substantial verities of the Christian faith, as exhibited in the Bible, in the church, in its history, and in the history of its doctrines. And so in the end it may be found, that the German philosophy, like all other systems, shall only contribute to enhance the glories of the truth as it is in Jesus.

It might be interesting and profitable to give a somewhat extended account of what the German mind has been doing in respect to the history of doctrines; but this we must waive for the present. They have produced, in succession, a series of valuable works, covering the whole ground, of which those that stand at the head of this Article are among the more recent. Münscher, Ruperti, Lentz, Augusti, Klee, Engelhardt, Baumgarten-Crusius,¹ and Meier, have all published able and learned works. Those of Engelhardt and Baumgarten-Crusius contain the results of the most thorough study of the original sources. Kliefoth has published an Introduction to the History of Doctrines, which is truly admirable, though pervaded somewhat too exclusively by the spirit of Schleiermacher's system of theology. But after all these works, we still believe that those portions of Neander's Church History which relate to the history of doctrines, are the most attractive, impartial, and truly philosophical, of any which have hitherto been written. His acquaintance with the original sources is probably unrivalled. His general tone is both Christian and humane. If he is often too tolerant of error, this is a more venial fault than a harsh intolerance, and less likely to pervert his critical

¹ The work of Baumgarten-Crusius was first published in 1832. Its learning is immense. Under a different title (*Compendium* instead of *Lehrbuch*), the first volume was re-written, and published in 1840. The second volume, containing the special history, was published in 1846, under the editorship of Hase. The text of this volume was all written out, "only the notes are wanting," said the author, just before his decease, to the editor; an important deficiency, since more than half of the volume is made up of the notes, which contain the chief citations and references. "An extraordinary way," says Hase, "of writing history, possible only to a man who had not merely the most intimate acquaintance with the sources, but always kept everything he had ever read in clear order before his mind—to write, as readily as a romance, a history which rested throughout upon the original authorities, and often upon the definite expressions, of a single document; and then, after months and years, to add to it, with a sure hand, the documentary evidence and all the learned apparatus." This deficiency, however, has been ably and fully supplied by the learning and zeal of the accomplished editor, a man whose own works are the most wonderful specimens of compressed learning and graphic statement of which the German theological literature, in the departments of church history and doctrinal theology, can boast.

judgment. If he seems indefinite in his statement of the views of the champions, both of heterodoxy and of orthodoxy; this may be partly because they were themselves not explicit; and this is a milder error than though he forced upon them the precision of usage which the theological terms acquired only at a much later date. If he delights in finding the points of union between the opposing parties; this may help to counterbalance the opposite evil of seeing always strife and never concord. Besides these works covering a larger field, there is a multitude of special histories, monographs, upon the great historical personages of the church, giving full views of their lives, times, controversies, and doctrinal systems. And the investigations are now concentrating more and more upon extended histories of special doctrines, of which that of Dorner upon the Person of Christ, is the most illustrious example; those of Baur upon the Atonement and the Trinity (including the Incarnation), are most learned and most Hegelian; that of Meier upon the Trinity is able and more orthodox than Baur; and that of Ebrard upon the Lord's Supper, published the last year, from the known ability of the author, is undoubtedly worthy of the highest consideration, and of special interest to us, since his views of the sacrament are Calvinistic.

The work of Hagenbach, to which we now turn, will be comprised, in the English translation, in two octavo volumes of about 500 pages each. Only the first volume of the translation has appeared, and of that we shall have something more to say after describing the main features of the original. This is quite uniformly referred to, with high commendation, by the fellow-laborers of the author in the same field. It is distinguished for its brevity, its clear statement of the leading points, its great candor, and its ample references to the body of contemporaneous literature. Much matter which ought to be in such a work, is referred to as contained in the other works on the same subject, which are supposed by the author to be accessible to his readers. Thus, upon many important points, v. Cöln's edition of Münscher (continued by Neudecker) is cited, but the original passages themselves are not quoted. The same is the case with other works. Such citations would be unnecessary in Germany. The author, in his preface to the second part of the second volume, says, that he takes for granted that Winer's Comparative View of the Confessions, will be in the hands of the students, and that he did not think it worth while to transcribe the passages from the older divines, which are found in such accessible books as Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus* and

