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NEILUS, Episc. et Mart.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

It is not without some hesitation and inward debate, that I have come to the resolution of dignifying my present labour by connecting it, in this manner, with your honoured name.

Not that I have any fear of being called to account by yourself, for the assumption of such a liberty. Having been one of the first to sanction the undertaking, you will not repudiate the result of its fulfilment.

But there are many who delight to hold you in honour, and who, without misgiving, may be called Nathanaels in piety, simplicity, and zeal—possibly, also, in the want of a large intellectual sympathy with regard to the various modes in which the elements of Religion, material and formal, are capable of being apprehended—to whom
every truly German theologian is little better than a Nazarene. My fear is, lest some individuals of this class should interpret my sincere and unceasing homage into an attempt to identify you with the details of doctrine and sentiment contained or implied in the following pages. Certainly, if such an attempt were made, it could be fruitful of evil to none save its author. You could not suffer: the Church and the World know you too well.

Considerate readers, however, will, I trust, bear in mind that a Translator, by the mere act of translation, does not even profess his own adherence to the system of his author. If it were so, a man might easily come to be esteemed the luckless champion of half-a-dozen different and hostile creeds. Much less, then, is the imputation of such an adherence implied in a mere Dedication.

There are reasons, moreover, for connecting your name with that of Schleiermacher: especially in an age which groans over the want of Union in the Church, and yet, in too many instances, hugs that mental littleness which renders Union impossible; an age, therefore, which cannot afford that any real analogy or identity between the services attempted or accomplished by men of God in different countries and under different circumstances, should be overlooked or ignored. The invidiousness, not to say the impertinence, of a formal comparison between yourself and the great German, I would wholly avoid. I should be very unworthy, too, to write myself your Pupil, if I were ignorant or forgetful of the existence of
an important difference, in principle as well as in detail, between your system and his. Yet if (though under different circumstances and in spheres of different extent) to combat alike, for love of the same Kingly Prophet and Priest of Humanity, against that bondage of the letter, which leaves no room for a free, symmetrical development of the higher life in man, but condemns even the renewed mind to a state of hopeless pupilage,—against that inflated fanaticism, which dreams that it can dispense with learning, and looks for the fire-baptism of Pentecost and the success of the Apostolic preachers without their previous training under the Prince of all Instructors,—and last, not least, against that haughty, Gorgon-eyed, soul-freezing Rationalism, which tends to confound Eternal Reason with the lean results of Human Reasoning, Faith with logical Understanding, and Religion with Morality,—if the participation in this grand conflict of principle (πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνευμάτως ἐν τοῖς ἰσορροπίασ) may form a bond of union between Christian Teachers of different countries and of different Church-Communities: then, doubtless, in that world in which all truth-loving spirits come to understand one another, there will be no lack of sympathy between yourself and him.

"Yet a little while" is this mutual understanding delayed! The day of conflict and toil—in its burden and heat, at least—is almost ended. A brief interval of venerable repose—(may it yet be long enough for the accomplishment of some parting service to the Church, in which ages unborn shall rejoice!)—of repose consecrated
by the respect, the sympathy, the prayers, of all who know how to appreciate the refinement of the gentleman, the learning of the scholar, the fidelity of the friend, the simplicity and integrity of the man of God—and then—"the night cometh"! A night, not shadowy, phantasmal, drear, like that through which the noblest Preceptor of Heathendom had to grope his uncertain way; but clear, calm, cloudless, illumined by the presence of the Perfected through Suffering, and fading into the pale dawn of Light Eternal!

In grateful acknowledgment of a relation which, although formally at an end, will, I trust, continue in some sense to have a virtual existence until, in one or both of us, the "mortal shall have put on immortality," I beg permission to lay this humble offering, though of foreign growth, upon the altar of your jubilee rejoicing; and once again to subscribe myself,

Reverend and Dear Sir,

With the greatest respect,

Your obliged and affectionate Pupil,

William Farrer.

London, April 1850.
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The purpose of this work is not, directly, to add another English verdict to those which have already been uttered among us respecting the character and merits (or demerits, as some would be ready to suggest) of Schleiermacher; but rather to furnish a small contribution, at least, towards the means by which the English Theologian may be enabled to form an independent judgment with regard to the matter. Truly it is but a small contribution which we here present; yet few, we think, will venture to deny that our selection is about the best that could be made by way of a beginning.* If we had wished to exhibit the rhetorical and poetic element of Schleiermacher's genius, or to illustrate the genetic development of his system, we should certainly have commenced with his "Discourses on Religion." In so doing, however, we should have fallen into the old

* It must not be forgotten, however, that a specimen of Schleiermacher's criticism appeared in England as early as the year 1825, in a translation of his "Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke,"—attributed to that eminently learned prelate, the present Bishop of St. David's, (then the Rev. Connop Thirlwall.)
blunder of showing but a brick or two as a specimen of
the entire edifice; or at all events, of inviting men to
judge of the size and splendour of the temple from a
sight of its mere approaches. Most readers, of the
class for whom this book is intended, will, we think,
prefer a bird's-eye view of the plan and frame-work of the
whole structure. And this is what we have sought to
furnish here.

In so far as an introduction was necessary, it has
been thought that this want would be best supplied in a
translation of the "Reminiscences of Schleiermacher,"
which were published in the "Studien und Kritiken,"
very soon after his death, by his friend and disciple, Dr.
Lücke. To the warm feeling and lively interest em-
bodyed in them by reason of the circumstances under
which they were composed, they unite a sober judgment
respecting the theological position, merits, and influence
of Schleiermacher,—a judgment which the Translator
cannot help regarding as correct in the main, though
his own stand-point as an English Congregationalist
would prevent him from accepting all the views of the
German Presbyterian Professor. Most firmly does he
believe, most heartily does he rejoice in, the testimony
of Dr. Lücke, that Schleiermacher had no intention of
founding a school, in the ordinary sense of that term.
It is the misfortune of the world, and pre-eminently the
misfortune of the Church, that when God sends a great
man upon the earth, he is too often forthwith regarded
by the majority of those who have, in some sort, a re-
ceptivity for his communications, not as a force, to
stimulate all powers of life in man, both human and Divine, to fresh activity and incessant progress, but rather as a kind of incarnate law or final norm, to mark for them, everlastingly, (so far as this world is concerned), the limits of the true and the attainable. Yet it can hardly be said that this has been the case with regard to Schleiermacher, at least in his own country. The worthiest and most reverent of his disciples whom it has been the happiness of the writer to know, are men who, so to speak, have got beyond Schleiermacher; but men who, at the same time, are ever free to confess that, under the blessing of the Only Wise, it was Schleiermacher himself who helped them to do so. It may be quite true, as one of our reviews, (a Hercules for strength from its very cradle), has lately affirmed, in an article, the ability of which it would be simply absurd to question, and almost superfluous to praise,—that "to revive his (Schleiermacher's) creed at this time of day, in any considerable school of Germany, would be as easy as to restore the Continental system;" albeit the writer has evidently allowed himself to state the case quite strongly enough, as men are wont to do when writing in earnest. According to our thinking, however, there is one thing which would be less easy still; and that is, to annihilate the influence which Schleiermacher has exerted, and is yet exerting, upon the character, the contents, and the developement of theology in Germany, and the consequent necessity for a certain degree of acquaintance with his system, on the part of every theologian who desires both historically and spiri-
tually to understand the Christianity of the nineteenth century, in its various forms of manifestation.*

There are three principal objects to be kept in view in a translation of this kind: strict fidelity to the author's meaning, so far as it is ascertained; a general adherence to his terminology; and a resistance, as effectual as may be, to the barbarizing influence which the practice of translation is apt to exert upon the style of the translator. The first and the last of these particulars are of the very essence of a translation, properly so called. The importance of the second of them will be seen at once by a reference to the fact that a great, original thinker, in any department of human science, rarely fails to introduce old and familiar terms into the midst of new associations and uses, as well as to frame new words for the expression of his own conceptions or classifications. All the three points just named have been regarded in the present instance; with what success the reader will determine. The Translator feels constrained to own, that in regard to the last of them his success has not always been proportioned to his wishes. Naturally inclined to the construction of long, intricate, and cumbrous periods, he has had to deal with materials calculated rather to aggravate this tendency than to correct it. A glance at Dr. Lücke's article will suffice to show the truth of this assertion in so far as he is con-

* The "Tabular Sketch" which follows this Preface makes no pretension to absolute completeness; but it is believed to be correct as far as it goes, and may serve to elucidate some passages in the "Reminiscences" which might otherwise be obscure.
cerned; and the extremely terse, compressed, and elliptical style and structure adopted in the present work of Schleiermacher's, being contrary to the general and natural character of his style as exemplified in his other productions, contributes to augment the difficulty of a close and yet tolerably flowing translation into English, —a difficulty which, in German works of this class, is always sufficiently formidable. The Translator confidently believes, however, that those readers who are best qualified to judge, will be precisely the readiest to make all reasonable allowance for defects which could hardly be avoided; and if the simple commendation of a conscientious and not wholly unsuccessful effort to retain and convey the meaning of the original be accorded to him, he is content to leave all minor blemishes to that indulgent consideration which is seldom refused to a first appearance in the more settled and permanent world of literature.*

It was at one time the intention of the Translator to prefix to the work a brief account of the progress which has been made, in Germany, in the preliminary discipline called Theological Encyclopaedia, since the second edition of Schleiermacher's book appeared; especially by the Theologians of what is called, with sufficient propriety, the Middle School—who, without sacrificing any part of the real gain to Theology involved in the labours

---

* Some of the more important subintelligenda which have been supplied, are enclosed within brackets,—especially those about which there might be a difference of opinion; but it would have been impossible,—and if possible, useless,—to have adopted this course universally.
of Schleiermacher, have succeeded in giving to the *Scriptural norm* of Christian Faith and Life a position more in accordance, not only with its own just claims, but also with the real exigencies of the devout consciousness, than that which seems to have been assigned to it in his system. But upon further consideration, the Translator was led to think that this purpose might be more suitably carried out elsewhere; and conceiving that if the adage about *a great book* is worth anything at all, it must apply with tenfold emphasis in the case of a large *introduction* to a *small* one, he was withheld from extending the present Preface, by the salutary fear that, if he did so, the reader might possibly hold himself excused from looking into it at all.

For the very extensive use which has been made of capitals and italics in the larger part of this volume, the Translator is exclusively responsible. His object has been to assist the reader in what Jean Paul calls the *summary apprehension* of the successive paragraphs; a kind of aid which the increasing productivity of the press and the pen is likely to leave us small room for despising.

It only remains to be stated, that if the present work should meet with due encouragement, it may probably be followed by the appearance of translations from other writings of the same author.

*London, April 1850.*
TABULAR SKETCH

OF THE

CHIEF FACTS AND DATES IN THE LIFE OF

SCHLEIERMACHER.

1768. Nov. 21, Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher born at Breslau, in Silesia.

Went to the school of the United Brethren at Neisky, in Upper Lusatia; and subsequently to the Theological Seminary of the same community at Gnadau, in Saxony.

1787. Left the Moravian Communion. Studied at the University of Halle, under Nüsselt, Knapp, Eberhard, and Wolf.

Became Tutor in the family of Count Dohna-Schlobitten, of Finkenstein in Prussia.

Removed to Berlin, to the Seminary for Masters of Classical Schools (in the capacity of Assistant-Teacher).

1794. His ordination. Assistant-Minister at Landsberg on the Warthe, in Brandenburg.

1796-1802. Preacher at the Charité (the principal Hospital) in Berlin.

Assisted the elder Sack (afterwards Biskop Sack) in translating "Blair's Sermons." Issued a translation of Fawcett's "Sermons," (Berlin, 1798). Took part with the brothers Schlegel in the "Athenseum." Published his "Discourses on Religion," (Berlin, 1799); "Monologues," (Berlin, 1800); "Letters of a Preacher residing out of Berlin," (an occasional production—Berlin, 1800); and a first collection of "Sermons," (Berlin, 1801). He also agreed to join Friedrich Schlegel in translating Plato, but afterwards undertook the work alone.

1802. Court-Chaplain (Minister of the Court-Church) at Stolpe, in Pomerania.


1807. (Halle attached to the Kingdom of Westphalia). Returned to Berlin, and lectured there. "Critical Letter on the so-called First Epistle of Paul to Timothy," (Berlin, 1807). "Occasional Thoughts on Universities, in the German sense," (Berlin, 1808).

1809. Minister of Trinity Church, Berlin. His marriage.

1810. Professor in the New University of Berlin. Attached to the Ministry of the Interior for the Department of Public Instruction.

1811. Member of the Academy of Sciences. "Brief Outline of the Study of Theology."

1814. Secretary of the Philosophical Class in the Academy. Release from his connexion with the Ministry of the Interior.


1821–22. "Connected Exhibition of the Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church."

1828. Establishment of the "Studien und Kritiken"—a genuine product of his spirit, though not directed by him.

1834. Feb. 12. Died at Berlin. His remains are interred in the cemetery of his parish, at some little distance from the city on its southern side. A simple monument, with a bust in white marble, of exquisite workmanship (by Rauch), has been erected over his grave.
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OF
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Often, within the present lustrum, has it been our painful lot to behold some of the most distinguished men of our nation depart from amongst us; precisely those to whom, in different departments of the intellectual life, the present generation is indebted for its peculiar character and progress.

Barthold Niebuhr, the great explorer of history, opens this series of illustrious dead; at the commencement of a season of commotion, in which more general calamity might possibly occasion the particular loss of this great man to be felt less at the moment, though the sorrow to which the event gave rise could not be wholly suppressed. Goethe, Hegel, and others, have followed him. Now, Schleiermacher, too, is no longer among us. Thus are the great personalities, the stays, the luminaries of our age, one after another, taken away from us. This is a circumstance which happens in accordance with the everlasting order of nature. Still, it is not on that account any the less painful. He who loves the heights and the mountains, descends unwillingly into the level plain. And yet this alternation of mountain and plain, of heights and levels, is, in the
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spiritual world also, order and law. The history of humanity pursues its course between concentration and origination in distinguished individuals, and gradual diffusion and development in the mass. Thus has it been ordained, even from the beginning, by Divine wisdom and love. No one ought to complain of this arrangement; least of all he who has been taught by the Gospel to discern even in death the law of life, and in the evanescent kingdom of nature the everlasting kingdom of Divine grace.

Schleiermacher, at a recent Festival of the Dead,* while instructing and consoling a Christian assembly with regard to the loss of distinguished men, by a reference to the arrangements of the Divine kingdom, uttered these memorable words: "This, too, is God's arrangement,—that there exists among the children of men a great, yea, often a very great difference, as well in relation to the intellectual gifts with which God has furnished them, as to the position which he has assigned them, and to those external conditions of efficiency by which one man seems to be favoured more than another. This difference exists, and we dare not deny it; so that when we look at human affairs in a general point of view, we cannot say that one human life is of the same value as another. And this Divine arrangement—where could it have been more clearly manifested,—what could have been a stronger expression of it, than the difference which obtained between the Redeemer and all other

* The Festival of the Dead (Todtenfest, Gedächtniss-Feier der Verstorbenen) is an annual holiday of the Lutheran Church, from which it has passed over into, or been retained by, the United Evangelical Church of Prussia. It is a simple commemoration of the departed, with a view to the edification of the living; and seems to have been instituted, in accordance with that conservative principle by which the Lutheran system is so extensively characterized, in place of the Romanist festival of All Souls.—Ta.
children of men! That was the highest point to which this diversity amongst men was to rise: that in the midst of the sinful race of men the Word was to become flesh,—that the express image of God was to walk amongst them. In comparison with this difference, every other may well disappear; and yet he who was thus distinguished, was scarcely permitted to attain the bloom of manhood, but was then to be taken away hence again. And what did he send in his room? By what means was the work which he had begun, to be now further carried on? He sent the Spirit of Truth; he poured out upon his disciples this Spirit, who took of that which was his, and made it clear to them,—who distributed gifts, and, according to his good pleasure, left not himself without witness, in a greater or smaller degree, in one and another. And thus it is, too, in all human affairs. Oh! when we call up before our minds, as a whole and in detail, the chequered web of our social affairs, consisting as it does of manifold complications, truly, how much seems often to rest on one beloved head! How often is the experience repeated, that upon the determination of a single individual, upon the fact of its coming to maturity or the contrary, a large part of the immediately ensuing course of human affairs depends,—war and peace, order or destruction, prosperity or ruin! Thus does it happen with regard to the civic concerns of men. The case is the same, too, if we have regard to the cultivation of their mental powers; in which, also, it often happens that one man outshines all others by a great example, and levels paths which were before blocked up: but it is necessary that he should be protected in his activity for a certain time, if the newly-opened field is not to be buried again under rubbish, and nothing to remain but what existed before
him. Let us not forget, however, that on the one hand the Redeemer was the culminating point, the highest summit of this Divine arrangement; but that he was also, on the other hand, the being through whom the prophecy was to receive its accomplishment,—that every valley should be filled up, and every height be made plain. And the more the community of man is developed,—the more widely the points of friendly contact, which as a common bond of union embrace all, extend,—the greater the influences which diffuse themselves from every part over the whole—so much the smaller does the influence of individual men become. Most of all is this intended to be the case, most of all is it actually the case, in the Church of the Lord, with regard to all that belongs to the concerns of salvation. It is true that even here, we see how, immediately in the room of the Saviour, the Spirit, poured out by him, moulded as its especial instruments only his apostles and some few individuals besides; and subsequently, too, we see that even the Church of Christ, from time to time, fell into such outward entanglements or such inward obscurations, that it became necessary for the Spirit of God to impart to individuals an especial energy, to kindle up an especially clear light in one, or in a few souls, in order that thus there might proceed from certain particular points a new life, which should continue to diffuse itself, should pervade the darkness, and, in the name of the Lord, awaken those who were dead to a new and fresh life again. But this is what constitutes our true confidence in the kingdom of God and its continuance,—that there are continually fewer and fewer of these disturbances, and that for this reason the necessity that individuals should be prominent in the kingdom of the Lord, also becomes more rare. If the
Spirit of God is continually to advance in the accomplishment of his work in the human race, his influence must be exercised upon men more and more on every hand [all-sidedly], his presence and operation must be capable of being perceived in every human life; and in the same measure must the disparity diminish amongst those who have found salvation in the name of the Lord, and are now seeking to diffuse that salvation more widely throughout the world. Therefore, as often as we derive from the life and activity of any individual, the feeling that he is, in a greater or smaller degree, an especial instrument of God and of his Spirit, it is very possible that when the period of his activity comes to an end, a feeling of anxiety may arise in our hearts; but this anxiety is not the product of faith. Faith ought to know that the Lord, when he recalls one, also calls and appoints another; and he will never be at a loss for instruments to accomplish that which, in his Son and through him, is already accomplished eternally, and in the progress of time shall be ever more and more accomplished, through the increasingly equable co-operation of human energies, enlightened and directed by God."

Thus has the Christian sage, by his truly prophetic interpretation of the arrangements of the Divine kingdom, consoled us by anticipation, as it were, for our loss of him, and taken away from our remembrance and contemplation of him that sting, which, apart from the influence of Christian faith and hope, would have been all the more painful, in proportion to the greatness of the loss which we suffer through his death.

Schleiermacher belongs to that class of highly-gifted men who, in every direction in which their outward and inward calling leads them, diffuse light and life, create, arrange, and rule. His was one of the kingly, domin-
ant natures. He was active in the most various departments and directions; he was distinguished and pre-eminent in them all. He was a learned theologian and a preacher of the word of God, a philosopher and philologer; he is known to the mass of the public as a talented writer upon the most important affairs of the day; and as a man of business, too, he was, in his own circle, beloved and highly esteemed.