De Wette's *Dogmatik der lutherischen Kirche*. It is a serious defect of the English translation, that it does not give these notorious and important passages. The additional bulk would not have borne any comparison with the additional usefulness. The same might be said of the references to the leading works upon particular doctrines, and the views of the most eminent men. It cannot be taken for granted that these works are in the hands of English readers. Very many of these references in the German, should have been enlarged into quotations in the English. But still, even without them, the translation might be of the greatest value as an incitement to more thorough investigations.

Hagenbach divides the whole history of Christian doctrines into five leading periods, with various subdivisions. The first period, from the end of the apostolic times to the death of Origen (A. D. 80 to 254), he calls the age of *Apologetics*. The second, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A. D. 254 to 730), is the age of *Polemics*. The third, from John of Damascus to the Reformation (A. D. 730 to 1517), is the age of *Systems of Scholasticism*. The fourth, from the Reformation to the Abolition of the Formula Consensus in Switzerland, and the rise of the Wolfian philosophy in Germany (A. D. 1517 to about 1720), is the age of conflicting of Confessions of Faith, or *polemico-ecclesiastical Symbolism*. The last period reaches from this era to the present time, and is described as the age of criticism, of speculation, of the conflicts between faith and knowledge, philosophy and Christianity, reason and revelation, and of attempts to reconcile these antagonisms.

Every writer, except a Hegelian, must be allowed to have a certain liberty in respect to his main divisions, and great freedom in the choice of the epithets by which he may characterize them. A Hegelian stands or falls by his trichotomy; but other men have a larger liberty of numbers. And this has been used most freely by the authors of church history and of histories of doctrine. Certain points are fixed; not even a Roman Catholic can forget the Reformation, though he may think the Council of Trent yet greater. The Council of Nice is generally assumed as another fixed point. Then we may take either John of Damascus or Gregory the First, according to our preference for the ecclesiastical or the doctrinal. Whatever may be the number of leading divisions, too, there will always remain a large possibility of subdivision. We may make three great epochs, or twelve; but under the shadow of the three greater, some ten or dozen lesser

ones will be sure to find shelter. It will be often convenient as well as right to say, *about* such a period. The main thing, however, is to give the leading doctrinal tendencies of the successive periods with tolerable exactness. The chief fault of the above division, we think, consists in the fact, that the ages are named, not after their doctrinal character, but after the *form* in which doctrines were presented and discussed; now it is polemics, now systems; at first, apologetic vindication, and at last antagonisms and adjustments. And then, too, the early Christianity was no more distinguished for its apologies than has been the later; it was only almost exclusively apologetic. The age of polemics did not cease with John of Damascus. There have always been conflicts between philosophy and Christianity, and faith and reason. Besides, in a history of doctrines, the division should be taken from the substance and not from the form; it should, if possible, exhibit the doctrinal character of the successive epochs. Thus the early ages of the church were chiefly occupied with the discussion of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation; the next period, with inquiries about nature and grace; the middle ages, not only with the development of the hierarchical system, and with systematizing the results of previous discussions, but also with the first rudiments of a correct theory of the atonement, and of a scientific natural theology; the period of the Reformation, with the articles of justification by faith, and the extent of church authority. Or, again, it has been said, that the past period embraced the purely theological questions; the second, the anthropological inquiries; the third, the subjects connected with redemption. The first is the early history; the second embraces the Augustinian and subsequent period; the third began with the Reformation; and now, it is said, we are entering upon a new series of investigations, those connected with the church. This is the scheme proposed by some writers, particularly Kliefoth, and, even if it be only an imperfect description of the actual course of the development of Christian doctrine; yet, the principle which lies at the basis of this division is preferable to that adopted by Hagenbach, if, indeed, he can be said to have any definite principle.

But this defect may be considered as merely nominal, and it is in part remedied by the full view which the author has given in the general description of each period, of its chief doctrinal features and controversies.

The introduction is occupied with giving a definition of doctrinal history; with exhibiting its relations to the other departments.

of theological science ; with the mode of treatment, the arrangement and the sources ; and with a slight sketch of other works upon the same subject.¹

In the treatment of each period the whole subject-matter is divided into general and special. Under the first or *general* division the author gives the leading characteristics of the period taken as a whole ; while under the second or *special* division he recounts the discussions and views upon the doctrines taken separately. The general doctrinal character, the statement of the chief controversies, heresies and tendencies, and some notices of the prominent theologians and their works, fill up the first or general division, under each period. In the special history of the first period, the author gives the views entertained upon almost all the topics of theology in systematic order, and in a much more systematic order than the opinions themselves were actually held ; more regularly, in fact, than he does in the second period, when there was actually an advance in this very respect. Under the head of each doctrine, then, there is first presented a concise statement of the views which were entertained, and this forms the text, which is fortified in a series of notes by ample quotations and references. This is the mode adopted throughout the whole work, and for the purpose for which it was written, to exhibit the results, and to guide in the study of the history of doctrines, it is probably better than would have been a more consecutive narrative, such as we have in Münscher's earliest work, and in Neander's church history. As a book for reading it is indeed less attractive, but as a book of reference its utility is enhanced. The work of Baur is also written in a consecutive narration ; but it everywhere takes for granted that the reader is familiar with other books which contain more ample and minute references.

The propriety of the division of the history of Doctrines into general and special has of late been much questioned. The first half of the works of Baumgarten-Crusius and of Augusti is entirely devoted to the general history, which is uninterrupted even to its close ; and then the second part contains the individual doctrines in their order. Baur and Klee and Kliefoth protest against this method, and assert that it destroys the unity of the history. Münscher (in his *Lehrbuch*) and Hagenbach attempt to unite the two, by first making a periodic division, and then subdividing each

¹ The work of Baur whose title stands at the head of this Article, gives the fullest account we have seen of what has been done in this department.

period into general and special. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages. By an uninterrupted general history we acquire a more complete view of the full course and progress of doctrinal investigation; but when we come to the special history, this is comparatively unintelligible without constantly referring back to the general portion, for we cannot well understand the species without the genus, and it also involves the necessity of frequent repetition. On the other hand, in attempting to make it all special history, there is equally involved the necessity of somewhere and somehow giving those general characteristics of the epoch, which have exerted their influence upon the unfolding of each separate dogma. Again, there seems to be a practical necessity of dividing the whole history into periods; but this is exposed to the disadvantage of constantly interrupting the history of each doctrine, even when it may be in the full flow of its onward course; for, unfortunately, though one doctrine at a given period may have reached a halting place, and obtained a victory, yet the others may be just in the middle of their career or conflict.¹ Yet still there are some few but only a very few periods in which a total change in the whole character of theological and philosophical discussion is to be plainly discovered, and it is these which the historian must make the basis of his periodic division; and upon this basis he may establish his first great subdivision into general and special. This is the course of Hagenbach, and, for practical utility undoubtedly the wisest. And this is essentially the method of Baur, although his treatment of the *general* portion is much more general and abstract than is that of Hagenbach.

It will be unnecessary to go through the work of our author, or to give even his general views of the successive periods. It has already taken its place as one of the most fair-minded and thorough works in this most important and attractive department of theological inquiry. It is independent, manly and Christian in its whole general spirit. An English reader will indeed look almost in vain for the controversies which have agitated his church; and an American reader will think that the author knows nothing at all about the true character and progress of the Reformed or Calvinistic portion of the Christian church under An-

¹ Thus Hagenbach is obliged by his periods to interrupt the Trinitarian and Christological discussions, when they are in full progress; and to separate Gnosticism, and Manicheism, by too wide a line. His statement in § 43 that the ideas of the Logos and the Son of God were first identified by Origen, is manifestly incorrect; they were already identified in the creeds of the second century. Conf. Kling, Studien u. Kritiken, 1841, p. 816.

glo-Saxon influences. But the history of the progress and influence, both doctrinal and practical, of this noblest product of the Reformation yet remains to be written. A Lutheran, a German, cannot write it. He does not understand it. He hardly sympathizes with its profound and searching elements. He does not live in the experience of those doctrines, at once most spiritual and most practical which are exerting a greater moral and religious force, and not in this country alone, than those contained in any other system which the world now knows.