It is not my purpose to set forth the great gifts and merits of Schleiermacher, completely and in every aspect. This is the business of an exact biography, for the production of which there will be no lack either of ability of or inclination, among those who constituted the more familiar circle of his latter years. I confine myself to that department in which Schleiermacher was, from the very first, at home; that to which, as to inward and outward vocation, he especially belonged: the department of Theology and the Church. In this department, he marks an epoch as few else have done. Dr. Neander, just after he had received intelligence of the death of his beloved instructor and colleague, accompanied the announcement of it to his hearers with these words: "The man is departed, from whom will be dated, for the future, a new epoch in theology." There will not be wanting those who, from ignorance, or petty jealousy, or party spirit, will deny this affirmation. But I anticipate, without anxiety, that the more his efficient activity shall unfold itself in its entire extent and connexion, posterity, with adequate knowledge, and without envy or partiality, will confirm the verdict pronounced in the first moment of sorrow. It will, it must declare him to be the man with whom a new tendency, in Theology and in the Church, had its energetic commencement.
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In general, Schleiermacher marks the transition of German Protestant Theology from the more negative-critical dispersing and destroying, tendency to that reconstructive, positive reformation with which we are now occupied. This reformation includes two elements; a regression and a progress. By the regression involved, I mean the renewed reception of positive Christianity into the whole depth and capacity of the devout mind; the restoration of severe, connected Christian thinking, and the reanimation of the idea of ecclesiastical fellowship. These are the unalterable elements of every healthy Christian life. Our Protestant Theology and Church are built upon them. They can never become lost in the Church of the Lord. But they were, for a time, more or less obscured, scattered, and deprived of strength, among ourselves. The problem of the present is, to animate, to collect, to strengthen them anew. This, however, is not possible, apart from the living progress of that science, which, advancingly with the progress of time, separates all that is purely human, all that is accidental and essential, all that is imposed and arbitrary from the original Word of God, and, amidst the letter and the form, makes the living spirit free and active; but which, at the same time, just by means of the spirit thus made free, preserves and animates the original form, and while opening up the understanding of the Word of God in its height and depth, on the other hand closes the path of contradiction and doubt for ever. The mode of procedure of this science will be chiefly critical. All criticism is not advancing and reformatory. We have become acquainted with a criticism which, being destitute of Christian spirit or contents, thought to understand and judge the fulness of the Gospel by means of emptiness, faith by unbelief, truth by imaginations and sudden
fancies. In this process there was nothing salutary, but, on the contrary, retrogression and corruption. The most painful experiences have convinced us, that the true criticism proceeds only from the fulness and concentration of Christian life and thought; that only by divining, humbly and believingly, to the depths of the Divine Word, does Christian science acquire the strength and the right to understand the truth of the Gospel, and in accordance with this truth to judge and condemn all error, and everything that is unchristian in its character.

Schleiermacher's youth falls within the period in which the criticism that was first set in motion by Semler with regard to Christian history, and by Kant with regard to philosophy, commenced its salutary conflict with the earlier orthodoxy, which had now become soulless and insipid. It was the same period in which, after long repose, all the elements of civil, literary, and ecclesiastical life were vehemently shaken as by a thunder-storm, and the old forms, ordinances, and customs went to pieces in our father-land too. Schleiermacher, although educated in a community which, from its entire character, was most of all removed from these revolutionary agitations, and closed against them, could not withdraw himself from a participation in them; the less so, since he belonged by nature to those independent and impelling spirits who produce agitation even if they find none, and whose vital element is that of free inquiry, investigation, and dubitation. In the Dedication of his “Discourses on Religion” to the friend of his youth, Gustav Brinkmann of Stockholm, who was educated along with himself amongst the United Brethren, he reminds the latter of that season “in which the mode of thinking of both young men was developed in a mutual fellowship, and in which, having broken away by the force of personal
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courage from a like yoke, and frankly seeking the truth, unbribed by any regard to mere authority, they began to call forth within themselves that harmony with the universe which their inward feeling prophetically placed before them as their appropriate aim, and which life ought to express ever more and more perfectly in every direction." But amidst all the impulsive energy of his liberty-loving, critical genius, which even in the midst of that confined and quiet community drew him into the agitations of the time, and which afterwards, when he had returned to the great fellowship of the Protestant Church and the University, constrained him to a lively and thorough participation in all the excited movements of the age, especially in all its scientific investigations, inquiries, and doubtfuls,—he yet continued to be inwardly and inseparably bound to the equally mighty energy of that devout disposition with which God had endowed him, and to which the community already referred to had itself given the first powerful excitement, as well as its definite direction towards that which is the everlasting contents [q.d. sum and substance] of life, and which is found in the Saviour, and in fellowship with him. I have never been able to read without heartfelt emotion, what Schleiermacher says in his "Discourses on Religion," in grateful remembrance of the religious education which he had received amongst the United Brethren. "Piety," he says, "was the maternal womb in whose sacred obscurity my young life was nourished, and prepared for the world which was as yet closed to it; in this element my spirit breathed, before it had as yet found its particular department in science and in the experience of life; this was my aid, when I began to sift the faith of my ancestors, and to purify my thoughts and feelings from the rubbish of former
ages; this remained to me, when even the God and the
immortality of my childhood disappeared from before
the doubting eye;* it led me undesignedly into active
life; it showed me how I ought to hold myself sacred,
with my talents and defects, in my undivided existence,
and through it alone have I learned friendship and love."

Thus were Schleiermacher's nature and life impelled
and governed by two equally powerful forces. In the
case of an intellect so thoroughly healthy, there could
be no talk of sacrificing the one to the other; but only
of maintaining, protecting, and perfecting each, within
its rightful province. Schleiermacher apprehended very
early the great problem of uniting, without confusion,
without mutual injury or hindrance, free scientific inves-
tigation with that piety which is governed by the Word
of God and of Christ, in such a manner, that the contra-
diction and the hostility in which they had become in-
volved by the movements of the age should increasingly
disappear. The solution of this problem was, most
strictly, the work of his whole life. He sought it in the
difficult way of separation, pursuing both elements in
their particularity, as far as to their highest and deepest
points of unity. He separated theology and philosophy,
faith and speculation, Church and State, with all that
dialectical acuteness with which he was gifted; but,
while he assigned to each of the two contrasted objects
its peculiar sphere, in which, undisturbed by the other,
it was, of itself, to unfold and to perfect itself, he held
fast, with equal clearness and cordiality, the great as-
sumption of the believing soul,—that as in the innermost

* Any one who, being without any personal experience in such matters,
might possibly misunderstand this passage, stands corrected by the obser-
vation relating to it, in the explanatory Notes [appended by Schleierma-
cher to the third edition of the work here referred to].
root of the spirit's life the two are one, so also must perfect unity and reconciliation spring as a necessary result from every healthy development of the diverse. But, seeing that he regarded this unity and reconciliation neither as consisting in a speculative formula of faith with which all thinking should commence, nor as an easy spoil of which any indolent or frivolous person may make himself master by means of half-efforts,—but rather as the infinite problem and the last result of a critical labour in common on the part of all, in every department of life,—it might easily happen that, because he was occupied chiefly in the labour of separating and sundering as his immediate work, the unobservant should think themselves obliged to reckon him amongst the disuniting, disturbing, and disrupting, rather than as belonging to the truly reconciling, constructive, and reforming spirits of the age. Any one, however, that considered his mode of thinking and his activity in their comprehensiveness and totality, must soon become aware that he was one of those great men in whose peculiar character is concentrated whatever is noblest and best in their age, and whose particular life-problem is at the same time the common, highest problem of the age; that is, in the present instance, the problem of reformation, by means of an equally energetic separation and reconciliation of certain things which form an antithesis with each other. His merit consists precisely in this,—that he not merely apprehended with perfect clearness the reformational necessities and the reformational elements of the age in the department of Christianity, but also, in a distinguished manner, by his peculiar theological thinking and working, satisfied the one and gave form to the other. In any other vocation than that of the theologian, Schleiermacher would still have become great and pre-
eminent. The age in which he made choice of his particular calling, was the same in which Spalding found it necessary to convince people as to the utility of the office of the preacher. The State held out to his view more brilliant paths than the Church; and any other science might easily have appeared to his mind of greater promise than theology, in which, at that time more than at any other, want of refinement, tedious controversy, and a destructive tendency, had the upper hand. But he made choice of the theological, ecclesiastical vocation, because his inmost nature impelled him to it. Theology and the Church were from an early period of life the innermost centre of his activity; his love towards them grew with his years; philosophical and philological studies were with him no mere collateral or amateur occupation, but still his special proficiency in these respects merely served to adorn and to complete his theological and ecclesiastical mastery.

Schleiermacher did not accomplish the reformation of the age, in Theology and in the Church, alone. No great man stands alone, without help and fellowship in his age. But Schleiermacher, with true originality, went on in advance; he, by way of eminence, stimulated and directed the process of theological and ecclesiastical re-edification, and first moulded for himself those who were the most distinguished helpers and companions of his work. He founded a school, inasmuch as, especially from his first appearance as a teacher of theology and preacher at Halle, he assembled around him and attached to him, by means of his discourses and writings, a multitude of enthusiastic hearers and admirers, who, roused and animated by him, have wrought and are yet working in his spirit. Probably there are few among those who have become serviceable or auxiliary to the new movement in
Theology and the Church, who do not owe their chief stimulus to the lectures or the writings of Schleiermacher. Indeed, mediately, all the more recent theologians have become his pupils, not excepting those who now follow another and even an opposite tendency. The stimulus put forth by him is at least consciously or unconsciously implied, in the case of all. If he has founded a school in this sense, he has not done so in any other. It was his manner, to work rather by stimulating than by prescribing, rather in the way of diffusion and emancipation, than in that of contraction, exclusion, and restraint. He never wished to found that kind of school which, with conscious purpose, makes its appearance as a party, secludes itself within a certain fixed method,* and excludes every modifying influence from without. For this,—notwithstanding all the strength and keenness of his subjectivity,—his regard for the Church and for science was too high, his intellect too free and too comprehensive. Even as, amidst all the certainty and fulness of that which he had found, he was and continued to the last to be himself a seeker (ζητητικος),—even as he counted free individuality amongst the noblest of life's blessings,—so, in his labours, his chief object was simply this, to form every one to be a seeker after truth in earnestness and love,—to make the individuality of each so free and vigorous, that he should be able, amidst every excitement from without, freely to possess the truth after his own fashion. Free, independent disciples were what he sought to attract; slavish repeaters and imitators inspired him with disgust. But there are not a few amongst his disciples who, although they were at first stirred up by his agency in favour of the new

* Mannerism would hardly have been too strong a rendering of the word here employed.—Tr.
movement, have subsequently, to a certain extent, fallen into contradiction and conflict with him. This circumstance has occasioned sorrow to many a friend of Schleiermacher; most of all in those cases in which it was observable with regard to his opponents, that they had either stolen their best weapons from him, or learnt from him how to use them. In his spirit, we can find fault with them only when, ungrateful for what they have received, they have set aside the fellowship of love with him. With regard to diversity of tendencies, and deviations from his opinions, no one was of a better courage than Schleiermacher himself.* He was not without sensibility as it respected affectionate recognition and attachment; misunderstanding and unkind separation had power to cause him pain; but he felt sincere rejoicing in the existence of a multiplicity of relations and tendencies, of oppositions and honourable conflicts. Apart from that which was furnished by the momentum of intellectual liberty in general, there was in himself an altogether special natural reason for this phenomenon,

* "It seems to me,"—he says in the Notes to his "Discourses on Religion," p. 345,—"especially in every time of a greater excitement of the religious life, such as has undeniably commenced among us now,—to be in the highest degree necessary for the personal comfort of all those who exercise a perceptible religious influence, whether it be officially, or without any external, and only by virtue of their inward calling, that they should elevate themselves to this more liberal mode of thinking," (see the beautiful passage concerning mastery and discipleship within the domain of religion, in the Discourses, p. 112), "in order that they may not be surprised, if many of those whose first stimulus has been received from them, nevertheless afterwards find it necessary to take up a considerably different mode of thinking and feeling ere they can arrive at full satisfaction. Let every one rejoice in that he has excited life, for by this he approves himself to be an instrument of the Divine Spirit; but let none suppose that it lies within his power to determine the form which this life shall assume."
and I am persuaded that Schleiermacher was acquainted with it. He had, in a peculiar manner, united in himself the various elements of theology, and bound them up into a noble whole. But that which in him, by nature and by industry, was intimately bound up together, was not so in all. Along with the great men who, by reason of their nature and character, stand in the centre of things, there exists always upon the circumference and within the circle the multitude of those who, although they are attracted and determined by the centre, ever pursue that one side and tendency only which is most in harmony with themselves, or of which they first became masters, and in doing so, lose all the rest, and, in the end, the centre by which the connexion is formed. Thus it happened with regard to Schleiermacher. Many whom he had, in the first instance, won back in favour of positive Christianity, or to whom he had opened up the profound source of the religious life in the immediate feeling, or to whom he had rendered clear and dear the vigorous connexion, and truth in the Spirit, of the Church's system of doctrine, found themselves so powerfully excited and impelled thereby, that in following out this tendency they overlooked and lost the other (the critical) side of the system,—which he, from the central position in which he had his life, held fast with an equal degree of attachment and energy; nay, in the end, estranged, they came to regard the latter as something hostile. It is a circumstance worthy of remark, and one which furnishes a testimony in favour of the Christian vitality of his mode of teaching, that amongst those who attached themselves especially to the critical side of his theology, and made a further advance in that direction, there was probably not one who did not at the same time hold fast and cherish the religious and positive ec-
clerical momentum which the system contains. But as Schleiermacher, from that living centre in which he had his position, readily perceived the one-sided tendencies of the age, and, when they threatened to obtain the preponderance, held it his duty to combat them, if not immediately, yet meditately, by bringing out with greater force the opposite side of the question,—it might easily come to pass that any one who saw him contending, with decision and zeal, in the direction referred to, might suppose, (especially when the observer was himself attacked by the wrathful Ajax) that he was involved in contradiction and hostility towards the truth which he had himself on other occasions defended. Thus have misunderstandings, silent and uttered enmities and separations, arisen in the midst of those who were in other respects akin to him. On this subject, he himself, in his own way, observes:—"If a one-sided tendency becomes too strongly prominent, it is my—I know not whether I ought to say manner or un-manner,* from a natural fear lest the ship in which we are all sailing should capsize, to go over to the other side with as much force as is possible with my small weight." Even these harmless words of moderating and preserving truth and love have been misunderstood, and cried down as an expression—coming to light at last—of his inward wavering and vacillation; by those who see in the diverse tendencies of the age nothing but corruption, and in the antagonist position against which they are furiously contending, nothing but untruth and apostasy from Christianity. Schleiermacher was far removed from the

* A literal rendering (for which I must intreat the reader's kind indulgence) of the play upon words contained in the original. Unart signifies properly "bad habit," or "naughty trick;" a meaning which our legitimate English word "unmannerly" will probably suggest in connection with the term employed above.—Tr.
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indulgence of this haughty manner. Great as was the weight he brought to the side on which he directly contended, still he never forgot the centre of the true reformative theology, of that which unites all the elements of Christian life and thought; but, often as he marched forth to conflict in different directions, he always retreated again to this as his proper standpoint, and never forsook the fountain of the living Gospel. He had but two foes against which, as such, he continually renewed the conflict, even to the last man; the servitude of the letter, which denies the liberty of the Gospel, and the frivolous superficiality which denies its everlasting truth.

Proceeding now to consider in detail the scientific, theological, and the practical, ecclesiastical activity of Schleiermacher,—and first of all to characterize the former as it presents itself in his writings,—we find its characteristic starting-point in his "Discourses on Religion, addressed to the cultivated class of its Despisers,"*—a work which has become famous alike through praise and through censure. It appeared for the first time in 1799, then in 1806, and again in 1821; the third time with illustrative and vindicatory annotations. The work, to a certain extent, quite belongs to the period in which it had its origin; it bears the stamp of the relationships and of the society in the midst of which it was first written. The period was precisely that in which it was still regarded, by a circle far from small, as a greater mark of intellect and refinement to oppose religion, especially positive Christianity,—or, at the best, to commend it to the authorities as a means of discipline to be applied to the vulgar,—than to defend it as the necessary foundation and stay of all true culture for humanity. The prevailing schools of theology, whether

* Reden über die Religion, an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern.
orthodox or heterodox, were little suited to dissipate the frivolous prejudices of the age against religion. Ecclesiastical orthodoxy maintained a firm hold upon notions and formulas which, by reason of the real progress of the age, had actually lost their power and vitality in the Church. Heterodoxy,* on the other hand,—in its philosophical, as in its historico-critical form,—was at that time preponderantly occupied in the work of pulling down; it wanted the living idea of religion, the divination, the enthusiasm, which would have enabled it to build up something new and something better; nay, it was to a certain extent occupied with the project of despoiling religion of its principality,—of banishing it from the centre of life, into the side and back-buildings of science, or of a self-existing morality. This suffices to determine, in general, the purpose, contents, and tone of the Discourses. Schleiermacher felt himself constrained to take the field with the two-fold warrior-might of a fresh, youthful enthusiasm in the cause of religion, and a keen, lively dialectic, to discover and to conquer anew, as it were, the domain of religion for the educated classes, to present religion to view in its true, original seat, freed from the misunderstandings and disfigurements perpetrated by foes and friends, and to inflame such as were in any way susceptible, with new love for the object thus presented. It seemed as if this would not have been possible to him, without the possession of an uncommonly brilliant eloquence. This quality, at least, has been admired even by his oppo-

* It may be proper to remind the reader, that Schleiermacher (and presumably also his friend and disciple) employs the terms orthodoxy and heterodoxy in a sense different from that invidious one which is commonly attached to them. With him they correspond in the main to the conservative, and the reformatory, element or tendency, respectively. See Brief Outline, §§ 208—206.—Ta.
nents, and probably contributed essentially to excite an interest in the subject, even in minds of the more inaccessible class. Friedrich Schlegel said at the time, "They are discourses, the first of their kind that we have in German; full of energy and fire, and yet very artistic, in a style which would not be unworthy of one of the ancients."—The society in which Schleiermacher then lived, was formed by the companionship of those enterprising and perhaps somewhat presumptuous spirits, who published and enforced their decided antagonism to the mental poverty and Philistinism* of the age, by a bold and fearless course of polemics in the "Athenæum." This explains to a certain extent that polemical form, that boldness and daringness of assertion, which made the Discourses as much a scandal to the so-called sober and prudent people, as they were a delight to minds of a more youthful order. But whether repelling or attracting, they were for all in the highest degree stimulating. Undeniably, the manner in which Schleiermacher apprehended and represented the nature of religion in these discourses, was a product of his own personal development up to that time, and a faithful image of his own individuality. Friedrich Schlegel called it, in this respect, "the most characteristic book we have—a book of an infinite subjectivity." A man who had attained to the consciousness of possessing religion within himself, in the profoundest

* Most readers, probably, are aware that the Philister (Philistines) are the "Town" of the German seats of learning, in opposition to the Professors and Burschen, or Students,—to whom we might apply the familiar epithet "Gown," if they were but provided with the graceful and scholar-like costume to which it refers. Philistinism (Philisterei) accordingly, is tantamount to a want of learning, of intellectual expansion and activity, of high enthusiasm; it is the Materialistic tendency in its broadest compass and manifestation.—Th.
depth of his soul, as the supremely sacred domestic hearth of his life,—anterior to all the speculation of science, and anterior to all action, as being itself the deeper source of both,—such a man could not think of it as a product or as an auxiliary supplement of knowledge and action. He assigned to it, as independent sovereign over the entire life, the feeling as its original, essential seat; feeling, however, regarded [not according to the popular use of the term, but] as constituting the central and kindling point, the inmost root of the soul. In order that he might be able to bring to recognition as such everything that exists amongst men under the character of religion, and, in the spirit of love, to take up into the idea of religion even its lowest gradations, he apprehended this idea, subjectively as broadly, and objectively as generally, as it was at all possible for him to do. But since he was himself conscious of possessing religion, in its definiteness and truth, only as a Christian and within the Christian church, it was necessary that he should endeavour to show that religion, universally, has an actual and vital existence only through the medium of positive religion and of fellowship. In the Discourses, the influence exerted by his studies of Plato, Spinoza, Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte, shows itself unmistakably. These authors, however, merely aided him, in the way of stimulus and of culture, to attain to a proper consciousness of his own distinctive peculiarity. Whoever reads the Discourses attentively and without prejudice, will easily perceive that in his mode of thinking with regard to religion, Schleiermacher is neither Jacobian nor Fichtean, neither Platonist nor Spinozist, but completely himself; and moreover himself with that soul of his deeply rooted in Christianity. It is precisely on account of these Dis-
courses most of all, that he has been charged with Pantheism; often without reflection, but sometimes deliberately and in earnest. Certainly, here and there, appearances, and even particular expressions, are against him. But it is only the man who leaves out of account the particular stand-point and design of the Discourses in the age in which they first appeared, and mistakenly regards certain of their extreme boundary-points as constituting their centre and substance,—the man who declares every more profound and intimate apprehension of the (in the religious soul indissoluble) relation between God and the universe to be Pantheism, and is better pleased with any cold, mechanical theory of the universe which dispenses with the living presence and operation of God therein, than with anything which has the effect of softening down and limiting rigid and one-sided notions,—it is only such a man that can regard Pantheism as expressing the true and permanent character of Schleiermacher's sentiments. At all events, after the explanations which Schleiermacher has given in reference to this matter in the third edition of the work, it is impossible for any one to repeat the accusation, without manifesting stubbornness and violating charity. The Discourses belong, by all means, to one of the earlier stages of development and of progress in the life of Schleiermacher; and it is by a reference to this fact that they must be explained. After the composition of his Dogmatics it would no longer have been possible for him to write them,—nor, indeed, would it have been necessary. They are apologies rather for religion in general than for Christianity in particular, delivered, as it were, in the fore-court of theology,—I might almost say in the fore-court of the Heathen; but
still they contain already, distinctly enough, the peculiar bases and essential tendencies of his entire theology; and this explains the fact that when, in the year 1821, Schleiermacher,—who regarded the work as no longer needed by the age, in consequence of the changes which had taken place since it was written,—was notwithstanding obliged to take it in hand for the purpose of preparing a new edition, and came to compare this youthful labour with his *maturer* Christian thinking, he found in it, certainly, much to explain, much to modify and to excuse, in the notes which he then added, but still, essentially, nothing to repent of and nothing to surrender.