The translation of Hagenbach's history seems to be the first attempt of a young German scholar, and it is issued under favorable auspices in Clark's Foreign Library. The plan of this library is excellent, and the works seem to have been, for the most part, wisely selected.

The translation generally reads quite smoothly, and a cursory inspection, without comparison with the original, might leave the impression that it was well done into English. But a work like this should be accurate. We are for the greatest liberty in the breaking up of involved German sentences, and believe that a free paraphrase is often essential to a good translation. The translator has often been very happy in his mode of doing this. But the value of such a book, giving as it does the opinions of so many men and parties in the most compressed form, is very much impaired on the score of authority, if the translator, with all his changes and paraphrases does not give the exact sense of the original.

We have already spoken of one defect of the translation, considered as intended for the English public, that it fails to put the reader into the position in which a German stands, who may be supposed to have free access to the works so frequently cited. This might have been in part remedied, not merely by introducing the cited passages, but also by a frequent reference to English works, where such exist, upon the same subject. The *patristic* literature of England is by no means of inferior value. On some points it is more abundant than even the German. The English love the church of the first three centuries next to their own establishment. And they have honored it by the most liberal use of its stores. We have been surprised to find that this first volume which embraces just that period is so very meagre in its references to the body even of the contemporaneous literature. Bull is now and then referred to; but Kitto's Cyclopaedia, and Lardner come in as the most frequent authorities.

We have compared about a hundred pages with the original and we will proceed to give some examples of the mistakes which we have observed.

P. 1. § 1. An important element in the definition of the History of Doctrines is omitted. Hagenbach says that it is the exhibition of the "gradual development of the Christian *faith* into definite doctrinal conceptions (dogmas)," etc. That is, that which at first exists in the form of *faith* is what is developed into another form, viz. the proper doctrinal form. All mention of "faith" is omitted by the translator.

P. 4. § 2. It is stated that the History of Doctrines forms the transition from Church History to ecclesiastical theology, and to theology properly so called. The Germans always make, and rightly, a distinction between these two forms of theology. But all mention of "ecclesiastical theology" is omitted in the translation. At the end of the second note of this section the translator tells us that the theology of the future is the "subject" of the researches of doctrinal history, while the original makes sense by simply asserting that it is its "goal."

What sense can be made out of the first part of the third note to § 6? "Since the age of the Reformation the symbols are in relation to Protestants, what they formerly were in relation to heretical sects—the barrier which the ancient church erected in opposition to all who held other than orthodox views. On the other hand, the Protestants were naturally led, in a similar manner, to set forth their own distinguishing principles." What means this "on the other hand?" and were the symbols barriers against the Protestants, or of the Protestants? The object of the note in the original is to state, that since the Reformation, Confessions of Faith have acquired a different character from that which they had in the Catholic church; that they were *not* only barriers against heresy, but subserved other purposes. Not only does this idea not appear in the translation, but a wholly different one is given. And in the last part of this note, the important fact is stated that after the Reformation the History of Doctrines becomes identified with "Symbolik;" but this part of the note is omitted, although it is expressly referred to, and in the translation, only a few pages after (p. 17).

We are told on p. 9 that the Gnostic and Ebionitic tendencies would not be considered in this history, "if they did not differ from the orthodox belief." If the fact that they differ from orthodoxy is a reason why they should be considered, then a great

many other things might be brought into a history of doctrines on the same grounds. The mistake arose from a misunderstanding of the peculiar sense of the German, "*ein Anderes.*" This involves an intimate relation, as well as difference.

The translator, in his preface, says that he has taken the liberty to omit some passages; but the reasons for his omission are not always obvious; and we suspect that the author could hardly feel indebted to him for leaving out the whole of the second note to the 11th section, which involves a justification of the mode in which he treats the general and special parts of his history. We are equally at a loss to know why, in giving the description of the fifth period, the translator should fail to translate the words: "*der angestrebten Vermittelung dieser Gegensätze,*" since they are an essential characteristic of this era.

When, on p. 17, the translator speaks of the "conflict between a lifeless form of dogmatic orthodoxy and an imperfect enlightenment," it is difficult to conjecture the meaning of the phrase, and hardly any would suspect that the latter words stood for: "*einer unbestimmten Aufklärung,*" or get from it anything approximating to the peculiar usage of the word "*Aufklärung.*"

Manifest misprints of the original are retained: e. g. p. 22, "Glossarium * * * *infirmæ* Latinitatis."

P. 25, line 7, we have "symbolical" for "systematic."

We read, on p. 33, note (2): "That Christianity should become more perfect, is impossible from the Christian point of view, if we look merely at the idea of religion as taught by the Son of God," etc. A correct translation would be: "A perfectibility of Christianity is, from the Christian point of view, inconceivable, if we understand this as meaning an enlarging or perfecting of the *idea* of Christianity," etc. The larger part of the 3d note on the same page is omitted, although the statement contained in it is expressly referred to afterwards.

The spiritual nature of Christ, we are told on p. 34, was "personified" in his disciples; and that some of them were "more talented" than others.

In the original, on p. 43, we have the contraction: "*des rel. Lebens,*" for "*des religiösen Lebens,*" but it is translated: "of real life;" as if the "rel." had stood for "*realen.*"

P. 39, "*der Kirche gegenüber,*" is rendered: "*in opposition to the Catholic church.*"

The term "Alogi," is said, p. 49, to be given to those who maintain that Christ was a mere man, "on rationalistic grounds, and

from *conscientious* opposition;" but it should read: "*conscious* opposition;" which makes quite a difference in the sense. And on p. 50, "Gemüth" is translated by "public mind."

The Gnostics did not regard the principal object of Christianity to be "the separation of Christianity from its former connection with the Old Testament" (p. 62); for, that it had such a connection, would have been a greater concession than they would have made; but they thought that the essential thing in Christianity was, that it abolished all such connection." The sense of the whole of the last sentence of § 29 is entirely perverted in the translation by making the argument from the Sibylline oracles coördinate with those from the spread of Christianity and the destruction of Jerusalem; while the original places them on entirely different grounds.

Near the bottom of p. 68, we are informed that "Origen spoke also of *spiritual* and *moral* miracles, of which the visible miracles were the symbols: (he admitted, however, their importance only inasmuch as they were real facts)." The consistency of the parenthesis with the previous statement, it would be difficult to divine; but the difficulty vanishes when we know that he considered the visible miracles as having this spiritual import, as well as having an importance as real facts—"*(neben ihrer factischen Bedeutung).*"

"The incarnation of the Godman is the principal dogmatic idea of this period," (p. 163). Original: "The manifestation of the Logos in the flesh is," etc. In the translation, by leaving out the "Logos," the peculiarity of the discussions is lost sight of: they revolved about the Logos; one may say, that this is implied in the above, but still it is not a translation, nor does it give the definite idea which marks the era.

In describing the views of Irenaeus upon the Lord's supper, the translation says (p. 200): "But the reason which he argues in favor of his views, viz. that the Gnostics cannot partake of the bread and wine with thanksgiving, because they despise matter, shows that he regarded the elements as more than merely accidental things, though they are only bread and wine." How far removed this is from conveying the true sense, will be apparent from a correct rendering of the words after "matter:" "shows that, even if he did *not* regard the elements as mere bread and wine, yet on the other hand he did not conceive of them as mere accidents;" that is, in the elements is something more than mere bread and wine; but still the bread and wine are not mere accidents, but essential parts of the commemoration. That any one

should make against Cyprian "the charge of insipidity," (p. 202), can hardly be proved by the sense of the German "Nüchternheit."