Up to the year 1804, he was perhaps known in the proper character of a learned theologian, only within certain limited circles. But from the time of his appearing, in that year, as a public teacher of theology at Halle, he awakened by his lectures, first the attention, and then the most devoted enthusiasm of the susceptible class of young men. I recollect very well how, at that season, some of my elder fellow-students, returning from Halle, spoke with enthusiastic praises of the new light that had arisen for them in the person of Schleiermacher. It was a circumstance involved in the history of his development and his individuality, that, in addition to Systematic and Practical Theology, the Exegesis and Criticism of the New Testament received an especial share of his attention. His studies in this department were profound and comprehensive; but unquestionably they were directed rather towards the Greek and Christian, than towards the Hebrew and Old Testament side of the matter. He was no stranger to what is called scholarship in the stricter sense of the word; but, as
he once playfully observed in writing to me, it was of no use to look for *Notices* from him. He read carefully such works as were connected in any way with his own department; but upon the principle of selection rather than of collection. And as he had, after the likeness of Plato, a soul which turned towards the Idea, and which possessed at the same time an artistic tendency,—everywhere searching after the living Idea, the connexion of the whole,—but seeking for this Idea, when found, the most appropriate, the most living, the purest Form,—so, even from the beginning, his mode of delineation, in the department of learned theology, was prevalingly artistic, graceful, and free from the constraint and the distraction of mind attendant upon the employment of learned citations. His "Critical Letter concerning the so-called First Epistle of Paul to Timothy," (1807) is composed in the style just described. It was by this specimen of his theological scholarship that he first made himself known to the learned world of theology; including even that portion of it which had not bestowed any particular attention upon his "Discourses on Religion." The specimen, however, was the specimen of a master. From the time of Semler onwards, the historical criticism of the Canon had been carried on with a large amount of freedom. Moreover, the critical difficulties presented by the Epistle in question, especially with regard to its historical relations, had been already noted, and Schmidt of Giessen had not been afraid at least to doubt its genuineness. But still the "Letter" was something new and unique in its way. It may be regarded as the first transplanting of that ingenious† criticism which

* E. g. such as might be expected from a learned and exact bibliographer or antiquarian.—Tn.
† In the higher sense of the word; bespeaking genius.—Tn.
had been employed by such masters as Bentley in the region of classical literature, to the literature of the New Testament. Up to this time, it had been the custom amongst theologians to subject to a sceptical criticism those Scriptures only which, in the ancient Church, had been regarded more or less as Antilegomena. But where, as in the case of the First Epistle to Timothy, the ancient Church gave testimony so unanimously that the book was genuine,—in such a case, even Semler's school did not venture to doubt. In order to remove the historical and exegetical difficulties presented by the Epistle, men chose rather to take refuge in hypotheses, than in suspicion. Schleiermacher, however, ventured upon a thorough-going, divinatory species of criticism. In this he disdained even the help which the absence of the Pastoral Epistles from the Canon of Marcion might have afforded him. As the suspicion had arisen in his mind in consequence of a connected study of the Pauline Epistles, and of the profoundly penetrating sympathy which he had sought to acquire with the whole character and manner of Paul, so, too, his argument against the genuineness of the Epistle was drawn from internal reasons for doubt; from the un-Pauline character of its thought and style, its want of connexion, the incongruity and indistinctness of its historical relations, and its suspicious resemblance (as of a compilation) to the other two Pastoral Epistles, &c. The criticism is so ingenious, the mode of presentation so lively and clear, so overpowering, that any one who gives himself up with but a certain measure of carelessness to the first impression, almost involuntarily agrees with the author. It is true that when we recollect ourselves, and examine the details more strictly, we perceive the weakness of particular points of the argument, the venturesomeness of
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certain particular assertions; we become suspicious of a criticism which deals with the Pauline Epistles as with classical writings, which assumes the existence of a finished and to us perfectly knowable type of the Pauline mode of speaking and of epistolizing, and—notwithstanding that our information is so defective—of a perfectly known and complete circle of historical relations as applying to the Apostle: but although the younger Planck and others have succeeded in bringing up a good deal in opposition to Schleiermacher's criticism, in defence of the Epistle, and towards the satisfying of men's minds respecting it, still, they have not succeeded in clearing away every disquieting suggestion, and the faith of the Church in the genuineness of the Epistle referred to has received a wound which, in spite of all the curative arts that have been applied hitherto, is not yet completely healed. But notwithstanding all the boldness of Schleiermacher's criticism, there was a measure in it. When, subsequently, Eichhorn rejected all three of the Pastoral Epistles as spurious, I recollect Schleiermacher told me that this appeared to him to be a going beyond all bounds, and that, in his opinion, any one who rejected the other two Pastoral Epistles gave up, by that act, the justifying reason and the basis for the criticism of the first of them. But whatever we may think as to the justifiableness and the result of Schleiermacher's critique,—a more ingenious, a more distinguished product of New Testament criticism (even so far as the form is concerned) we have not to show, anywhere. I have heard classical philologers speak of it as something of which they envied us the possession. The divinatory species of criticism, which this Letter has been the chief means of putting in motion among us, has its dangers,
and least of all is it an occupation to be pursued by everybody. But it is necessary to the completeness of the theological Science of the Canon; and since there is no rational ground for regarding it as less necessary within the domain of theology than in that of classical literature, it must be imputed to Schleiermacher, as a real merit, that he introduced it among us in the manner in which he did. The historical criticism of the Christian Canon continued to form one of Schleiermacher’s favourite occupations. Many a critical hint, many a critical inquiry and reply, of a like nature with his essay “On the Testimonies of Papias respecting our first two Gospels,”* may possibly yet lie hidden amongst his exegetical Lectures. As an author, he made a further application of this criticism to the Gospel of Luke, in relation to the difficult problem concerning the manner in which the synoptical Gospels had their origin; in his “Critical Essay on the Writings of Luke” (Part i. 1817). It is well known, how, especially from the time of Lessing downwards, this problem had been almost exhausted by a series of hypotheses; not solved, however, but only rendered more enigmatical. Schleiermacher, concurrently with Dr. Gieseler,† led back the investigation out of those airy regions into which men had been misled by Eichhorn’s hypothesis of a single original Gospel, to the sure ground of history and exegesis. His hypothesis—as simple, as it is historically probable—is this: that our Gospels are to be regarded as collections, formed independently of one another, of smaller and larger

* In the Studien und Kritiken for 1832, Pt. 4. p. 735 et seq.
† Dr. Gieseler’s “Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die Frühiern Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien” was published at Leipzig in 1818, its author being at that time Director of the Gymnasium at Cleve. The substantial agreement of his theory with that of Schleiermacher is sufficiently intimated in the text.—Ta.
evangelical memoralia previously existing. He endeavoured to establish this hypothesis by applying it in the first instance to the Gospel of Luke. By going more deeply into the structure of this Gospel, and by comparing it with the other two, he attempted, in the most ingenious way, to discover in their original form and character the evangelical Memoirs which he supposed to form its basis; and to determine Luke's manner of proceeding in the collocation and arrangement of them. The apologetical interests of the sacred Scriptures have but gained by this attempt of his; not merely because, as a general principle, they never can do otherwise than gain by the spread of truth, but also because our conviction as to the goodness of Luke's sources of information, and as to the conscientiousness with which he employed them, has been essentially promoted by Schleiermacher's essay. It has been objected against this work, that its suggestions are often more ingenious than probable, especially with regard to the sections and junctions [of the Gospel], and to the original form of its sources. But it was partly in Schleiermacher's manner, and partly in the nature of such a first experiment, that the theory should be carried out in all strictness, even to the extreme. It is one advantage of these acute investigations, that they enable us to discern clearly how far we may go. This is always an important gain. Continued criticism, especially the uniform carrying out of Schleiermacher's method in the case of the other two Gospels, will infallibly lead to many modifications, limitations, corrections [of the views entertained by him]. But it is only by proceeding in the manner which he adopted, connecting the comparative study of the Gospels with an investigation as to the individual manner of each Evangelist in particular, that the critical pro-
blem presented by the Gospels will, with the progress of time, be determined more and more to the satisfaction of science and of the Church. But even if it should hereafter be found necessary to strike out other paths,—provided they be but paths of truth, the distinguished merit of Schleiermacher in his essential furtherance of this inquiry must always meet with grateful recognition.*

In consequence of a natural combination of criticism with exegesis, these treatises on the First Epistle to Timothy and on the Gospel of Luke, also contain specimens of Schleiermacher's exegetical method; occurring rather, however, merely by the way. Any one who has had the good fortune to hear his courses of exegetical lectures, will be able to give a better account of his exegetical method than I can. My knowledge of it (apart from the occasional specimens just referred to) is derived merely from the perusal of his essay on Col. i. 15—20,† and from the statements of those who have attended his lectures. The idea which I have formed of it to myself is the following. Schleiermacher knew of no other mode of expounding the Sacred Scriptures, than that in which there is a mutual interpenetration between a philological spirit and philological skill, on the one hand, and a living interest in the Canon as embodying the original, normal representation of Christianity, on the other. He declared expressly, in his encyclopaedian course,‡ that exegesis, unaccompanied by a true interest on behalf of

* The English translator of the above work [reported to be the present Bishop of St David's, Dr C. Thirlwall] says in his Introduction, very truly, "It deserves to be studied as a specimen of exegetical criticism which has seldom been equalled, and which cannot fail to excite the admiration even of those who do not admit all its conclusions."

† See the Studien und Kritiken for 1832, p. 497 et seq.
‡ See his "Brief Outline," §§ 147, 148.—Ta.
theology and of Christianity, is just as idle and inadmissible, as it is when unconnected with a philological spirit and with philological skill. In his view, the thing to be aimed at in all interpretation consisted in this,—to apprehend correctly every individual thought along with its relation to the idea of the whole, and thus to construct for ourselves, in the way of imitation, the original act of composition. But though his attention was directed above all things to the solution of this chief problem in a really philological manner, he made it little or no part of the business of his exegetical lectures specially to investigate the grammatical and historical elements of this solution, but more or less taking these for granted, in order to avoid all diversion of attention, or touching upon them only in so far as they were of essential service to the hermeneutical operation, he went directly, in every case, to the construction* and delineation of the thoughts and their connexion. He carried out this process of construction with a preponderating regard to the form of the thoughts before him. The ascetic, apologetical, and systematic development of these thoughts, he left for discourses better adapted to the purpose. In this respect, his sermons rendered essential service in the way of completing his exposition towards the more real [material as opposed to formal] and popular side of the subject. They are a treasure as it respects the exegetical developement of thought.—His scientific exposition was chiefly marked by a dialectic character, and rested on the assumption of certain

* Here, and in the context, this term is used to signify the process by which we re-construct, as it were, in our own minds, with as much accuracy as possible, a thought, or a system of thoughts, expressed or recorded by another. The many readers who do not need this comment will perhaps pardon its insertion, for the sake of the few who do.—Tr.
strict laws of thought and of composition, as applying to his author also. In this department of exposition he attained to distinguished excellence, and was indeed a master.—The hermeneutical operation consists of two equally essential movements of the mind,—which seem to exclude each other, but which in reality are inseparable; the immersgent and the emergent, as I am disposed to call them. By the former I understand the entering fully, the sinking of one's self, as it were, into the spirit and the peculiar manner of the author. In order to this, a certain degree of self-renunciation, of self-surrender, is required; such as is to be found in the case of friendship. This is the first, the essential condition of all true understanding; which is all the purer and more objective in its character, the more the expositor, in the act referred to, denies himself and his own individuality and age. This hermeneutical self-denial, however, is not required to be (any more than that self-denial which is in the strictest sense moral) a giving up of one's proper self; but only an expansion of the latter. If this entering into the [position and spirit of the] author is not at the same time a voluntary apprehension, a true taking up into our proper self of that which was foreign to us, a personal, individual appropriation, it is fruitless, because it is more or less unconscious or unintelligent. The process of exposition is completed only by an individual appropriation [of the author's meaning]; the translation, as it were, of that which was foreign, into that which is our own. The highest perfection to which the process of exposition can attain, is, to apprehend the meaning of the author with full objectivity, (by a process of penetration, emergence), and to give it forth again with a like degree of individuality (emergence and appropriation). So long as there is no
true, pure friendship, no complete establishment of identity, between the author and the expositor, the exposition is more or less in danger from the influences of misapprehension and nonapprehension. No one individual succeeds in the perfect solution of the exegetical problem in this its height and depth. In every expositor, even in him who gives himself up most completely to the influence of the author, there always remains behind an unconquered, uncompensated portion of his own individuality, by which the pure objectivity of the apprehension is interfered with. On the other hand, he who merely goes through the process of self-surrender, without any accompanying, vigorous appropriation, will be more or less deficient in the power of expounding what he has received, and thus bringing about an understanding of it on the part of others. The gifts which exposition requires are not distributed in an equal proportion. Schleiermacher belongs to the class of those who are far more strongly inclined towards a distinctive individuality of apprehension, than to self-surrender; who rather draw over the author to their own position, than allow themselves to be drawn by him. This method, provided it does not wholly neglect the endeavour to enter into the individuality of the author, has both its reasons and its advantages. It is precisely this circumstance,—the complete traversing of the contents of the New Testament Scriptures by a large number of competent individual and original apprehensions,—which leads to a growing understanding and appropriation of these contents within the Church. In so far, we must admit that Schleiermacher, by reason of the peculiarity and originality of his manner of apprehension, rendered important service to the cause of exegesis also. But this energetic individuality of his, which impressed itself upon every
thing that came within his sphere, had precisely the effect of preventing him from entering into the views of the New Testament writers with that self-surrender, that self-forgetfulness, which is necessary in order that the expositor may give again in its purity, and free from all damage, the unfamiliar meaning, and the unfamiliar form. Amongst the writers of the New Testament, there was none that approached more nearly in character to himself than Paul; of the whole number, he most loved him. For that very reason, he has probably contributed more to the proper understanding of this writer, than to that of any of the rest. Schleiermacher, however—an accident which easily befalls the love of energetic men—imperceptibly changes the Apostle into himself; makes him just as severely dialectic in his mode of thinking, just as artistic in his manner of writing; and seeing himself in Paul, rather than Paul in himself, falls into the consequence (notwithstanding all the acuteness, and the almost magical force, of his exegetical argumentation and style,—as, for example, in the Essay on Col. i. 15–20) of expounding himself, rather than the Apostle. Still, we cannot allow ourselves to be at all withheld by this circumstance from estimating his merit in connexion with exegetical theology so much the higher, since even in those cases in which he erred by reason of the over-might of his peculiar genius, he succeeded in awakening a larger amount of scientific life and effort in the pursuits of exegesis, than has resulted from the labours of a hundred others, who, from a want of genius and of individuality, were not even capable of going wrong.

The foundation of the University of Berlin in the year 1810, marks an important epoch in Schleiermacher's theological activity. I do not know what share he
had in the proceedings connected with the actual foundation. His talented work on the Universities is said to have been not without influence in this respect. But one thing I do know,—that Berlin, just like Halle a hundred years earlier, stands for the sign of a new period in theology; and it is not an accident, but a circumstance included in that connection of things which is of higher ordination, that Schleiermacher is seen, from the very beginning, at the head of the theological faculty in the new University, as Savigny is at the head of the juristic. The spirit of the new University, in the department of theology, was indicated soon after its foundation, by the appearance of Schleiermacher's "Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, drawn up to serve as the basis of Introductory Lectures"* (1811). Only a few sheets, but a whole world of new thoughts! Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology,—as a science, a purely German necessity and production, involved in the very nature of academical studies as pursued in Germany,—had already received considerable furtherance from the labours of Nösselt, Kleucker, and Planck. But Schleiermacher leaves even the nearest of his predecessors far behind him. In his work, Theology appears for the first time as an organic whole, constructed in a wonderful manner and by a master's hand, from its practical point of origination,—the necessity for an orderly Guidance of the Christian Church, and the necessary interest of the theologian therein,—to its practical summit,—the theory and technology of the ecclesiastical praxis. Taking up, separating, connecting, arranging, with a like degree of recognition, all the essential elements of theology,—the

* Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums, zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen entworfen.
religious and the scientific, the practical and the theoretical, the positive and the philosophical,—Schleiermacher rears with artistic genius a magnificent edifice, as well founded, as it is complete and inwardly connected. The arrangement is so simple, that every reader finds his way through it without difficulty; every theological talent and interest finds its place, its work; a vital connexion pervades the whole system; no one is permitted to be idle; only the indolent and unscientific are excluded, and that [as a matter of course, and] without the utterance of any formal ban. One does not know which to admire most in this work; the noble plan after which the whole is constructed, or the boldness and originality with which it is carried out. This ground-plan lay solely in Schleiermacher's own mind; the then existing form of theology contained merely certain first lines and essential relations, as materials towards its construction, and these, moreover, to a certain extent, were presented in a different order and connexion. Since the idea of theology from which Schleiermacher set out was superior to the then existing reality, it follows that his outline contains a theology of the future rather than of the present. In this sense it is, to a certain extent, a truly prophetic work, which, upon the supposition of a vital progress in our science and our church, will, as time advances, meet with increasing fulfilment. If I am required to point out what is new in the work, and what we have especially gained by it, I must call attention, first, to the intimate connecting of theological science with the idea of the Church, by means of which the positive, practical end, and the moral, religious interest of theology are determined; then, to the defining and placing of the notion of Philosophical Theology, at the very portal of the study of
theology, whereby the old controversy as to the relation of theology to philosophy receives a simple adjustment; further, to the peculiar combining of the Exegetical, Church-Historical, and Systematic elements under the common notion of Historical Theology, by which means the injurious separation of these divisions is done away, and, in particular, in the department of Systematic Theology, the perpetually recurring intermixture of Dogmatics with the Philosophy of Religion, and of theological with philosophical Morals, is guarded against; also, to the imposing manner in which Practical Theology is constructed as an organic whole, and is taken up into the idea of theology as an integrant part of it, nay, as being indeed its crown;* and lastly, in so far as Methodology is concerned, to the thorough and decided distinction laid down, between that general amount of theological acquirement without which it is impossible for any one to be a theologian, and that special proficiency which is required as the condition of the properly academical form of activity.—The Outline has been objected to on account of the epigrammatic brevity by which it is characterized. But it was the very purpose of the work, that it should contain propositions merely; which none but masters in the science can understand without further elucidation. And although I could myself wish that the new edition of 1830 had contained a yet larger number of explanatory notes, I must

* I rejoice to find the work so highly estimated,—with especial reference, too, to this point,—in Dr. Nitzsch's "Observationes ad theologiam practicam felicium excolendum" (Bonnæ, 1831, 4to.). I entirely agree with him when he says: "esse (hunc librum) ante omnia a ceteris libris, quibus hoc tempore theologorum literatura vel aucta est vel inundata, plane segregandum, deinde eadem tamquam novum auctorem et antesignanum praeficiendum.—E prophetico genere si veniam denum, dicat aliquid eam esse methodum, dicat quoque e poetico interiori illo vocis sensu, quo Aristoteli poetici dicuntur."
still confess that, for academical compendia, the form of brief and even enigmatical propositions, appears to me incomparably more suitable than that copiousness of detail which rather stifles than awakens the desire for explanatory lectures. In so far, Schleiermacher's Outline seems to me to be characterized by distinguished excellence with regard to its form also.