Sometimes, even where the words are very simple, we have the sense of the original wholly changed. When, e. g., on p. 290, to which we have just accidentally turned, we read: "Concerning the origin of sin, the generally received opinion was, that it is to be ascribed to the will of man," etc.; the passage states, that the generally received doctrine was, "that the *essence* of sin has its *seat* in the will of man" ? A most important statement of Müller, in respect to a misconception of Augustine's views, in the 4th note, is also omitted.

"The union of Christians with Christ," (p. 298) is given as the translation of "das Christliche Gemeingefühl;" and where the original asserts that some of the charges against the Pelagians might be attributed to a "*Consequenzwacherei*," the English tells us that Celestius was compelled to infer these consequences, which is not even hinted at in the German.

But we have probably already fatigued our readers sufficiently by these citations and comparisons. The usefulness of such a book, which is intended to be a work of authority, which is so exclusively devoted to the statement of facts and opinions, and upon the most important subjects of investigation and reflection, is greatly injured, and in some cases entirely annulled, by these mistranslations.

The author of the other work, whose title is placed at the head of this Article, is one of the ablest and most learned of the Hegelian interpreters of Christianity. He has written full histories of the doctrine of the Atonement, and of the Trinity and Incarnation. The latter is in three large volumes, and is the most complete work we have upon the subject. He has also written works upon the origin of the Episcopacy, upon the Christian Gnosis, or speculative Christianity in its historical development, upon the religious system of the Manichees, upon the Pastoral Epistles of Paul, and upon the Christian elements in Plato's system.¹ He also wrote

¹ Dr. Baur is regarded as the founder of a new school, in respect to the early history of the church. According to his view, the earliest Christian church was still deeply imbued with Jewish elements. This is seen in the Apocalypse and in the Epistle of James. Christianity is indeed, in some respects, a new power; but it is clad in the armor of Judaism. In the genuine doctrine of Paul, we find the first signs of a distinctly new order of things. This genuine doctrine is contained in the epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians; the epistle to the Hebrews belongs to the same class. The smaller epis-

two able works in the Roman Catholic controversy which attended the publication of Möhler's Symbolism.

With such preparation he has come to the work of composing a text-book upon the history of doctrines. The extent and accuracy of his learning are undoubted; his critical skill is admirable; his mastery over the details, and his power of combining together, great masses of facts, in luminous and succinct statements, are often surprising. Grant him his theory, and with that theory he will go into the very midst of the disordered hosts of conflicting opinions, and call them all around him, and dispose them in regular order, and show you a complete organic series and connection derived from what seemed so chaotic. He leads you down the whole course of Christian history, brings out each new phase of doctrine in orderly succession, tells you why such a doctrine received such a form at one time, and another shape in a subsequent period; gives the great epochs of the doctrinal history of the church as coincident with or produced by the greatest changes in the sphere of human thought; and finally shows how, according to his speculations, the whole sum and substance of the Christian faith, all that is essentially true and abiding therein, is contained in and resolvable into certain positions of the Hegelian philosophy. All of Baur's previous works upon Christian doctrine have this character; but in none of them does it stand out more prominently than in his text-book. He does indeed here, sometimes,

ties ascribed to Paul, those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, indicate a much higher position than do the other epistles, and are probably, he says, not genuine, but belong to a later date. Until the middle of the second century, the church was going through the struggle with two great parties, the *Petrine* and the *Pauline*. The whole Jewish-Christian church was Ebionistic. (Conf. Schweglers Montanismus.) This theory is resorted to, for the purpose of explaining the production of Christianity by a sort of natural process, out of the Jewish faith; and no more arbitrary criticism can be found, none more opposed to the true historical method of inquiry, than that which its author applies to the hitherto undoubted epistles of Paul. It proceeds from his reluctance to admit a full and distinctive revelation, given to man; and leads to a critical injustice like that which Hegel showed in his *Philosophy of Religion*, where he places the Jewish faith, even in its religious elements, beneath the Greek and Roman superstitions, simply because it came first in the order of time, and it would not consist with his notion of a progressive development, to suppose that that which was first in the order of time, contained as high an order of ideas, as that which came later. Such are some of the extravagant results to which the theory of *development*, when sundered from the recognition of a full and positive revelation, has led some of the more philosophical of the German theologians; and it suggests valuable and necessary cautions in respect to the employment of such a theory in theological matters.

seem almost to shrink back from the full avowal of the results to which his system leads him: he rather hints at than advocates some of the most destructive consequences of the pantheistic theory; he does not, for example, expressly deny the personality of God, nor the individual existence of man in a future state; but most manifestly all his speculative and theological (or, untheological) tendencies are most in harmony with such a denial. He leads you through the whole vast process of the Christian history, and conducts you to results which virtually overthrows every article of our faith, not merely in its form, but in its vital substance.

The plan of his work is simple and comprehensive. The whole process of the history of doctrines he brings under the relations which the mind, the spirit of man, has had to the substance of the Christian faith (dogma in its widest and ancient sense) in its different stages of progress. There are three such stages. The first is that in which the whole effort of the mind is to appropriate the doctrines, as mere articles of faith, as something objective; not so much to reflect upon them, as to express and receive them as matters of absolute faith. This period reaches to the end of the sixth century. The second period, that embracing the middle ages and scholasticism, is distinguished by the endeavor to bring the articles of faith into nearer proximity to, or reconciliation with, human consciousness; so that they should cease to be something merely objective. But the authority of the church then pressed so heavily upon men's minds, that this attempt failed. The absolute truth of the ecclesiastical dogmas was always presupposed. Before any true reconciliation between reason and faith, theology and philosophy, Christianity and human consciousness could be consummated, there must be a great revolution in the relative position of the two. And so in the third great period, that of the Reformation, we find the human mind at war with all church authority and tradition. The whole relations of theology and philosophy are changed. This principle, it is contended by Professor Baur, lay in the very nature of the Reformation, although it has been carried out to its full results only in the latest times. This process, now, is held to be not only real as a matter of fact, but absolutely necessary from the nature of mind. Man's spirit must go through this course. By this process, and only thereby, is truth eliminated. And the results to which it conducts us are the only abiding truths which a thinking man can receive or maintain. Philosophy is above theology; reason is above faith; all that is true in our systems of faith, is what philosophy on its own grounds

demonstrates to be the absolute truth. It demonstrates the truth; whatever cannot be thus demonstrated, whatever cannot be comprehended, whatever, in the phraseology of this school, cannot be a matter of self-consciousness, has no inherent validity, and is to be banished to the realms of fiction), or is of value only as a record of the course of human thought. The human soul has outgrown all that it cannot comprehend. In the whole history of the race, in every department, this same unalterable process has been going on, and in each it has led to the same results. All that is substantial in all history, all that is veritable in all doctrines, is the *philosophical* truth contained therein. The philosophy of the doctrine is the doctrine itself. The truths of revelation are nothing more than certain philosophical ideas.

A process more vast, and more desolating than this we are unable to conceive. This process, unfolded in the history of man, this theory asserts, is God himself; the Trinity—it is this process. The distinction between the infinite and the finite is abolished; God comes to consciousness only in the consciousness of man. The distinction between time and eternity, this world and another, is abrogated; the substance of eternity is contained in time. All that truly and forever exists in spirit, and spirit, not as individual, but as universal and impersonal. The whole order of our ideas is reversed. Reason domineers over faith; time over eternity; the human over the divine. The doctrine of the two natures of Christ is resolved into the union of the human and the divine in the history of the race. The atonement is a work of reconciliation performed only in and by the human spirit; justification is the conscious knowledge of each individual spirit of its union with the absolute spirit; immortality is not the continued existence of the individual after death, but is the continual existence of that which is spiritual; and while the Scriptures declare that the last enemy that shall be overcome is death, this philosophy by the mouth of Strauss asserts, that the belief in a future life is the last great enemy which speculative criticism has to contend against, and, if possible, to overcome.