I reckoned just now as a part of what we have gained by this work, the peculiar representation which is there given of Systematic Theology (embracing Dogmatics, Morals, and Ecclesiastical Statistics) as the integrant concluding part,—the part relating to the Church's Present,—of Historical Theology in general; which latter, according to Schleiermacher's views, has Exegesis for its commencement, and Church History in the stricter sense for its middle portion. On this point, I shall meet with contradiction from some; perhaps from the majority of persons. I myself, however, am of the number of those who do not unconditionally assent to Schleiermacher's representation of Systematic Theology in the respect referred to. I am of opinion that the scientific interest from which Systematic Theology has its origin, is prevailingly of a different character from the historical; even supposing the critical interest to be reckoned along with the latter. It [the interest which gives rise to the construction of a Systematic Theology] is precisely the systematic interest; and specifically, not that subordinate interest which is directed towards the organic arrangement of a given historical material, but the interest which aims at a scientific exhibition of the principles of Christian faith and conduct in their absolute truth, in such a manner that all doubt and contradiction, and all inward incoherency of Christian thinking with regard to them, disappear. This is altogether
a different thing from the historical interest. But, notwithstanding what has just been said, I must still abide by the assertion, that Schleiermacher, by giving this strong prominence to the positive, historical *momentum* in Systematic Theology, by pointing out the proper object and contents of the latter, in the developed dogmatical and ethical consciousness and system of teaching of the Church, and by repressing subjective caprice and individual speculation, rendered essential services, which, if not now, yet certainly hereafter, will be acknowledged with gratitude. But this leads me to speak of the work in which he has carried out the view of Systematic Theology just adverted to,—his greatest work,—that with which he closed and crowned his theological labours of a literary character among us,—his "Exhibition of the Christian Faith, according to the principles of the Evangelical Church."* (1st ed. 1821–22; 2nd ed. 1830–31).

Amidst the conflict of opinions and tendencies within the department referred to, it is a difficult thing to convince all, that with this work, a new period, a true reformation in dogmatical literature, has its beginning. I do not know anything which one could place by the side of it, in regard to historical importance, except, perhaps, in its day, the "Institutio Religionis Christianæ" of John Calvin. Even its opponents have been obliged to bear testimony, by the liveliness of their opposition and the energy of their attacks, to its stirring and searching power. A time will come, when new epoch-marking developments in Dogmatics will convert the development of our time, involved in Schleiermacher's work, into a thing of the past; but, so long as there is life in our

* Darstellung des christlichen Glaubens nach den Grundsetzen der evangelischen Kirche.
science, the time will never come, when men shall cease to reckon the work itself as constituting one of those commanding, and as it were prophetic heights, from which new prospects of the goal, and new paths to it, are obtained and defined.

People have generally admired the dialectic skill which is apparent in Schleiermacher's Dogmatics: many, without knowing properly what it is they admire; and some, rather equivocally, with a secret dislike and a convenient fear, by which they consider themselves exonerated from the trouble and labour of studying the book thoroughly. But it is a great thing in a science, and always delightfully conducive to its progress, when a distinguished genius brings it nearer to the idea of strict science,—procures recognition and supremacy in it for method and order, for notional precision and strictness of connexion. Schleiermacher accomplished this service for Dogmatics in the degree in which he did, and his merits in this respect are so much the more highly commendable, by reason of the fact that his dialectic skill thoroughly overcame and practically refuted the earlier popularism and the merely outward logical method, together with the faint-hearted tendency to despair of securing a scientific form at all,—attained its object in a manner which was lively, free, and, in short, anything but scholastically dry. But this is neither the only merit, nor the greatest one, of Schleiermacher's work. Its greatest merit is to be sought in its contents; in this, namely,—that Schleiermacher, from first to last, gives so decided a prominence to the positive character of the Christian system of belief, to its most inward significance and connexion in the life of the Church. Notwithstanding all the peculiarity, acuteness, and honesty of his subjective apprehension, he has thereby contributed to give
force again, in the minds of men and in science, to the objective and eternal truth of the Christian Faith, in an incomparably higher degree than others, who, in their presumed possession of purely objective, absolute notions as God himself possesses them, look down conceitedly upon the subjective Theologian-of-Feeling, (for so they esteem this skilful dialectician), as occupying a lower stage, above which they have risen long ago. Dr. Twesten remarks very justly, that "Schleiermacher, by conducting the science of Dogmatics to the facts of the Christian consciousness, as its basis and its true object, secured faith itself against the assaults of a science which mistakes its own boundaries, as well as restored to the System of Faith its own proper independence." This merit will be thankfully imputed to him even by the latest posterity; and it is quite possible, that if the intoxication of the new absolute science should be succeeded by a period of jejune scepticism, the Dogmatics of Schleiermacher will then become the chief armoury from which weapons will be drawn for use against the latter. We may account it a fault in this work, that the exegetical foundation has not, in it, the breadth and completeness which might be desired, and that the Christian consciousness is not apprehended with sufficient precision in its original, canonical form. But this defect is connected with an excellence which ought to be gratefully recognised; namely, that Schleiermacher regards the essential contents of the System of Faith not as a concluded letter, but as a free, spiritual stream, diffused through the entire historical life of the Church, and attaining to its complete development thereby. At the same time, he holds fast its pure source in the life and teaching of the Saviour; he will not acknowledge anything which has not flowed thence; but
while he is persuaded of the incessant directive and formative agency of the Spirit of Christ in the Church, illustrating Christ's word and Christ's history, he takes for granted, with a magnanimous confidence, that that which is in the Church matter of general acceptance and consciousness as having a Christian character, must also be precisely the Christian Truth. Dr. Twesten commends, "as one of the fairest aspects of this masterpiece, the noble tolerance which knows how to place itself as much as possible above opposing views, and without misapprehending their true character, yet to point out how the Christian consciousness may find expression in an equal degree in each of them." I do not merely quote these words; I thoroughly subscribe to them. The time is already come, in which this noble tolerance that characterizes the Dogmatics of Schleiermacher, is more and more demanded from the Protestant Church, and imposed upon it as a duty, as the true means of sustaining Christian fellowship, in opposition to the increasingly self-willed, disuniting, exclusive, and, in so far, unchristian and destructive antagonisms of the theological schools. The work, however, has, on this very account, been charged with fixing too broadly the limits within which the Christian character shall be held to apply, and with weakening down the characteristic Christian truth, while it widens the fellowship of Christian love. But the persons who bring the charge, are merely those who are not able to distinguish between tolerance and indifferentism. A man who so decidedly adheres to the characteristic contrast of the Gospel between sin and grace,—who gives so strong a prominence, and the central place in his belief, to the historical, living Christ in his absolute sinlessness and onliness,—who so unreservedly and consistently excludes the
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heretical deviations of Ebionitism and Docetism, of Manichæism and Pelagianism,—who so keenly apprehends and carries out the Protestant principle, without denying the elements of truth which are to be found in the Catholic,—as Schleiermacher has done in his Dogmatics,—such a man can be regarded as indifferent, only by those who are subjects of the most pitiful intolerance and bondage of the letter. If the Deistic Rationalism of the antecedent schools of theology has ever received a discomfiture, it has been in the Dogmatics of Schleiermacher. Many an assault that is now proclaimed as having led to a decisive victory over Rationalism, the latter would have overcome; the deadly wound that has been inflicted upon it by the truly rational, but not rationalistic Dogmatics of Schleiermacher, is something which it will never get over.

It is the fortune, or misfortune, of every great, distinctly individual work, to meet with manifold opposition. Want of understanding and misunderstanding have, at the least, fully as much to do with this as the desire after truth—if not more. It has happened thus, too, in the case of Schleiermacher's Dogmatics. With the insight which he possessed into the existing state of the Church and of theology, and with his modest consciousness that the immediate result presented by him was merely his own apprehension of the Christian system of faith, and not the system of Dogmatics in its absolute form, he was prepared to be both misunderstood and assailed. His Letters respecting his "System of Faith,"* in which he endeavoured to dispose of all polemical matter, in order that it might not be in his way when preparing a second edition of the work, show how noble

* In the Studien und Kritiken for 1829, Parts 2 & 3. [These Letters are both addressed to Dr. Lücke.—Tz.]
was his manner of thinking, with regard to the attacks which he had experienced; how, namely, he looked upon every honest opponent, rather as a coadjutor in the common work, than as an opponent in the proper sense of the word. He endeavoured, in these letters, to remove the misapprehensions to which the work was liable; and, with unprejudiced readers, he has assuredly in a great measure succeeded. But even as, in the first composition of his work, he had been to a certain extent careless of possible misapprehensions, had treated many points without enough either of clearness or of precision, and was, in general, accustomed to expect of his readers (because it was his own habitual practice), that they should understand every individual detail by a reference to the whole of which it formed a part, and his Dogmatics by a reference to the connexion of his entire theological system of thought; so, too, in these letters,—partly from an artistic dread of tedious diffuseness, partly from a kind of magnanimous carelessness,—many points have been treated suggestively rather than fully, and thus a good deal of matter for misunderstanding has been allowed to remain; nay, from his manner of dealing out cuts and thrusts on the right hand and on the left, he has, perhaps, added to that which existed before. This fact has been interpreted to his prejudice, as having resulted from a feeling of haughty contempt. But the imputation is unjust. In scientific matters, he never manifested contempt towards anything, except downright stupidity, and the ill-will exhibited by persons who were of no consequence whatever. Except in such cases, he willingly entered into a consideration of the opinions of others; though it was not easy to get him to do this any further or any longer than the interest of his own mind in the cause of truth allow-
ed. And so these attacks and misunderstandings will yet continue for a time; until his Dogmatics shall have succeeded in penetrating more generally into the spirit of our Church and of our theology, and in converting the truth which the work contains into a matter of common possession.

Schleiermacher was not one of those who, in the field of science, egotistically fancy that every thing begins with them. He cheerfully went back to the earlier stages and developments of theology, learned from them, and found in them points of connexion for his own views. This historical interest, on the one hand, furnishes an explanation of the manner in which, in his Dogmatics, he goes back to certain earlier dogmatic definitions laid down by celebrated teachers of the Greek and Latin Churches, and seeks to extract the golden grains which may be found in them. On the other hand, it has given rise to a couple of Essays in the department of Dogmatic History, which are characterized by a high degree of thoroughness: one "on the Doctrine of Election," (an investigation of the Augustinian and Calvinistic theory), with which the Berlin Theological Journal for 1819 begins; the other, "On the Contrast between the Sabellian and the Athanasian Representations of the Trinity," with which the volume for 1822 is creditably brought to a close. The distinguished talent of Schleiermacher, cultivated as it had been by characteristic investigations into the history of Grecian philosophy, manifests itself in both these treatises. To the second of them, we are indebted for some new pragmatical points of view with respect to the earliest history of the doctrine of the Trinity. The former Essay looked like a work out of season, since, from its defence of the logical consistency adhered to by Augustine and Calvin
with regard to the doctrine of election, it was adapted, so far as the multitude were concerned, rather to injure than to aid the Union of the two Evangelical Confessions, which had then but just begun. But when I pointed out this circumstance to him, he declared that it was his intention, precisely with a view to serve the interests of the Union, to excite a new discussion with regard to a matter which superficial reflection, indeed, supposed itself to have decided long ago,—but which, if the Union was to develop and perfect itself in a scientific point of view also, [and not to subsist merely as an outward fact], must needs, sooner or later, be brought under examination. That this difficult problem has since then been more closely and thoroughly investigated, and possibly, also, a beginning made towards new dogmatic determinations respecting it, is a circumstance for which we may thank the stirring treatise referred to.

It was not, however, merely as an author, that Schleiermacher laboured for the reconstruction and advancement of theology; as an academical teacher, also, by means of oral discourse, he opened up new paths, and furnished new points of view. When some portion of his discourses shall have been printed, it will be possible to specify more accurately the amount of gain in this direction. His lectures on the life of Jesus have given occasion to the subsequent delivery of similar courses in other Universities; and Hase's work on the life of Jesus,—an excellent book, notwithstanding all its faults,—derived its origin from the same incitement. Of Schleiermacher's lectures on the topic referred to, I know only thus much,—that distinguished as they are by the peculiar manner in which the subject is treated, they will be found to yield, when published, a mea-
sure of novelty and of stimulus, in reference both to the exposition of the Gospels, and to the dogmatical and ethical contemplation of [the person and history of] Jesus. So with regard to Practical Theology, on which he lectured regularly, and always in an enlivening, delightful manner,—Ecclesiastical Statistics, a discipline of which he was the first to establish a scientific notion at all,—Church-History, and the Historico-Critical Introduction to the New Testament, upon which he discoursed from time to time, and which he enriched with new points of view and new investigations,—and lastly, Christian Morals, upon which, mediately as an author, he exercised a reformatory influence by his "Criticism of the Doctrine of Morals" and his ethical disquisitions contained in the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences,—all these branches of science will, as time advances, be indebted to his lectures for new tendencies and new incitements, as well amongst those who heard his discourses, as amongst those who are merely privileged to read them.

Schleiermacher was in possession of Theology as an organic whole,—not merely for the purpose of satisfying his own individual scientific necessities, or of enhancing the lustre of his genius,—but in its vital relation to the Guidance of the Christian Church; a work to which he felt himself called, both in the pulpit and in the academic chair, as an officer of the church, and a minister of the Word of God. If it is only the mutual interpenetration and vivification of the ecclesiastical and the scientific interest that constitutes the true theologian, then was Schleiermacher so much the more
completely entitled to the appellation, in that both these elements were to be found in him, each in a distinguished degree; and withal in so beautiful an equipoise, that he was qualified to serve the Church with equal effectiveness as a practical and as a theoretical theologian. I have always admired and envied him for this,—that God had given to him to be active in both directions of the theological life with an equal degree of eminent proficiency. His scientific activity in the study and in the academic chair, was crowned, every Sunday, by the preaching of the Word of God in the pulpit, and was also variously interwoven, the whole week through, with ecclesiastical duties in his congregation, and with the catechetical instruction of the youthful Christians committed to his charge. For any one else, this would have been too much; one occupation or another would have suffered by reason of all the rest. Not so with Schleiermacher! I have never even heard him complain that his manifold duties were too much for him, or that one interfered with another. On the contrary, he seemed to find in the one refreshment and reanimation for the discharge of the other. And when I call to mind in addition, that notwithstanding all his multiplied official occupations, and his copious activity as a writer, he was at all times possessed of leisure, good temper, and a lively readiness for the enjoyment of social life in larger and in smaller circles,—that he never brought with him into society the unwieldy gravity of the study or the official position, but was always the cheerful, enlivening companion,—I can free myself from the spell of that astonished admiration with which I regard this great man, only by considering how richly the good God had endowed him with gifts above others, and by delighting myself with the contemplation of his virtue.
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in turning them all to account, and bringing them all into a proper connexion with one another.

That which was immediately and chiefly prominent in his performance of duties connected with his spiritual office, was his Sunday's sermon; an image, and at the same time a supplement and completion, of his scientific activity. As regards the relation of his Sermons to his Dogmatics,—the manner in which the two verily agree with, supplement, and explain each other,—I may appeal to the excellent essay on that subject by Dr. Rienäcker, Preacher at the Cathedral in Halle,* and am certain that any one who reads it attentively will agree with him in this, that Schleiermacher, although he attached great importance to the formal difference between the scientific, academic lecture, and the popular mode of communication with regard to the Christian Faith, and everywhere gave effect to the distinction, yet knew so little of any material diversity between the two things, that one must needs say, his Dogmatics are just as indispensable to a complete scientific understanding of his Sermons, as the study of his Sermons is necessary in order to an all-sided comprehension of the former work. They are but superficial or malicious persons who, without any foundation for it, have given utterance to the suspicion that the man was a different character, in the pulpit, from what he was in the academic chair and in his scientific writings. The same fervour and love with which, in the pulpit, he held fast to the positive contents of Scripture, and made its vitally personal centre, the Redeemer, as the only-begotten Son of God, the ever-recurring theme of his sermons, appear also plainly enough in his Dogmatics, amidst the labours of the critical and dialectic understanding; and

* In the Studien und Kritiken for 1831, Part ii. p. 240 et seq.
the freedom and spirituality with which, in his Dogma-
tics, he everywhere places himself in opposition to the
bondage of the letter, to the false allegorio-Gnostic, as
well as to the Jewish-Christian manner of connecting
the Old and New Testaments, and to the confounding
of the essential and the non-essential, are prevalent also
in his Sermons,—in which, after the noble style of
Luther, he expected of his hearers a toleration for even
the freest announcement of truth perceived. I have
already remarked above, what a rich treasure his ser-
mons are for the purposes of scientific exegesis, especial-
ly in relation to the New Testament. But in order that
it might be fully perceived how truly Schleiermacher,
in the pulpit as in the academic chair, was a man of
complete, homogeneous, and symmetrical character, one
of his younger disciples, Rütenick, has shown, in a very
instructive manner, (in the first instance, it is true,
only in a popular form,) how his whole System of
Christian Morals may be constructed from the materials
afforded by his sermons. Of the questionable distinc-
tion between dogmatical [doctrinal] and moral [ethical]
sermons, Schleiermacher knew nothing. As, even in a
scientific point of view, he admitted but a very relative
distinction between Dogmatics and Morals, and insist-
ed most decidedly upon the maintenance of the most inti-
mate connexion and mutual relation between the two, so
too, in his sermons, he always held fast and exhibited the
most vital, reciprocal connexion as existing between
Christian thought and action, between faith and love; and
I do not know one of his sermons, whether printed or
merely listened to, in which one would find a preponde-
rance of the dogmatical or the ethical element, unaccompa-
nied by a most vivid tracing out of each to its junction
with the other. A complete statement of the cha-
characteristic peculiarities of Schleiermacher's mode of preaching is not my object here. The talented characteristic sketch by Dr. Sack* is a good beginning towards an apprehension, without exaggeration and without party spirit, of Schleiermacher's great merits, and his distinguished originality, in this department also. My friend designates the homiletical peculiarities of Schleiermacher as being threefold. The first, and the most fruitful of good, appears to him to be the confidence and earnest vitality with which all his contemplation sets out from a fellowship with the person of Christ by means of faith and love, makes this fellowship explanatory of the essential character and destiny of the Church, and draws from it a reliance on the power of the Spirit, which has already passed over into the Church. While he assigns to this characteristic the greatest praise, and the epoch-marking importance which belongs to Schleiermacher's mode of preaching, he finds its second characteristic, (to which he alludes rather in the way of censure), to consist in this, that the worth accorded by Schleiermacher to the Word of God in the Scriptures, is not that of ever newly originating his faith, and of giving to it a Divine determination with regard to its essential elements, but merely that of guiding and regulating his reflection upon his own believing feeling.† This censure, in my views, is based upon a false apprehension of the idea of faith as entertained by Schleiermacher. Dr. Sack supposes that faith, namely the faith which is peculiarly Christian, was, in Schleiermacher's estimation, pre-