To the exposition and propagation of this system in its essential parts the work of Baur is devoted. In compressed statements it brings forward all the main positions of the leading men and schools and parties and periods of the Christian church. Its array of learning, couched in pregnant statements and frequent references (almost uniformly without citations) is imposing. Its statements are lucid and comprehensive. Its philosophical part

alone is fully presented; the theological opinions are for the most part only briefly hinted at. In the course of 300 pages it gives its concise summary of the history of doctrines, and resolves them all into philosophy as their head and centre. Of course it is brief. The most important matters are often only hinted at. Yet it is an instructive book. Its perversions are not so much of the opinions of individuals as of the whole substance of Christianity. Its errors are chiefly in its philosophical constructions of doctrines. Such a system can afford to let the New Testament teach the main features of the orthodox scheme, for the New Testament has only the value of a record of the opinions of men, 1800 years ago; it can afford to let the current testimony of the universal church be on the side of orthodoxy, for the church is overmastered by philosophy. It can afford to be critical and thorough and comparatively impartial in giving all the facts of the case, for these facts are but the woof of the web which their system itself is weaving.

But it cannot afford to let a single article, not merely of the Christian faith, but even of the bold creed of natural religion, remain in its simplicity and integrity. It transforms and undermines each and all of them. Natural theology fares no better, but even worse, at its hands than does revealed religion. It sweeps through the whole sphere of faith, and with relentless hands destroys all that has ever been held dear and sacred. It knows nothing sacred except philosophy; it holds nothing as true but its own annihilating processes and desolating conclusions. It is the deadliest enemy which Christianity has ever encountered; and, only by Christianity, only by orthodox Christianity can it be overcome. The bulwarks of natural religion are insufficient against such a logical and learned and philosophical foe. A negative faith has nothing to oppose to its vast generalizations. A faith that rests only on abstractions is already in alliance with it. A faith whose only bulwark against deism and infidelity is in the doctrine respecting miracles cannot hold its ground against the criticism and philosophy of this new enemy. A faith which rests only on tradition cannot abide the searching tests which this school applies. Only a faith which rests in Christ as its centre, which is wrought by His spirit, and allies the soul to Him, which relies upon His sacrifice, and sees in Him the very incarnation of deity; only a theology which has its root and its life in Christ can withstand the encroachments of that fearful philosophy, which after annulling all faith in the past and all hope for any-

thing beyond the seen and temporal, leaves nothing for the race of man to accomplish, excepting the reorganization of human society in such a manner as will confer the largest and longest happiness upon those whose only destiny is to be denizens of this earth for threescore years and ten. The time is sweeping on when he who will not be a Christian must be a pantheist; when he who does not find God in Christ, will find him only in the human race; when he who does not love the human race for the sake of Christ will have no higher love than love to humanity.

Against this arch-enemy of Christianity the whole Evangelical German theology is now waging battle. On the field of history, in the sphere of criticism, in the domain of philosophy even, it is opposing it step by step. Every inch of ground is in dispute. It is not German theology as such which has led to these sad results; for it is against these results that the most vigorous efforts of this theology are now directed. Nor in them do we find the whole of German philosophy, nor even its necessary consequences; any more than we find the legitimate tendencies of Locke's system in the sensualist school of France. But we do here find the most learned and acute and philosophical system which ever did battle with the Christian faith. And in this conflict Christianity must either be annihilated or victorious beyond all former example. It is not a system of absurdities, it is not a mere matter of speculative inquiry, it is not a system which is so irrational that it should excite only our derision,—not such a thing is it that now engrosses the whole power of the German mind, and is feared by German Christians as nought else of human origin is feared; but it is a system the most comprehensive, the most intolerant, the most consistent, the most aggressive, which the human mind has ever reared. In no sport was it built up, and by no sneer will it be dissolved. The noblest minds and hearts of Germany are now contending against it—and this contest they wage not only for themselves, but for us also. And that it may issue in the final triumph of Christ and his church should be the constant prayer, as it is the firm faith, of every Christian heart.