* In the Studien und Kritiken for 1831, Part ii. P. 359 et seq. (in a critique upon the sermons of Schleiermacher and Albertini).
† Literally, faith-feeling, (Glaubensgefühl); a compound employed with an immediate reference to Schleiermacher's theory respecting the ultimate basis and essential nature of religion.—Tn.
ponderantly a feeling, unaccompanied by the consciousness of an objective truth. This I must deny. In his sermons, as also in his Dogmatics, Christian faith, it is true, is essentially something subjective, a subjective life in men; but its characteristic, positive, distinct and definite character [Bestimmtheit] to which Schleiermacher gives such decided prominence, is indeed just a product of history, of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ; which, as its essential contents, Christian faith receives at all times in the purest and clearest form from the Scriptures. It is true, it draws from the sacred Scriptures this its contents, not as an outward word, as a doctrine by nature foreign to itself, but as an entire life, in which doctrine and word have their being; and it receives the same in the Christian Church, not as something which is ever newly appearing and originating, but as something which by virtue of the Christian Spirit, is present in the community of the faithful; as something which is already known, only that it is constantly growing in vitality and completeness. Dr. Sack is further of opinion, that with the peculiarity censured by him,—which he terms, by way of reproach, Schleiermacher's idealistic element, but to which we should rather give, in praise, the appellation spiritual-ecclesiastical,—there is connected a third peculiarity manifested by Schleiermacher in his sermons, namely, that he supposes the life and operation of grace to be present in all his hearers not merely as a matter of perfect consciousness, but also in such a stage of advancement, that too little regard is had to the manifold states of defective piety and of incipient faith which nevertheless actually present themselves in our congregations; and I must certainly allow that there is such a connexion; nor can I overlook the existence of a certain one-sidedness in this respect. But
OF SCHLEIERMACHER.

on the other hand, I must declare that it has always afforded me special gratification, and has appeared to me exceedingly praiseworthy, when Schleiermacher has mounted the pulpit with this magnanimous assumption of his believing and affectionate soul, that he found the Christian congregation, as such, already founded and gathered together by the Lord and his Spirit, and that he was not called to the first planting of their faith, but rather to the watering of that which was already planted, by the unrestrained communication and efflux of his own enthusiasm and knowledge, as deriving their origin and intensity from the word of God. Schleiermacher did not overlook the different stages of knowledge and piety which exist in a congregation; he took good notice of such states as are defective. But, [in preaching], he always assumed as the starting-point, a certain average measure of Christian faith and life as existing in the congregation; leaving the inferior stages to another kind of instruction than that which is afforded by preaching. In an age in which there are so many who deal with Christian congregations as if the work of redemption and regeneration had not yet found a beginning in them at all, either consciously or unconsciously, or as if it had every Sunday to be commenced anew, and by this perverse fashion, weary and exasperate, rather than elevate and gladden,—Schleiermacher's opposite peculiarity is only a matter for praise.—I cheerfully subscribe, on the other hand, to what Dr. Sack says respecting "Schleiermacher's talent of combining the unity and variety of his discourse, in transparency of form, and more than logical clearness of arrangement, so as to form a whole, constructed, as it were, of but one piece." I cannot forbear copying, word for word, the whole of the beautiful passage of my friend's observations which
relates to this point, even with the partial censure it contains,—which I, however, can allow to pass only as being rather a representation of the well-authorised individuality of Schleiermacher: "This precision of his thoughts," Dr Sack goes on to say, "and this clearness in their relations, combined with the noble structure and the dignity of his language, this idea-abounding and animated fulness of soul, compassed about with ecclesiastical taste and tact, cause the fervidness of his essential tendencies to appear with a prominence which affords the highest gratification. At the same time, however, it cannot be concealed that the entire structure of the author's language is rather ecclesiastical and elevated and at the same time antique, than biblical and properly homiletical. This circumstance is connected, again, with his neglect of the Old Testament; which is the inexhaustible source for the homiletical style, so far as the more lively and the more elevated departments of the latter are concerned. One may venture to say that the author has too little of the oriental, in apprehension and expression,—nothing of that quality which gives to the style of Herder, (apart from its defects), so powerful a hold upon the reader, especially in his earlier writings; where he [Schleiermacher] attempts the properly rhetorical, the Bible-imitative, he is seldom happy. His strength, to be sure, lies in another department; in that of truth and gentleness, of quiet energy and constancy,—qualities which pervade his words, breathing out, as it were, from their very centre."

It is known that Schleiermacher was not in the habit of writing his sermons before delivering them. Those

- I should prefer to translate ad litteram, and to say churchly; it would give a more exact and a more appropriate meaning; but the word is hardly English.—Tu.
which are in print are all taken from notes made while he was speaking. When I was in the habit of hearing him, there were always two of his younger friends employed in taking notes of his sermons. Any one who was aware of this, was led to admire the great gifts of the man still more. To a certain extent, the sermon did not first originate in the pulpit, inasmuch as it had been already conceived in his mind several days before, and this conception had been completely carried out, as it were, up to the moment of his delivering the discourse. But he wrote nothing down, except, (at the time of my living with him,) on the Saturday evening, the text and subject, and at the most, in addition to this, the several divisions of the latter, briefly indicated. This he called making out his bill.* Thus, however, he entered the pulpit. Here, then, so far as its precise form, its mode of presentation, and its details were concerned, the sermon had its origin, as a living product of his previous reflection, of the animating impression produced by the spectacle of the assembled congregation, and of that mastery of his mind over the order of his thoughts and his language, which was present to him at all times in an equal degree. Any one who knew this, might observe how the artistic structure of Christian discourse arose; how, at first, speaking slowly and quietly, more in the ordinary tone of discourse, he collected and arranged his thoughts; then, again, when he had spoken for some time, and had as it were spread out and drawn together the whole net-work of thought, how his speech became more rapid, more excited, and, the nearer he approached to the admonition or encouragement which formed the conclusion, proportionally augmented in copiousness and fluency.

* Seinen Zettel machen. He seems to have been thinking of the items of which his memorandum consisted.—Ta.
Thus did I hear him, Sunday after Sunday, for the space of several years. He was always like himself; and always attractive, by reason of his peculiar mode of treating the text, by novelty and freshness of thought, by a well-ordered method of presentation, and by fluency of speech. I have never heard of his having made a mistake in speaking, or of his having corrected himself. If one's attention was not extraordinarily enchained by the thoughts presented, one often had occasion to admire the manner in which, with his peculiar style, inclined to the construction of intricate periods, he every moment, even in the midst of the most intricate, found the right word, and never lost the clue that guided him safely to the conclusion. It is not every one that has this gift; least of all the gift of speaking before a congregation, in all moods and circumstances, upon all matters of Christian faith and life, without written preparation, and always with the same degree of fulness, clearness, and beauty. It is often the case that the contents suffer under the mastery, and from the extreme readiness of the language. This easily gives rise to a monotonous manner; accustomed trains of thought quickly return; and so of all the other vices of this kind which belong to uncalled-for extemporizing. Of all this, there was no trace to be found in Schleiermacher. He had his own manner of expression, peculiar to himself; his own peculiar circle of thought. But the affluence of his mind, and the fulness of Christian life that was in him, did not permit any of the customary vices of extemporizing to obtain in his manner of preaching; but led to the result, that the hearer merely beheld in him with complacency the highest degree of homiletical skill, and was able purely to enjoy the rich fruits it yielded. When I once asked him how he had arrived at this enviable
degree of skill, he answered, that he had, very early, attained to the perception, that the highest thing to be aimed at was, not to reproduce the sermon in the presence of the congregation, merely by means of the memory, but to let the words arise, fresh and new, from the energy and fulness of the soul at the very moment; and that in order to become qualified for doing this, he had begun by merely omitting to write the conclusion of the sermon; and thus, proceeding backwards, step by step, (just as one leaves off by degrees a warm garment to which he has become accustomed,) he had at last attained even to that which was most difficult of all,—to refrain from writing down even the introduction.

Any one who heard but a single sermon from Schleiermacher, might entertain the apprehension that he was not intelligible, that he was not popular enough, for the more uneducated in his congregation. But upon a continued and connected hearing, this apprehension completely disappeared. He expected much of his hearers; but still, properly speaking, nothing more than familiarity with the Scriptures,—and attention. And since he knew how to enchain the latter, even in the less educated, by the freshness and spiritual liveliness of his delivery, by his constant connexion of even the profoundest Christian ideas with practical life, with the existing condition of church, family, and fatherland,—an explanation is afforded of the fact, that while his audience at church consisted indeed for the most part of the more educated class, yet people of a meaner condition, and these even from other congregations, were seen to visit his church regularly, and to listen with attention to his discourses. I believe that with the progress of time, this portion of his audience continually increased in numbers; since, just as there was in his
entire theology a vital progress, so also in his mode of preaching, concurrently with the continued experience and enlargement of his inward life, there was a constant advance in the qualities of Christian simplicity and fervour, from year to year.

Preaching, certainly, constituted for Schleiermacher the principal scene of his efficiency in the congregation; but, even as he was accustomed to take a connected view of all that belonged to any particular circle of activity, so was he also mindful, and that with a like degree of love and faithfulness, of all that is included in the essential nature of the congregational life. Even before the necessity for liturgical reforms in connexion with Divine worship became more generally a matter of discussion, he endeavoured, in his own congregation, to awaken, and to satisfy this liturgical want as well as he was able to do it in his own circle, without a more general reform in the Evangelical Church as a whole. Since he regarded singing and preaching as constituting one living whole, and the hymn-book then introduced was on the contrary obstructive to the ordering of such a whole, he hit upon the expedient of getting particular hymns printed, at least for each morning service,—hymns which he selected, with a reference to their sense and suitability, from the rich treasures of sacred song, ancient and modern, belonging to our Church. Thus his congregation became acquainted by degrees with the most beautiful of our hymns, and he himself was practised and qualified for taking a leading part in the preparation of a new hymn-book, which should be adapted to our present state of Christian culture. It is known that he was one of the principal compilers of the New Berlin Hymn-Book. His defence of this collection*

* "Ueber das Berliner Gesangbuch. Ein Schreiben an Herrn Bischof
testifies to the clearness, precision, and experience of his mind in this department also.

I have no immediate information in regard to his catechetical method in the religious instruction of the young. I know only this,—that his instruction preparatory to confirmation was very much liked and sought after, especially amongst the higher orders, and that the young persons of both sexes whom he prepared and confirmed, attached themselves to him with an especial degree of cordiality and constancy. This would be inconceivable, unless, in this department of labour also, he had possessed a considerable talent for warming and spiritually animating the minds of the young in favour of the Gospel. The congregation of young persons which he thus formed for himself, was at the same time, as it appeared to me, his principal sphere for the exercise of the pastoral care. He did not withdraw himself from the discharge of this essential part of his duty as a preacher. But it was a characteristic involved in the entire nature of his position, and to some extent also in his personal individuality, that as a pastor, he rather permitted himself to be sought after by those who had affection and confidence towards him, than went himself in search of them. What he possibly sacrificed of efficiency, in this department of his spiritual office, he compensated, in a high degree, by his constant and active participation in the general concerns of the Church. Schleiermacher regarded the individual congregation as a vitally organic part of the ecclesiastical whole, inseparable from the latter both in health and in disease. His reformatory activity was directed at a very early period towards the circumstances and the

necessities of the Church's life as a whole. His first publication in connexion with this subject consists of "Two Non-prejudicative Opinions in matters connected with the Interests of the Protestant Church; with a more immediate reference to the Prussian State" (1804). This document was written about the time when he had finished his profoundly thoughtful work on the Criticism of the Doctrine of Morals. It appeared without his name; but it bore the impress of his mind. In the first Opinion, which relates to the separation of the two Protestant Churches, the ecclesiastical life-question of his mind, the Union, already makes its appearance, as clearly and definitely as possible. He points out the mischiefs of the separation hitherto existing: how, in relation to the religious interest, it nourishes superstition on the one hand, and, on the other, indifference towards even the essentials of religion; then, moreover, how it also operates injuriously in relation to general morality and true culture; and again, lastly, how, in relation to the state and the school, it also shows itself as an evil which it is high time to remedy. All this is worked out in a manner distinguished as much by the truthfulness of lively experience, as by genius and wit. But Schleiermacher did not content himself with complaining of the evil; even then, along with the necessity of the Union, he also pointed out the proper manner of its accomplishment; he demanded that the fellowship of the Churches should be restored, without touching the differences in the system of doctrine or the variations in the ritual, and insisted that this restoration should be effected without circumscribing the liberty of faith and action of any individual. Even at that time, he called attention to the fact, that in the community of the United
Brethren, this idea of Union was realized in a satisfactory manner. The second Opinion inquires into the means by which the decline of religion may be prevented. Full of the most lively and truthful delineations of the corruptions, unseemlinesses, and incongruities which were to be found as well in the regulation and administration of public worship as in the constitution and condition of the clerical order, it contains at the same time a multitude of reformatory hints and proposals, which, in the revolution that has taken place in the ecclesiastical life since 1814, have in part been realized, in part agitated anew, and subjected to a fuller discussion. I do not know what impression these two Opinions made at the time of their appearance; assuredly but a very preparatory one. They contain already, however,—partly wrought out in detail, partly in the germ,—all those ideas which, ten years later, Schleiermacher began to diffuse after a more energetic and more complete fashion, and to conduct to supremacy.—It was but for a short time that he was permitted to take part in the general government of the Church in one of the higher spiritual offices connected with the State. It was at that season of the regeneration of the Prussian State, when those ministers of powerful intellect, Von Stein and Wilhelm Von Humboldt, were seeking, in every department, to place the most able men at the head of affairs, and when, accordingly, Schleiermacher also could not fail of finding his place. I do not know in what manner, nor to what extent, he exercised an influence at that period in connexion with the reform of the Church. But this I know, that he willingly withdrew from the position, when, subsequently, the troublesome quickness and decision of his mind met with more of simple resistance than of positive effect. After
this he confined himself to aiding, according to his ability, partly as a writer, and partly as the freely elected President of the Berlin Synod, in promoting the conduct, upon the right basis and in the right way, of the reform of public worship and the constitution of the Church, (which had been agitated, especially since the year 1814, even in the highest quarter); and, along with this, of the Union. To this period belongs the series of his occasional publications relative to ecclesiastical affairs,—chiefly of a polemical character, and commencing with the celebrated "Letter of Congratulation to the Very Reverend the Members of the Commission appointed by his Majesty the King of Prussia for the purpose of preparing new Liturgical Forms" (1814).

The anonymous guise of this work did not prevent the instant discovery of the author; so completely does it bear the impress of his mind. Rather a condolence and warning, than a congratulation, and not wanting in a certain degree of irony,—it was nevertheless received by the Commission with more than kindness. One might almost say that none of Schleiermacher's writings attained its end so immediately as this. The Commission, with noble self-denial, entered into the ideas of Schleiermacher; instead of precipitately constructing new liturgical forms, it proposed that a constitution should first be given to the Church, by means of which it should be possible to give to the needful reform, as proceeding from within outwardly, the character of a collective volition of the Church. It pertains to the imperishable renown of the King of Prussia, that he entered into this idea with all the interest of his Christian mind, and all the energy of his kingly will. It is true, the new Liturgy for the Court and Garrison Congregation at Potsdam and the Garrison Church at Berlin, was little
adapted, even by the manner in which it was introduced, to give rise to the hope of a true, comprehensive reform, brought about in a proper way. Schleiermacher, like a watchman on the battlements of the Church, observant of every appearance and movement in the ecclesiastical horizon, did not omit—this time with the avowal of his name—with frankness, yet in a tone of mildness, to subject the new Liturgy to criticism, in his pamphlet "On the New Liturgy for the Court and Garrison Congregation at Potsdam" (1816); and, at the close, to direct attention anew to this point,—"that a well-ordered Synodal Constitution affords the only means of securing for the Church a legitimate co-operation towards the reform of Divine worship,—so that neither the caprice of the individual shall be able wildly to wander at pleasure in the sacred concerns of public worship, nor a fruitful and acknowledged point of union be wanting to the like-minded, who would fain enter into a mutual connexion,—nor the man of experience and of eminence be destitute of that silent, direct influence which it is proper for him to exercise.—When, then, upon the occurrence of the jubilee of the Reformation in 1817, the King, by his praiseworthy example and excellent arrangements, prepared the way for, nay, in very strictness founded, the Union of the two Protestant Churches, and, as early as the spring of 1817, the official notification with regard to the formation of Presbyteries, and the union of the Protestant clergy into District, Provincial, and National Synods, made its appearance as the result,—Schleiermacher's rejoicing over the incipient success of his fairest and most cherished desires was equalled only by the zeal with which, by counsel and by deed, with love and diligence, he sought to promote and defend the new work. His ideas, in the mean time,
had found entrance and patronage in more extended circles; a number of the clergy, especially the younger part of them, had come forward as fellow-labourers and fellow-counsellors in the sacred enterprise. Schleiermacher, with thankfulness and modesty, cheerfully recognised this fact; devoid of envy, he rejoiced that he was neither the only labourer, nor, outwardly, the most important one. In order, however, that by the communication and discussion of his opinions and counsels with respect to certain particulars of the official notification just referred to, he might unite such as were like-minded to a deliberate and unanimous action at the Synods which were shortly to be held, he hastily stepped forth in advance, and wrote, as early as the summer of 1817, his "Observations concerning the Synodal Constitution about to be established for the Protestant Church of the State of Prussia."—When, soon after this, the Berlin Synod assembled, and as a mark of honour elected him to be its President, he fulfilled the duties of this office with such zeal, such aptness, patience, and love, that even those who had, until then, rather feared and mistrusted him, began to bestow upon him their affection and confidence; so that the labours of the Synod evidently prospered under his guidance, through the increasingly lively harmony which prevailed amongst its members. The Union, and the new Constitution of the Church, appeared at that time inseparable,—the one was the necessary auxiliary of the other. Thus, the first sign of life given by the Synod was its "Official Declaration respecting the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, to be held by the Synod on the 30th of October." Schleiermacher was the author of this document. In it, he sets forth the Union, in a brief and popular, a gentle and earnest manner, as a purely eccle-
siantical pacification,—unconnected with any settlement of dogmatical differences, which would be useless, nay, would lead to new divisions,—and testified by means of a new and common ritual in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.

Nothing could be more convincing than this simple declaration; and any one who, in the spirit of it, took part in that first united celebration of the Lord’s Supper by the entire Protestant Clergy of the metropolis, will recollect how that elevating and sacred service, accompanied as it was by the animating remembrance of the as yet undivided commencement of the Reformation,* contributed essentially to give stability and completeness to the conviction of the verity and purity which belong precisely to this kind of union. Contradiction and misinterpretation were hardly to be looked for; at least from theologians, who must needs be acquainted with the history of the previous divisions, and attempts at union. When, therefore,—while every one at Berlin, in vigorous health, and strong generous faith, was resigning himself to the hope that the work thus commenced would go on in gladdening prosperity, Dr Ammon’s† Examination of Harms’s Theses‡ made its appearance,

* Its commencement, namely, by the publication of Luther’s Theses; the special event to which the commemoration of 1817 referred.—Tr.
† The well-known Rational Supra-naturalist, as he has sometimes been called; author of “Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion,” and other works which have excited a good deal of attention. A man of great learning, both classical and modern, and a celebrated preacher; though, when I heard him about four years ago, I thought him sadly cold and dreary. Schleiermacher compared him to an edel, which continually slips out of the fingers of any one who attempts to catch it.—Tr.
‡ The name of Claus Harms is well known in Germany as that of a very popular and successful preacher, as well as able and fearless defender of the standard Lutheran system of doctrine. Born May 25, 1778, at Fahrstedt, a village in Ditmarsh, (the West part of Holstein), he went to
—a bitter pill for the weaklings in faith of that day,—
and found fault with that as morbid which we considered healthy, and dishonoured with all manner of insidious calumnies and ignoble derision the ordinance which had been celebrated with all devoutness,—every one was roused, I know not whether more to indignation or to pity. Upon a closer consideration, however, it seemed impossible, for the sake of the cause involved, to allow the attacks of so influential and renowned a theologian upon that still recent and delicate work, the Union, to go unproven. All looked to Schleiermacher as the natural champion of this cause; and he was not the man to let himself be long sought after, where its interests were concerned. His pen was already pointed; he dipped it in the generous indignation which Ammon’s production had excited within him; and thus, in February 1818, appeared his “Letter to Mr Principal-Court-Chaplain Ammon, on his Examination of Harms’s Theses.” Whatever may be our judgment respecting the polemical tone of this composition, it is possible that something more of mildness and good-nature would per-
the village school until he was twelve years old; after which the clergyman of the place taught him the rudiments of Greek and Latin. He was then required to assist his father, who was a miller and farmer; and upon the death of the latter, he managed the property for his mother, until, in 1797, she disposed of it, and thus left him at liberty to follow his own strong impulse towards a more studious life. He went to school at Meldorf, and in 1799 removed to the University of Kiel, where he devoted himself to the study of theology. In 1806, the congregation at Lunden, in North Ditmarsh, elected him as their Diaconus, (Curate or Assistant Minister). Ten years later, he removed to Kiel in the capacity of Archidiaconus, becoming subsequently (1837) Church-Provost and Councillor, and (1842) Superior Councillor of Consistory. His numerous literary labours have all been occasioned or suggested, in a greater or less degree, by his active zeal and experience as a preacher and pastor. The “Ninety-five Theses” referred to in the text were published in 1817, as a kind of announcement of the Tercentenary Festival of the Reformation, which
haps have won over his opponent, rather than vanquished him; but Schleiermacher's whole character rendered it a thing impossible for him to oppose sweet to bitter; he was fond of a homœopathic cure in such cases, and as Ammon had employed wit in his challenge, it was natural that Schleiermacher should serve him with wit in return, and that of a flavour both salt and bitter. I myself, however, who just at that time saw much of Schleiermacher, can bear witness, that although upon other occasions he ascribed to himself, probably in jest, a certain itching for polemics, he was actuated and guided, in the work just referred to, purely by his zeal for the cause at issue. If, at the same time, his strokes fell upon the person, this was unavoidable; because the matter seemed to turn upon his annihilating the opponent's personal right of attack, and making the latter feel that this had been done. I do not make this observation for the purpose of wounding the feelings of his antagonist, who is still living, but for the purpose of stating the historical connexion as completely as possible from my own recollections, and of defending my friend who was held that year. It would seem that the author thought to commemorate Luther by imitating him in his mode of assailing the theological and ecclesiastical abuses of his time. Harms's bold and decided assertion, in these Theses, of the doctrines of Human Depravity and Saving Faith, gave rise to a fierce and widely-extended controversy, in the course of which he felt himself constrained to attempt a more elaborate exposition and defence of the views he had put forth. See his "Briefe zur nüthner Verständigung über meine Thesen" (Letters, intended to promote a better comprehension of my Theses), 1817, and "Dass es mit der Vernunftreligion nichts ist" (That Natural Religion [the Religion of Reason] amounts to nothing), 1819. The strife was maintained on both sides for a considerable time, and then dropped; its appreciable results, as is usual in such cases, being but small,—unless we reckon amongst them the honest, healthy celebrity which thence accrued to the author of the first challenge, and which his later years have abundantly justified and confirmed.—Tr.
against false accusations on the part of some who are ignorant of the facts; accusations which I, too, have subsequently heard.

But this was not the last conflict which our valiant combatant in the cause of the Union and Constitution of the Church had to sustain; others, incomparably more severe, were impending. No long time elapsed, before the ecclesiastical horizon was enveloped in an exceedingly ominous gloom. To the statesmen of the old school, the development of a more liberal constitution and a more important position for the Church, was from the very first a source of great annoyance; the suspicion of a new *hierarchical* preponderance found utterance,—at first in secret, but soon, also, aloud. Mistakes, exaggerations, remissness, and precipitation, on the part of the theologians, gave a semblance of reason to the objection, that the age was neither peaceful enough nor mature enough to allow of the Church's having a constitution of greater vitality [than that to which it had been accustomed]. And as, in the department of political life, especially from the year 1819, something of crime and something of thoughtlessness, revolutionary giddiness and the fantastic tricks of a superficial liberalism, called forth a necessary reaction, and a defensive solicitude and apprehensiveness with regard to every excitement of a free and lively character seemed almost to be but a part of the duty of caution and circumspection, it could not but be that by degrees, in the ecclesiastical department also, preference should be given to the policy of stopping short and standing still, rather than to that of following up the movement which had been begun. This is not the place, nor is it possible for me, to set forth and to pass judgment upon the individual *momenta* of the reaction in ecclesiastical affairs, as they followed upon and in
consequence of one another. Enough, the appearance of the new Prussian Liturgy and Agenda was the commencement and the signal of a new and in part opposite tendency, obstructive at once—at least in its immediate result—to the Union, and also to the Constitution of the Church. Schleiermacher could not, in accordance with the principles of his practical theology, approve either the contents or the form of the new liturgical arrangements. He would have been untrue to his most inward and essential nature if he had agreed to them; and it was a consequence involved in the energetic character of his mind, as well as in the nature of the position he had previously occupied, that he became the leader of the opposition. His pseudonymous publication, "On the Liturgical Right of Evangelical Sovereigns, a Theological Deliberation, by Pacificus Sincerus" (1824), struck at the root of the opposite tendency, and stirred up anew the controversy respecting the principles of law involved in the connexion between Church and State; a controversy which, in the age of indifference, had almost been laid to sleep amongst the theologians, and had merely dragged along a wretched and spiritless existence in the schools of the jurists. The consequence has been, that since that time there has also arisen in this department, amongst theologians and jurists, a more lively intercourse and conflict of diverse tendencies and opinions.—In appearance, the noble hero was vanquished. The opposite tendency has, practically, obtained the upper hand. But, that its supremacy is, I might say, merely interimistic, and that its theory, half out of fright at the consistent, logical development of itself in the writings of Augusti and others upon this subject, and half from a consciousness of the power of truth arrayed on the other side, becomes increasingly
modified, relaxes, and concedes, until, perhaps, a point has been found in which the true medium is situated; this is the work of the man who so long and so steadfastly maintained and led the opposition,—until so much had been conceded on the other part, that he thought he could not, without doing violence to the claims of truth and love, delay any longer at least a cessation of hostilities.* I am too little acquainted with the individual momenta of the proceedings with regard to the Agenda since the year 1827, in which I left my native country, to be capable of judging as to the inward motives by which Schleiermacher was influenced in his conditional acceptance of the Agenda. But this I know, that in the great concerns of the Church, he never did anything contrary to the dictates of his knowledge and his conscience, and he was just as far removed from the idle arrogance and self-will of an absolute opposition, as from the pitifulness of giving up a single particle of the truth, or of his convictions, for the sake of outward peace or gain. He thus failed, it is true, to reach the summit of his desires and strivings for the welfare of the Church;

* Schleiermacher's great object (see Brief Outline, § 287,) was to secure, as far as possible, the perfect combination of freedom with regularity, in public worship; to limit the subjectivity of the officiating minister, without reducing either himself or his congregation to the condition of mere machines. I was informed by a resident in Berlin, who is not unknown to the theological world of Germany, that Schleiermacher was accustomed practically to assert his liberty in this respect, even to the last. The Prussian Liturgy, namely, includes a general intercessory prayer, for the King, Royal Family, Army, and People of all ranks and conditions, which is usually recited after the sermon, though it may precede the latter. This form Schleiermacher declined to use; and substituted an extempore prayer, in which the same topics were taken up, and pretty much in the same order, as in the printed form. I am not aware that he attempted to vary the other parts of the Liturgy, to which, as being derived chiefly, I think, from certain of the ancient Liturgies, he might possibly feel less objection.—Tr.
OF SCHLEIERMACHER.

desires and strivings which proceeded from the most honest conviction. The tragic sorrow which this circumstance occasioned, he never concealed. But, by his example, his writings, and his efficient activity, he conducted the age to a point from which, (provided the Evangelical Church of Germany does not misapprehend its true life and well-being), it will accomplish, under more favourable and peaceful circumstances, that of which the might of an unfavourable and tempestuous condition of the world only permitted the noble genius of Schleiermacher to make a beginning. No great and clear idea has ever been lost, or remained but an image of fancy and a pious wish; least of all such as, by a reference to the inmost necessities of mankind and to the nature of the case, have been so energetically made a matter of consciousness within the Church, as the ideas to which we here allude have been by Schleiermacher.

In the last years of his life, Schleiermacher saw himself involved in a controversy with two persons with whom he would rather have remained at peace. The approaching celebration of the jubilee of the Augsburg Confession furnished those two distinguished theologians, Von Cölln* and Schulz†, of Breslau, with an occasion for publishing conjointly, and with a reference to certain disquieting signs of the times, a public declaration and preliminary caveat respecting theological liberty of doctrine in the Evangelical Universities, and its limitation by means of symbolical books,—in case the design should

* A divine of the moderate Rationalist school. He died February 17, 1833, in the forty-fifth year of his age. His principal work, a system of "Biblical Theology," was published after his death, with a memoir of the author prefixed, by his friend Schulz.—Tr.

† Dr. David Schulz, the accomplished editor of Griesbach's Greek Testament, and author of many important contributions to Exegetical Theology in its various branches.—Tr.
be entertained of introducing a new requirement of adherence to the Augsburg Confession.* Declaring the Augsburg Confession to be no longer adapted to represent the unity and community of faith and doctrine in the Evangelical Church, they pointed to a better future, in which, with a larger measure of agreement, and a more general diffusion of correct views, it would be possible and advisable to set up a new and more valid Confession. Schleiermacher, knowing himself to be perfectly agreed with these gentlemen in the maintenance of the Protestant liberty of doctrine against every kind of limitation, addressed a letter † to them, in which, on the one hand, he declared that there was but little ground for apprehending any new impositions of adherence to the symbolical books,—pointing out the perfectly unpractical and useless character of such impositions, and the unlikelihood, for this very reason, of their being resorted to; and, on the other hand, protested even against the wish that new confessional documents should, at any period whatsoever, take the place of the old. Looking at this letter in connexion with what Schleiermacher had written elsewhere respecting the essential character of the Protestant Symbols, (in the "Almanack of the Reformation" for the year 1819), one might possibly take offence at certain sharp points which, according to his custom, he carelessly left sticking out here and there; but the tone of calmness, pacification, and encouragement was unmistakably prevalent throughout the whole epistle. The passage, however, which contains the greatest occasion of stumbling, is that in which, in order to show how altogether impracti-

* The title runs,—"Ueber theologische Lehrfreiheit auf den evangelischen Universitäten und deren Beschränkung durch symbolische Bücher," (Breslau, 1830).—Ta.

† In the Studien und Kritiken for 1831, Part i.
cable it is to effect the exclusion or conversion of the Rationalists by means of orthodox formularies of doctrine and liturgies, he directs attention to the fact that it is possible for many a one, perhaps, even notwithstanding the difference of his own views, to accept and to use the prescribed liturgical and other formularies,—in his own sense and meaning, namely—without our being able to say in every case, unconditionally, that this constitutes a want of truth and faith, or a reservatio mentalis. It was to be foreseen, that this expression,—although, in its connexion with the whole, it explained itself, as being a benevolent and excusatory, rather than a morally strict judgment with regard to a whole series of cases which are of no infrequent occurrence, especially in the liturgical praxis,—would be subject to manifold misapprehension and misinterpretation. That the “Evangelical Church-Journal” was uncharitable enough to make it a reason for charging him with hypocrisy and laxity, nay with Jesuitism, occasioned him no surprise, and as he himself says, he silently left it to the enjoyment of its gratifying discovery; but that the two gentlemen before referred to also deemed it necessary, in their double reply, to call him to account on this head, was a circumstance which caused him pain. He did not omit to answer for himself, respecting this and respecting other matters, which had been made an occasion of reproach against him, as involving a contradiction between the earlier and the later Schleiermacher; he did so in the Preface to his “Sermons relating to the Commemoration of the Delivery of the Augsburg Confession” (1831). One sees, at the same time, what pain it occasioned him to be laid under this necessity. I will not attempt to roll away all the blame of the misunderstanding from him; but his defence
is sufficient to satisfy any one who knows Schleiermacher to have been just as decided an enemy of all hypocrisy and equivocation, as of the bondage of the letter. I cannot approve all that he has said with regard to the present significance of the Symbols, but I share with him the glad anticipation of a condition of the Church, in which the true unity and community of doctrine shall have existence and vitality in the midst of perfect liberty. In respect of the stand-point appropriate to such a discussion, however, I can but concede that he has not, with sufficient circumspection, distinguished between the two cases,—namely, that in which symbolical books and liturgical formularies are already in existence and in use, and that in which such things are newly set up for general use,—and judged them according to their difference; and the like with regard to the momenta of Reformation and Revolution.

It is impossible for me to speak of Schleiermacher's theological character and merits, without having the entire personality of the man, amiable and exalted as it was, brought to my recollection. I was taught to know and love his theology and his personality together; in him the one sustained and gave brightness to the other, and my experience has doubtless been the experience of several who have occupied a position of proximity to him,—that the one became intelligible and dear to a man by means of the other. If I further attempt to delineate, from the image which I retain of his personality, some of its principal features, I know well that I want the skill to produce a portrait such as would be worthy of him; not, however, either the love or the
truthfulness faithfully to describe the impression which he has made upon me in an intimate acquaintance of several years' duration.

I saw him for the first time in the spring of 1816. That moment I shall never forget. I had approached him by letter some months before, and had gone to Berlin especially in consequence of the encouragement which he had afforded me, for the purpose of habilitating myself in connexion with the Theological Faculty there. As his letter had expressed a friendly sincerity, rather than a cordial warmth, so I found it to be with himself, too, at our first conversational meeting. It was only by degrees that the shy and timid reverence with which I had approached him, gave place to another feeling; nay, it was, at first, only increased by the admiration which the immediate presence of his powerful soul, manifesting itself in his glance and in his speech, excited within me. But just then it was least of all my doing, that this timidity and shyness gradually disappeared, and gave place to an increasingly cordial and confidential respect. Any one who mustered courage to seek him, was very soon cordially met by him; and then, it was not merely the cheerful and jocose kind of social intercourse by which he tempered with gentleness the oppressive might of his genius, but it was just the loving soul, opening itself, simply and naturally, to every one upon whom he had reason for bestowing his confidence. He then no longer merely permitted an approach, but came to meet the individual, in an encouraging and confiding manner, and attracted to himself all that was susceptible and in need of love towards him. I can never think of the affectionate manner in which he drew me closer and closer towards him, bestowed upon me a constantly increasing confidence, encouraged and com-
forted me,—without the most grateful emotion. His love was no effeminate tenderness, accompanied by ever open, caressing speech; but an earnest, compact fire, which not merely passed through the stranger mind with a magnetic softness of attraction, but also convulsed it like an electric shock,—"yet even thus, always possessed for such as abound in vital energy a refreshing charm."

—Any one that did not understand and tolerate him in this guise, might easily feel himself repulsed in the midst of his approach; and thus it has happened with many, who had been accustomed to a more effeminate sort of friendship. But what he says in his Monologues is perfectly true: "I am sure of those who are really disposed to love me,—my interior nature; and firmly does my soul entwine itself about them, nor will it ever forsake them. They have learnt to know me; they behold my spirit; and those who once love it as it is, must love it ever more faithfully and ever more fervently, in proportion as it develops itself and fashions itself more dually in their sight. Of this possession I am as well assured as of my being; nor have I as yet lost any one that ever became dear to me in love." I am not the only one who is in a position to celebrate his fidelity and persistence in friendship. Those who occupied a still nearer position, and had been longer connected with him, will furnish a yet stronger testimony that he was one of the most faithful of men, and that he understood the noble art of keeping a friend, firm and warm, even in the midst of ill-tempers and incongruities.—It is a common saying, that along with a man's advance in years, his ability and inclination to form new friendships are diminished; the bloom of youth, it is said, is the proper season for laying the foundation of friendship; the later, colder, more isolating years of life are the less adapted to the
purpose, inasmuch as persons of the same age become more and more rare. In this respect, too, Schleiermacher continued fresh and young; he never isolated himself. The friends of his youth were but the stock of the, in him never-dying, tree of friendship, which even in his latest years put forth new branches. He knew how to set aside even the disparity of years and of intellect, by the youthful freshness and serenity of his affection.

It may sound paradoxical to the ears of strangers, and of those who judge according to appearances, but I speak with perfect truth when I affirm, that over the deepest ground of his heart love reigned supreme, from the very first,—and, as time went on, ever more purely and more tenderly; and that even the keenness of his intellect, the stinging wit, the bitterness of speech with which he fought and wounded, were never able to overcome the love which was the foundation of his heart. I know no one that possessed so noble a tolerance, so expansive a heart, ready lovingly to judge and to bear with the most various gradations and tendencies of intellect. Notwithstanding the decision and finality which charac-

terized his mode of thinking, he possessed a universal capability of finding out and recognizing, without envy or repining, whatever was good in others. When I lived with him in Berlin, he was the man who, in spite of all misapprehension, whenever he detected anything like ability, either amongst his ecclesiastical or amongst his academical associates in office, was the readiest of all to yield to it a loving recognition and eulogy. And I remember that on more than one occasion he set younger men right, when they had let fall an arrogant, intolerant judgment respecting others. "Leave me that man in honour," was his saying; "he has ability and merit, in his way."
He never had reason to be afraid of any antagonist. Nor was he ever so. He was never in want of opponents; and just as little was he in want of a mind for controversy. If he was merely attacked personally, so that the attack did not at the same time affect any important cause of which he was the representative, he never defended himself. He rebuked his adversary by his silence. For ordinary learned controversies he had not enough either of time or of egoistic irritability. But when he saw the truth, the welfare of the Church or of the State, placed in jeopardy, and thought the foe of sufficient consequence, he never delayed; weakly tolerance was then as far from his thoughts, as a sparing of his time and ease. Usually the first in the field, he attacked the opponent with every force, every art, and every privilege of an honourable warfare. The employment of irony, of biting wit, in controversy, he considered allowable, nay, necessary. He did not understand wherefore he should not make use of the weapons which nature had bestowed upon him, and was of opinion that when the opposite party had come forward in a spirit of self-conceit, there was nothing so effective, for the purpose of enforcing upon him the salutary feeling of his own insignificance, as the lash of a stinging wit. He had a kind of pleasure in wit, an instinctive turn that way. But amidst the enlivening use of this weapon, he strictly and diligently kept in view the cause itself which he had to defend. He practised Polemics as a moral duty and art to which he felt himself inwardly called by the nature of his genius and by his love to the cause. If he had once apprehended the necessity of a controversy, he flung himself with the whole force of his personality against that of his antagonist. The personal element in his polemical style often served merely by
way of dramatic enlivenment; but it is in a far higher degree the natural expression of his hearty interest in the cause at issue, an interest by which he was penetrated in the most lively manner. His mode of controversy was not convenient either to himself or to his antagonist. He made earnest work of it, and drew blood. He knew beforehand that he would draw down upon himself, from this quarter and from that, evil report, hostility, anger, and revenge; he regretted this—but, for the sake of the cause involved, he willingly accepted that which, from the ordinary character of men, was inevitable. His valour was in such cases greater than his prudence. Whatever prudence he may have had, the prudence of the indolent and the cowardly was of a kind which he ever disdained.

Always, and in every age, the number of those who labour, accomplish, and produce, to the same extent as Schleiermacher, will be but small. The natural rapidity and certainty of his mental movements does a great deal in the way of explanation. What he wrote for the press had been previously so well considered and prepared, even with regard to the form, that—since he always possessed at the same time a mastery of language—he never had occasion to strike out any thing. None of his sermons, none of his lectures cost him more than the time which was requisite for a thorough meditation. A small scrap of paper sufficed for his memoranda, even in lectures such as those upon the History of Philosophy. Thus in every labour, by his various proficiency, he saved time and spirits for new intellectual acquisition and new exertion. He was, moreover, very economical with regard to time, and by this means had time for everything that his very comprehensive vocation requi-
red of him. In his latter years, certainly, I have heard him complain that he was no longer able to accomplish all that he wished. But it is precisely the most industrious and creative class of men, by whom this complaint is most emphatically made; and the material energy, which is also an essential requisite, does not grow with a man's years. Schleiermacher had, altogether, but a limited capital of physical strength at his command. His bodily constitution was naturally weak and delicate—at least in the years in which I lived with him—and sickly too. But what a mastery he exercised over it, compelling it, even in its sickly states, to be the servant of his mind! Labours and journeys, official activity and social life,—his body must suffice for all and obey the requirements of all. In pedestrian traveling* he always took the lead; in the evening the last to go to rest, in the morning the first to prepare for renewing the journey. I know that he has preached, and delivered lectures, when suffering from spasms of the stomach, and no one has perceived that he was ill. I have often had an opportunity of observing, that when he has been in company till late in the evening, (and it was not easy for such meetings to last too long for him), the most cheerful and animated of all who were there,—he has lectured or preached next morning, with freshness unimpaired, often as early as six o'clock. This Socratic mastery and might of the spirit over the body was a part of his inmost nature, and secured to him in

* It may be as well just to remind the reader, that frequently, German professors, as well as German students, turn the long vacation (or at least a part of it) to account in this particular way, by having recourse to the best of all possible preparations for the fatigues of a University campaign.—Tn.
age that renewed youth, with which he "smilingly saw
the light of his eyes departing, and the white hair
springing up between the locks of blond,"—with which,
even to his latest breath, he maintained so lively a par-
ticipation both in the earnest labour and in the cheerful
enjoyment of life. Of the wonderful account which we
have heard lately,* that "whoever has had occasion to
observe him within the last three years of his life, will
be able to testify that he was the subject of an often
irrepressible sadness, a prostration, an inability to con-
tend against sorrow, which was such as to excite com-
passion,"—of this apocryphal compassionate story I un-
derstand nothing. "A domestic calamity," it is said,
"furnished the first inducement to this state of mind;
or, to express myself more correctly, the death of his
only son tore away the flood-gates which still dammed
up the feelings of a broken existence,—broken, he him-
self, perhaps, knew not how.—From that time there
was an affecting joylessness in Schleiermacher's preach-
ing; the plan of his masterly discourses remained the
same; but his tone, his manner, the solution of his dia-
lectic enigmas, had undergone a change. One would
not believe it, and yet he might every Sunday convince
himself of the fact,—that Schleiermacher never again left
the pulpit without shedding tears:" and so the story,
devoid of taste or connexion, goes on still further, and
becomes at last so senseless as to exhibit to us a man
who shut both eye and ear, and with tears entreated his
congregation to do nothing but be resigned, and "close
their eyes and ears,"—and who, at last, approached with
enthusiastic confidence nearer and nearer to the imme-
diate appearance [vision?] of the Redeemer, until he was
able to revel in the corporeity, the personality, in the

* Extraordinary Supplement to the Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 77, 1834.
entire actuality of the God-Man, as Thomas saw him after the Resurrection?*—What a piece of nonsense! What an unfamiliar, nay, what an impossible Schleiermacher has this marvellous dreamer beheld! The death of his only and hopeful son did communicate a most vehement shock to his mind. How was it possible that it should be otherwise? But a man who could so lift himself up amidst the first sorrows of his paternal heart,—go to the grave of his ardently beloved son,—and speak with such composure, such strength of faith, as Schleiermacher did,—could not, either then or afterwards, have had the feeling of a broken existence. Schleiermacher possessed by nature a very profound and powerful sensibility, but he had also an equally energetic power of mind to govern it at all times. Long before the death of his son, I have seen him leave the pulpit with tears in his eyes. This profoundest stirring up of his religious feeling, however, merely gave to his discoursing the full warmth of conviction; it never hindered him from thinking and speaking clearly and with power. I saw him at two different times after the death of his beloved son, but on both occasions, I found in him the same Christian ευφροσύνη with which, in previous years, he had been able to master both bodily and mental pain, and to dictate to his feeling its proper measure.

Schleiermacher has this in common with the greatest and noblest of men, that there is something animating even about his death. It was the reflection, nay, the glorification of his life.

* I have been at some pains in rendering the words of this remarkable passage; for its meaning I am not accountable. The reader who avoids stumbling at it on this account, will at least be tempted to question its aesthetic propriety.—Tr.
That, when the tidings of his death resounded, not merely in Berlin, but through all Germany, nay, as far as the German name extends, all was consternation and sorrow over the great, irreparable loss,—that friends and pupils, admirers, opponents, strangers, his congregation at Church and at the High School, the entire city in which he had lived, the Court, and the people, vied with one another in giving splendour to his funeral,—this is assuredly no mere outward testimony to the greatness of his name. It is much, and it is beautiful, but this is not what I have in view. I am referring to the inward history of his death. I have read the record of the observations, made with the attentiveness of affection, and committed to writing for the benefit of his more intimate friends, by her who in life was nearest to him, and who during his last days did not leave him for a single moment. As much of this as is suitable for a more extended circulation, I am permitted to communicate. "The temper of his mind during the whole course of his illness, was marked by a serene and gentle tranquillity, a punctual compliance with every direction; there was never a sound of complaining or discontent; he was always alike cheerful and patient, although grave, and retired within himself." "One day, when he awoke from a slumber into which he had been thrown by means of opium, he called his beloved consort to his bed-side, and said, 'I am, to be sure, properly speaking, in a state which fluctuates between consciousness and the absence of consciousness, but inwardly I am spending most delightful moments; I am constrained to be constantly in the midst of the profoundest speculations, which, however, are here identical with the most heartfelt religious experiences.'"

I find in this incident a beautiful crowning of his life
with glory. The man who had struggled his whole life long, to attain to the higher unity of the religious and the speculative, but who, with modesty and caution, regarded it not as the commencement but as the ultimate aim of his thinking,—receives it as a reward and signal of departure for the heavenly kingdom, in those moments when the outward man dies, in order that the inward man may rise, free and pure, to the perfect enjoyment of eternal life in God!

The last days and hours of his life were pervaded and irradiated by the presence of religion. Even his dreams were reflexes of his religious life and activity. "I have had such a beautiful dream," he said on one occasion, "and this dream has left with me quite a peculiar and salutary frame of mind. I was in a very large assembly,—there were many persons, familiar and unfamiliar, all looking at me, and wishing to hear from me something of a religious character; it was in the nature of an instruction, and I gave it with so much pleasure!"—Affectionately mindful of children and friends, and, in proportion as he drew nearer to the important moment, more profoundly immersed in love, as the inmost spring of his being, he said, "To the children I leave the saying of St John, 'Love one another!'" "And I charge thee," said he to his consort, "to salute all my friends, and to tell them how heartily I loved them."

He had soon become certain of his approaching death; he would have been glad to remain with those who were dear to him; he felt that he had yet much of hardness to endure, before arriving at eternal rest; but he went to meet the last conflict with composure, and with devotedness to the sacred will of the Eternal Love.

"The last morning, his suffering visibly increased, he complained of a violent sensation of burning, inward-
ly, and the first and last murmur forced its way from
his lips,—'Alas, Lord, my pain is great!' In a deeply
affecting manner he then said to his family, 'Dear
children, you should now all of you go from the room,
and leave me alone; I would fain spare you the woeful
spectacle.'—The perfect lineaments of death presented
themselves; his eye appeared to have grown dim,—his
death-struggle to have been accomplished. At this
moment he laid his two forefingers upon his left eye, as
he often did when reflecting deeply, and began to speak:
'We have the reconciliation-death of Jesus Christ, his
body and his blood.'—While thus engaged, he had
raised himself up, his features began to grow animated,
his voice became clear and strong, and he said with
priestly solemnity, 'Are ye one with me in this faith?
to which his friends replied with a loud 'Yea!' 'Then
let us celebrate the Lord's Supper! But there can be no
talk of the sacristan. Quick, quick! let no one stumble
at matters of form!' After that which was necessary
for the purpose had been fetched, (his friends having
waited with him, during the interval, in solemn silence),
he began, with increasingly radiant features, and eyes
in which there had returned a wonderful, indescribable
brightness, nay, a sublime glow of affection, with which
he looked upon those around him,—to utter a few words
of prayer and of introduction to the sacred service.
After this, addressing in full and aloud, to each indivi-
dual, and last of all to himself, the words of the insti-
tution, he first gave the bread and the wine to the
others who were present, then partook of them himself,
and said, 'Upon these words of Scripture I abide;
they are the foundation of my faith.' After he had
pronounced the benediction, his eye first turned once
more towards his consort with an expression of perfect
love, and then he looked at each individual with affecting and fervent cordiality, uttering these words,—"Thus are we, and abide, in this love and fellowship, one!" He laid himself back upon the pillow. The radiance still rested upon his features. After some minutes he said, 'Now I can hold out here no longer;' and again, 'Give me another position.' He was laid upon his side; he breathed a few times; life came to a stand. The children had entered the room in the mean time, and surrounded the bed, kneeling. His eye gradually closed."

In the anguish of sorrow, and in the feeling of spiritual elevation, I have nothing to add further, save the words of Scripture, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord!" and, in recollection of the saying with which I once dedicated a book to him, "Be mindful of your teachers, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose end contemplate, and be followers of their faith!"
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PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It has always appeared to me a matter of no ordinary difficulty, to deliver academical discourses under the guidance of a hand-book constructed by another; for every deviation in opinion seems to require at the same time a deviation from that order of arrangement which has originated from a different point of view. Certainly, the plan alluded to becomes the more easy, in proportion as the peculiar views of individuals with regard to details are subordinated to a common view with regard to the whole; that is, in proportion as that has existence, which is commonly called a School. But how little this is the case in Theology at the present time, every one knows. For the very same reason, therefore, which makes it a matter of necessity,—if a guiding-clue is to be employed at all, (a practice which is at all events useful, in many respects)—that I should construct one for myself,—it is not competent for me to put forth the claim that other instructors should make use of mine. If I should therefore appear to be going a step too far, in introducing to the public at large, by means of the press, a work which is intended merely for the present and future hearers of my lectures, I comfort myself with the thought, that these few sheets contain the whole of my present views with regard to the study of theology, and that these views, whatever their specific character, may, perhaps, even by their deviation from those which are held by other men, operate in the way of stimulus, and generate something better.

Other teachers are accustomed, in their encyclopaedian courses,
to give also a brief abstract of the individual discipline themselves which are thus exhibited; to me it appeared more fitting to conform to the example of those who, in such discourses, prefer to fix the student's whole attention upon the formal side of the subject, in order that the significance of the individual parts, and their connexion, may be the better apprehended.

DR. F. SCHLEIERMACHER.

BERLIN, December 1810.

---

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

After the lapse of nearly twenty years, which have passed away since this little book first appeared, it was perhaps only natural that I should find much to alter in matters of detail; although the theory, and the mode of treatment, viewed upon the whole, have remained altogether the same. What I have altered, in expression and in position, is also, I hope, improved. In like manner, too, it is my desire that the brief notes appended to the main propositions of the work may not fail of their end, which is, to facilitate the progress of the reader.

The numbering of the paragraphs of each section separately, in the first edition, occasioned much prolixity in the citation of them, and a change has therefore been made in this respect.

DR. F. SCHLEIERMACHER.

BERLIN, October 1830.
BRIEF OUTLINE, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THEOLOGY, in the sense in which the word is constantly taken here, is a positive science, the parts of which are connected into a whole, only by their common relation to a determinate mode of faith, that is, a determinate form of the God-consciousness; those of Christian Theology, therefore, by their relation to Christianity.

A positive science, namely, is, in general, a body of scientific elements which have a connectedness of their own,—not as if, by a necessity arising out of the very idea of science, they formed a constituent part of the scientific organization,—but only in so far as they are requisite in order to the solution of a practical problem. If, on the other hand, a Rational Theology has, in past times, been exhibited as an essential part of the scientific organization: it is true that this also has reference to the God of our God-consciousness; yet, being a speculative science, it is altogether a different thing from the Theology with which we have to do.

§ 2. A Theology will be formed in connexion with every determinate mode of faith, in the measure in which the latter is communicated rather by the aid of mental representations* than of symbolical actions, and in the

* Vorstellung, in its older and more established acceptation, is the generic term employed to designate the contents of the intellectual consciousness; it may also mean the act by which these are brought before the mind. It is made to include, as its leading subordinates, Anschauungen, (percep-
measure in which, at the same time, it obtains historical importance and independence; which Theology, again, may be different for every different mode of faith, because it is connected with the individual character of the latter, as it respects both form and contents.

*Only* in the measure stated; because, in a community of small extent, the necessity for a Theology, properly so called, does not arise; and because, in the case of a preponderance of symbolical actions, the ritual Technology [*Technik*] which contains the interpretation of the latter, hardly deserves the name of a science.

§ 3. Theology is not the business of *all* who belong to a particular Church, nor *in so far as* they belong to it; but only *when* and *in so far as* they have a share in the *Guidance* of the Church: so that the *contrast* between such persons and the mass [of Church Members], and the *prominent appearance* of Theology, are matters each of which implies the existence of the other.

The expression "Guidance of the Church" is here to be taken in the broadest sense, without reference to any one particular form.

§ 4. The more the Church advances in its development, and the more numerous the regions of language and of culture over which it extends itself, the more...
many-partedly does Theology also become organized; for
which reason, Christian Theology is that which has at-
tained to the highest state of cultivation.

For, the more these two things come to pass, the more nu-
mérous are the differences, both in men's conceptions and in
their modes of life, which Theology has to connect together,
and the more various the historical material which it has to
investigate.

§ 5. Christian Theology, accordingly, is the collective
embodiment of those branches of scientific knowledge and
those rules of art, without the possession and application
of which a harmonious Guidance of the Christian Church,
that is a Christian Church-Government, is not possible.

This, namely, is the relation laid down in § 1; for the
Christian Faith, in and for itself, does not need such an ap-
paratus in order to its efficacious activity, either in the indi-
vidual soul, or in the circumstances connected with the social
life of the family.

§ 6. The said branches of knowledge, when they are
acquired and possessed without reference to the govern-
ment of the Church, cease to have a theological character,
and become assignable to those sciences to which, ac-
cording to the nature of their contents, they respectively
belong.

These sciences are, then, according to the nature of the
case, Philology and History, Psychology and Morals; together
with certain disciplinæ which are off-shoots from the latter,—
the Doctrine of Art in general, and the Philosophy of Religion.

§ 7. By virtue of this relation, the variety of know-
ledge referred to is, to the will to be efficient in the
Guidance of the Church, as the body to the soul.

Without this will, the unity of Theology is lost; and its
parts become disintegrated into the different elements of which
it is composed.

§ 8. But, as these heterogeneous branches of know-
ledge are connected into such a whole, only by the pre-
sence of an interest in Christianity, so also this interest in Christianity can manifest itself in an appropriate activity, only by being coupled with the possession of the said branches of knowledge.

According to § 2, a Guidance of the Church can proceed only from a highly developed historical consciousness; but it can become truly useful, moreover, only by means of a clear knowledge respecting the relations of [men's] religious states towards all that are of a different kind.

§ 9. If we conceive of an interest in religion and a scientific spirit, existing in a state of union, in the highest degree and in the greatest possible equilibrium, and with a view to both theory and practice,—we have the idea of a Prince of the Church.

This appellation for the theological Ideal is, it must be admitted, appropriate only when the disparity between the members of the Church is great, and when, at the same time, the exercise of influence over an extensive region of the Church is possible. But it seems more suitable than the term "Father of the Church," which has already received the stamp of currency for a particular circle; and, for the rest, it does not in the least involve any allusion to an official relation.

§ 10. If we conceive of this equilibrium as done away: then, he who has, in his own person, cultivated chiefly the knowledge that relates to Christianity, is a Theologian in the more restricted sense of the term; and he, on the other hand, who cultivates especially the activity which has to do with the government of the Church, is a Minister [Kleriker].*

This natural sundering of the two characters shows itself outwardly with different degrees of prominence at different

* Etymologically, this word should of course have been rendered Clergyman. But, to say nothing of the invidious distinction which in practice confines the application of the latter term to the ministers of but one or two of the Christian Communities existing in this country, (which, however, would of itself suffice to justify our rejection of the word as an adequate representative of Schleiermacher's more catholic meaning), it
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... times; and the more it prevails, the more indispensable is a lively interaction between the two classes, in order that the Church may maintain its ground.—For the rest, the term Theologian will, in the remaining portion of this work, be taken for the most part in the broader sense, as comprehending both tendencies.

§ 11. Every dealing with any branches of theological knowledge as such, whatever its nature, is always to be reckoned within the department of Church-Guidance; and whatever process of thought,—whether it be more of a constructive, or more of a regulative character,—may be pursued concerning that activity which has to do with the Guidance of the Church,—the said thinking always belongs to the department of the Theologian in the stricter sense of the term.

Even the scientific activity of the Theologian must have for its object the promotion of the Church’s welfare,—and partakes, therefore, of a clerical character; and all technical prescriptions with regard even to the properly clerical forms of activity, have their place within the circle of the theological sciences.

§ 12. If, according to what has been said, all true Theologians also take part in the Guidance of the Church, and all who are active in the government of the Church also have their life in Theology; it follows that, notwithstanding the one-sided tendency of each class, both these characteristics,—an interest in the well-being of the Church, and a scientific spirit,—must be united in every individual.

For as in the opposite case, the scholar would no longer be a Theologian, but would merely be occupied in working up is, if we mistake not, commonly used to designate the individual as being a member of the clerical order, rather than as a preacher, pastor, or Church dignitary. Applied to our own country, therefore, the term would really include that which is here opposed to it by the author; for we have no large order or class of unordained theologians and Church dignitaries, as they have in Germany.—Tn.
certain elements of Theology in the spirit of that particular science from which they might happen to be derived; so also the activity of the Minister would be, not a guidance technically correct, or even directed by prudent thoughtfulness, but simply a confused exercise of influence.

§ 13. Every one who finds himself called to the exercise of the guiding activity in the Church, determines for himself the mode of his working, according to the measure in which one or the other of these two elements preponderates in him.

Without such an inward calling, no one is in truth either a Theologian or a Minister; but neither of these modes of working is in any way dependent upon the circumstance, that the government of the Church constitutes the basis of a particular civil status.

§ 14. No one can be perfectly possessed of the various branches of theological knowledge in their full extent; partly because every discipline in particular is susceptible of an infinite development in detail, and partly because the diversity of disciplinæ requires a variety of talents, which can hardly be all possessed in an equal degree by any one individual.

This capability of development, even to the extent of an infinity of detail, applies as well to all that is historical, and all that is connected with the historical, as to all technical rules in relation to the variety of cases that may possibly arise.

§ 15. If, however, every one should determine on this account to confine himself wholly to some one part of Theology; the whole would have existence neither in any one nor in all together.

Not in the latter,—because, with such a kind of distribution, no co-operation could take place between the individual occupants of different departments; nay, strictly speaking, there could not be even a communication amongst them.

§ 16. A mastery, therefore, of all the theological disciplinæ in their essential features, is the condition un-
ORDER which alone even but one of them can be dealt with in the manner and the spirit which are proper to Theology.

For only thus,—when every individual, along with his own particular discipline, possesses also a general comprehension of the whole,—is it possible for communication to take place between all and sundry; and only thus is it possible for each, by means of the discipline to which he specially devotes himself, to exercise an efficient influence upon the whole.

§ 17. Whether a man labours with a view to the perfecting of a particular discipline, and what discipline he selects for this purpose, are matters which are determined chiefly by the peculiar character of the talent possessed by the individual, but also, in part, by his views with regard to the prevailing need of the Church at the time.

The prosperous advancement of Theology in general, depends in a great measure upon the satisfaction of this condition,—that there shall be found, at any and every given period, distinguished talents for that, the onward cultivation of which is most needed. Those persons, however, can always be efficient in the greatest variety of ways, who have mastered the largest number of disciplines in a certain degree of proportionateness, without aiming at special proficiency in any one of them; whereas, on the contrary, those who devote themselves exclusively to a single department, are capable of accomplishing most as scholars.

§ 18. The following, therefore, are matters which are indispensable to every Theologian. In the first place, a correct view of the mutual connexion existing between the different parts of Theology, and of the particular value of each in relation to the common object. In the next place, a knowledge of the internal organization of every discipline in particular, and of those leading topics included in it, which are the most essential with regard to the entire connexion. Further, an acquaintance with those helps by means of which he may at any time pro-
cure immediately whatever information he may require. Finally, *practice* and *certainty* in the application of those precautions which are necessary, in order to his making the best and most correct use of the results presented by the labours of others.

The first two particulars are frequently united, under the title *Theological Encyclopædia*; and the third, too, (namely, *Theological Bibliography*), is possibly drawn into the same connexion. The fourth is a section of the art of Criticism which has not been worked out as a separate discipline, and concerning which but few rules can be given in the way of teaching; so that its attainment depends almost exclusively upon the possession of a certain *natural capacity*, and upon *practice*.

§ 19. Every one who wishes to make himself master of a particular discipline in its whole extent, must make it his object to *sift* and to *supplement* what others have already accomplished therein.

Without an effort of this kind he would, whatever the completeness of his knowledge, be but a mere depositary of *tradition*; a mental activity which is, of all, the most subordinate and the least important.

§ 20. The encyclopædian outline which is intended to be given here, relates merely to the *first* of the general requisites above mentioned (§ 18); only that it deals, at the same time, with the *individual disciplinae* in the same manner as with the *whole*.

Such an outline is usually called a *Formal Encyclopædia*; in contradistinction to which, those which are denominated *Material* are intended rather to present a brief sketch of the leading *contents* of the individual *disciplinae*, but are less exact in setting forth their *organization*. Inasmuch as Encyclopædia is, in its very nature, the first Introduction to the study of Theology, it certainly has connected with it, also, the *Technology* of the order according to which one ought to proceed in the said study,—or what is usually called *Methodology*. But this, in so far as it does not present itself spon-
taneously, upon an exhibition of the inward connexion [of the various theological disciplinae], depends, in the present condition of our academical institutions, as well as of our literature, too much upon accidental circumstances, to make it worth while that we should constitute this a particular section, even, of the discipline with which we are occupied.

§ 21. There is no such thing as a knowledge with regard to Christianity, so long as men,—instead of endeavouring, on the one hand, to understand the essential nature of Christianity in its contrast to other modes of faith and other churches,—and on the other, to understand the essential nature of Religion and of Religious Communities in connexion with the other activities of the human mind,—content themselves with a merely empirical mode of apprehension.

The fact that the essential nature of Christianity is connected with a certain history, merely determines more particularly the mode of the understanding insisted upon; it is a circumstance which cannot prejudice the problem itself.

§ 22. Unless Religious Communities are to be looked upon as practical mistakes, it must be possible to show that the existence of such associations is a necessary element in order to the development of the human mind.

The first part of the alternative has recently been exemplified, in the “Reflections on the Essential Nature of Protestantism.”* What constitutes Atheism, properly so called, is just a looking at religion itself in the very same way.

* Betrachtungen über das Wesen des Protestantismus. Thus the title of the work referred to is given by Schleiermacher. Under this title, however, I have sought for it in vain. Probably he meant to refer to “Betrachtungen über den Protestantismus,” (8vo, Heidelberg, 1826). The first chapter of the latter book is entitled “Das Wesen des Priestertums;” and this may have led to the apparent mistake. The work was published anonymously; it is attributed to a certain K. I. Jochmann, of whom I know nothing further. What I have to say of the book is derived from a merely cursory examination of it, and is so far open to cor-
§ 23. The farther development of the notion of Religious Communities must also yield an indication, in what manner and in what degree one may be different from another; and likewise, how that which is individually characteristic in the fellowships of faith which are historically given, is related to these differences [which are conceived of as possible]. And the place for this is in the Philosophy of Religion.

The latter name, employed in this (certainly not yet altogether usual) sense, designates a discipline which, in relation to the idea of the Church, stands in the same position with regard to Ethics, as a certain other discipline which has to do with the idea of the State, and a third, which has to do with the idea of Art.

§ 24. All that is necessary in order to a proper exhi-}

tion. The fundamental principle appears to be a thoroughly Kantian identification of religion and morality. The author starts with sundry quotations from Hume, setting forth the evil consequences which have resulted from the separation of the two; and, pursuing his principle to its furthest consequences, exhibits Christianity as absolutely opposed to what (expressing the parallel meaning, as he has done, in parallel terminology) we may call Priestianity and Churchianity. The Church, in so far as it can be said to have any existence at all, becomes merely a moral association, and the Christian minister a moral teacher (in the Kantian sense). In short, while the book is not without some good things in detail, its general tendency is decidedly negative and destructive. I subjoin a brief synopsis of the contents, and must refer the reader who is desirous of further information to the work itself. Book I. is introductory, being devoted to the statement and discussion of principles. Chap. i. The Essence of Priestianity. Chap. ii. Christianity and its Disfigurement. Chap. iii. The Purser Transmissions of Christianity (these the author finds amongst the sects of the Middle Ages). Chap. iv. Protestantism. Chap. v. The Aberrations of Protestantism. Book II. (Historical, containing the application and verification of the author's principles), The Protestant Churches. Chap. i. The Presbyterians (especially those of Scotland. Neal's "History of the Puritans," and, if my memory serves me, M'Crie's "Life of Knox," have stood the author in good stead). Chap. ii. The Episcopal Church (of England, of course). Chap. iii. The Political Church (as organized under the German Princes).—Tn.
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bition, (upon the basis just pointed out), of the essential nature of Christianity, by virtue of which it is a peculiar mode of faith,—as also of the form of the Christian Community,—and, at the same time, of the manner in which each of these, again, is subdivided and differenced,—all this, taken together, forms the division of Christian Theology which we call Philosophical Theology.

The appellation is justified, on the one hand, by the connexion of the problem involved with the science of Ethics, and on the other, by the nature of the contents of that problem; which has to do for the most part with notional definitions. Such a discipline, however, has not hitherto been exhibited or recognised as a unity, because the necessity for it, in the form in which it is here conceived of, does not arise until we come to deal with the problem of organizing the theological sciences. Still, the matter of the discipline in question has already been worked up with a tolerable degree of completeness, in consequence of certain practical necessities which have grown out of various circumstances of the age.

§ 25. The purpose of Christian Church-Guidance is both extensively and intensively conservative and progressive; and the knowledge relating to this activity forms a Technology which we, grouping together all its different branches, designate by the name, Practical Theology.

In the cultivation of this discipline, too, up to the present time, there has been a very unequal distribution of the labour applied. The details, namely, of official duty, have been discussed with great copiousness; but, on the other hand, that which relates to the work of guidance and arrangement upon the whole, has received but scanty attention,—indeed, the connexion proper to a disciplinary treatment of the subject has been observed only with regard to individual portions of it.

§ 26. But Church-Guidance requires also that there shall be a knowledge of the Whole that is to be guided, as viewed in its existing condition; which condition, (since the whole referred to is of a historical character),
is capable of being understood only when it is viewed as a product of the Past; and this apprehension [of the Past and the Present as antecedent and consequent, and of the latter as explained by the former], in its entire extent, constitutes Historical Theology, in the wider sense of the term.

The Present cannot be rightly dealt with as the germ of a Future which is to correspond more nearly to the [true] notion [of the thing referred to,—i. e. Christianity organized in the form of a Christian Community], unless it is perceived how this Present has itself been developed out of the Past.

§ 27. If Historical Theology exhibits every point of time [in the history of Christianity] in its true relation to the idea of Christianity; it is at once not merely the foundation of Practical, but also the verification of Philosophical Theology.

It will be both, of course, in so much the greater degree, the more manifold the developements which are already presented to our view. For this reason, Church-Guidance was, at first, a matter rather of correct instinct [than of careful study], and Philosophical Theology manifested itself in attempts of but little power.

§ 28. Historical Theology, accordingly, forms the proper Body of theological study; and is connected with Science, strictly so called, by means of Philosophical, and with the active Christian Life by means of Practical Theology.

Historical Theology also includes within itself, historically, the Practical division of the science; since the correct understanding of any particular period must needs show also what were the leading views in accordance with which the Church was governed during that period. And by reason of the connexion which was pointed out in § 27, Philosophical Theology must also, in like manner, be mirrored in Historical Theology.

§ 29. If Philosophical Theology, as a discipline, were brought to a proper degree of perfection, it might form
the commencement of the entire course of theological study. As it is, on the contrary, the individual portions of it are to be acquired only in a fragmentary manner, in connexion with the study of Historical Theology; but even this can take place only when the study of Ethics, which we have to regard as being at the same time the science of the principles of History, has gone before.

Without a constant reference to ethical principles, even the study of Historical Theology can be nothing but an unconnected preliminary exercise, and must needs degenerate into unintelligent tradition. This enables us, to a great extent, to explain the state of confusion in which the theological disciplines are so often presented, and the total want of certainty which is manifested in their application to the guidance of the Church.

§ 30. Not only is it impossible for the Technology which is yet wanting for the purposes of Church-Guidance, to present itself, except as a result of the perfecting of Historical by means of Philosophical Theology; but even the customary imparting of rules respecting the details of official duty, can work only in the manner of a mechanical prescription, unless it is preceded by the study of Historical Theology.

The consequences of occupying one's self prematurely with this Technology, are a practical superficiality, and an indifference to scientific progress.

§ 31. Within this trilogy,—Philosophical, Historical, and Practical Theology,—the entire course of theological study is included: and the most natural order for the present Outline is, indisputably, to begin with Philosophical Theology, and conclude with Practical.

Whatever division we might choose to begin with, there would always be a good deal which we should find it necessary to assume from the other two, on account of the mutual relation which exists between them all.
PART THE FIRST.

OF PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY.
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§ 32. Since the peculiar, essential character of Christianity is as little susceptible of a purely scientific construction as of a merely empirical apprehension, it admits only of being defined critically (compare § 23) by comparing that which, in Christianity, is historically given, with those antitheses by virtue of which it is possible for Religious Communities to be different from one another.

Although certain general rubrics may be laid down with respect to characteristic differences, still, we cannot construct the individuality of individual men [ideally, a priori]; and the same process is equally impossible with regard to the individuality of such collective or moral personalities as are here referred to.

§ 33. The point of departure, therefore, of Philosophical Theology can be taken only above [or beyond] Christianity in the logical sense of the word; that is, in the general notion of a Religious Community, or Fellowship of Faith.

In accordance, namely, with what has been said before, it may be laid down as a general principle, that every determinate form of faith, and every individual Church is capable of being rightly understood only by means of the relations of co-existence and of subsequence which it sustains towards others;
and so far, the point of departure referred to is the same for all the analogous discipline of other Theologies [than the Christian], inasmuch as, in order to exhibit the relations just mentioned, they must all revert to the same higher notion, and to the possibility of its being subdivided.

§ 34. The relation of any historically-given condition of Christianity to the Idea of Christianity, is determined not alone by the contents of the said condition, but also by the manner in which it has been produced.

These two things, it is true, are matter of reciprocal implication; inasmuch as it is not possible for states of different character to have been produced from the same earlier condition otherwise than by some difference in the process; and so of the converse. This, however, renders it so much the safer to employ, by way of preference, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, for the purpose of finding out the above relation. And that, in the case of a living and historical whole, its various conditions do not all stand in the same relation to the Idea of the whole, is self-evident.

§ 35. Since Ethics, as the science of the principles of History, can also exhibit the mode-of-becoming of a historical whole only in a general way; so, in like manner, it is only in the way of Criticism, by a comparison of the general differences there exhibited [i. e. in the science of Ethics] with that which is historically given, that we are able to find out what, in the development of Christianity, is the pure expression of its Idea, and what, on the contrary, must be regarded as a deviation from that Idea, and consequently as a morbid condition.

Morbid conditions do occur in historical, not less than in organic individuals; to subordinate differences in development there can be no reference here.

§ 36. As often as Christianity, [thus historically organized], divides itself into a plurality of Church-Communities, all of which, notwithstanding, lay claim to the same appellation, Christian,—the same problems arise
with regard to these also; and there is then further, in addition to the general, for every one of these a special, Philosophical Theology.

Manifestly, this is the position in which we find ourselves: for even if every one of these particular communities were to declare all the rest to be portions which had fallen into a morbid condition, still, from the point of departure which we have adopted (see § 33), the claims of all must, for the purpose of the first problem, be subjected to the critical process referred to. Our special Philosophical Theology, therefore, is Protestant in its character.

§ 37. Since the two problems here stated,—in §§ 32 and 35,—exhaust the purpose of Philosophical Theology: it is, if viewed as to its scientific contents, [a species of] Criticism; and, from the nature of its object [subject-matter,] it appertains to Historical Criticism.

In the solution of these problems, namely, is contained all that is required to form the basis of Historical as well as of Practical Theology, in their relation to Church-Guidance.

§ 38. Philosophical Theology, as a theological discipline, must have its form determined by the relation which it bears to Church-Guidance.

This, of course, applies also to every special Philosophical Theology.

§ 39. As every individual is in the Church-Community to which he belongs, only by virtue of his conviction of the verity of that mode of faith which is successively propagated therein; so also must Church-Guidance, in its conservative aspect or application, be designed to procure recognition for this conviction by imparting it. But the foundation for such a proceeding is furnished by those investigations which relate to the peculiar, essential character of Christianity, and, in like manner, to that of Protestantism; which constitute, therefore, the Apologetical portion of Philosophical Theology,—the for-
mer class of inquiries sustaining this relation to general, Christian Philosophical Theology, and the latter, to the special Philosophical Theology of Protestantism.

No other kind of defence is to be thought of in connexion with this appellation, than that which seeks to prevent any manifestation of hostility towards the Community. The endeavour to bring others, also, into the Community, is a matter of clerical practice which certainly involves a resort to the storehouse of Apologetics; and a Technology with regard to it,—which, however, has scarcely begun to be formed,—would constitute the portion of Practical Theology resting immediately upon Apologetics.

§ 40. Since every individual, in proportion to the strength and clearness of his conviction, must necessarily also experience dissatisfaction with regard to such morbid deviations as may have arisen in the Community to which he belongs; Church-Guidance, by virtue of its intensively conservative aim (§ 25), must be designed in the first instance to make this deviation, as such, a matter of consciousness. This can be effected only by means of a correct exhibition of the essential character of Christianity,—and, in like manner also, of Protestantism; which exhibitions, therefore, in this application, form the Polémical division of Philosophical Theology,—the first, in relation to its general,—the second, in relation to its special, Protestant form.

The principles of the clerical praxis which is directed towards the removal of morbid conditions, find their place here; and the Technology of this praxis would constitute the division of Practical Theology which bases itself immediately upon Polemics.

§ 41. As the direction of Apologetics is wholly outwards, so is that of Polemics altogether inwards.

That which is far more commonly designated by the name,—the outwardly directed special Polemics, of Protestants, for example, against the Catholics, and in like manner the gen-
eral Polemics of Christians against the Jews, or against Deists and Atheists,—is likewise a clerical proceeding in the broader sense of the term; a proceeding that, on the one hand, has nothing in common with the discipline of which we are treating, and one that, on the other hand, could hardly be recognized as salutary in its character by a well wrought out [system of] Practical Theology. It might be affirmed, truly, that we need but to view this proceeding as having, not a Protestant, but a general Christian character, and then its direction, too, would be wholly inwards. But, in that case, it would also be directed, not, (as it is nevertheless always supposed to be), against Catholicism upon the whole, but only against that in it which does not belong to its peculiar form, but is to be regarded as a morbid condition of Christianity.

§ 42. Since, then, Philosophical Theology contains no farther problems; we have to treat, in the immediate sequel, of the organization of Apologetics and Polemics, and this as well in their general, Christian, as in their special, Protestant form.

Either, therefore, first of general Philosophical Theology in both its divisions, and then of the special in like manner; or, first of Apologetics, general and special, and then in like manner of Polemics. The latter arrangement has been preferred.

SECTION THE FIRST.—PRINCIPLES OF APOLOGETICS.

§ 43. Since the notion of Religious Communities, or the Church, attains its sole realization in a body of historical phenomena existing side by side with and following upon one another, which have a certain unity in the said notion, but differ among themselves, it must also be shown with regard to Christianity,—by setting forth both that unity and this difference,—that it properly belongs to the body of phenomena just mentioned. This is effected by laying down and applying the correlative notions of the Natural and the Positive.
OF PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY.

The laying down of these notions, the former of which expresses what is common to all, and the latter the possibility of different, peculiar modifications thereof, belong, properly speaking, to the province of the Philosophy of Religion; and for that reason, the said notions are equally valid also for the Apologetics of every religious community. Supposing, now, that we were in a position to refer in this manner to the Philosophy of Religion [for the notions just specified], all that would be left, of this [problem], for Christian Apology to deal with, would be merely what is contained in the paragraph next following.

§ 44. It will then be necessary (reverting to the notion of the Positive), to lay down a formula expressive of the peculiar, essential character of Christianity, and, connecting it with that which is characteristic in other religious communities, to take it up under the said notion [in the way of generalization.]

This is, certainly, the fundamental problem of Apologetics: but in proportion as a formula of the kind referred to is to be found only by means of a critical process (comp. § 32), in the same proportion is it to be completely verified only in its practical application.

§ 45. It is also necessary that Christianity should establish the validity of its claim to a separate historical existence, by the nature and manner of its origin; and this is effected by a reference to the notions, Revelation, Miracle, and Inspiration.

The more it relies ultimately upon original facts, the greater is its title to an independent existence, and vice versa; just as the same principle applies with regard to other species of association.

§ 46. But, inasmuch as the historical exhibition of the Idea of the Church is also to be viewed under the character of a continuous series: it is therefore necessary, notwithstanding what was said in §§ 43 and 44, that the historical continuity, in the sequence of Christianity
with regard to Judaism and Heathenism, should also be pointed out: which is effected by the application of the notions, Prophecy and Type.

The observance of the proper medium in the determination and application of these notions, is perhaps the highest problem of the discipline before us; and the more complete the solution, the firmer is the foundation presented for that practical activity which has to build upon it from without.

§ 47. Since the Christian Church, like every historical phenomenon, is a thing subject to change; it must also be shown how the unity of its essence is, nevertheless, not endangered by these mutations. This investigation embraces the notions, Canon and Sacrament.

Apologetics are not concerned about the dogmatical theories relating to these two notions; inasmuch as the said theories cannot be anticipated here. Both facts, however, are related, notionally, to the continuity of the essential in Christianity; the former, as this continuity finds expression in the production of mental representations [proper to Christianity,—the Canonical Scriptures affording the constant source and means of these]; and the latter, as the same certainty finds expression in the transmission of the [Christian] fellowship [from one generation to another.]

§ 48. As the notion of the Church yields itself, in a scientific form, only in connexion with the notions of all other organizations of a common life which develope themselves out of the notion of humanity (comp. § 22); it must also be shown concerning the Christian Church, that viewed in its peculiar, essential character, it is capable of existing along with all these organizations; a consequence which must result from a correct investigation of the notions, Hierarchy and Church Power.

The State, and Science, come especially into consideration here. For no one could be expected to recognize the validity of the claims of Christianity, if, by virtue of its very essence, its efforts were hostile towards either of these organizations.
OF PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY.

The solution of the problem is therefore the more complete, the more definitely it can be shown that these internal institutions of the Church, in the very notion of them, aim only at the independent development of the Church in connexion with the State and with Science, but do not aim at disturbing the equally independent development of the latter. Everything relating to this subject, that belongs to Practical Theology, remains excluded from the present inquiry.

§ 49. In proportion as regard is had, in all these investigations, to the two circumstances,—that Christianity is intended to exist as an organic community,—and that it is exhibited and communicated chiefly by means of thought, (comp. § 2),—in the same proportion will they, of necessity, lay a foundation for the conviction that, from the very commencement [of the process], (comp. § 44), the essential character of Christianity has been rightly apprehended.

If, in all that relates to doctrine and polity, we find the same essential character of Christianity expressing itself, and that in agreement with the formula laid down; this circumstance constitutes the best verification of the latter.

§ 50. If the Church is in a state of division, the special Apologetics of every ecclesiastical party respectively,—and consequently, at the present time, Protestant Apologetics also,—must pursue the same course as general Apologetics.

For the problem is the same; and the relation of every individual Church-party to the rest, resembles the relation sustained by Christianity towards those other fellowships of faith which are akin to it. The reference insisted upon in § 47, leads [in this connexion] to the notions Confession [Creed or Symbol], and Rite, and in connexion with that which is described in § 48, the thing of chief importance is the relation to the State.

§ 51. In this case, also, general, Christian Apologetics, being affected by the theory of each particular modification of Christianity, will assume a peculiar form in each.
There will, certainly, be the less of this, the more strictly everything of a dogmatical character is excluded from the investigation. But it ought never to be carried so far, as that each shall seek for itself an exclusive recognition as Christianity,—representing the rest, on the contrary, as unchristian. This is intended to be provided against at the outset, by the division of Apologetics into general and special.

§ 52. Since it is not possible for a number of Christian Church-Communities, standing in opposition to one another, to have formed themselves otherwise than out of a condition of the whole in which no antagonism had found expression; it is the more necessary for each of these communities to defend itself against the charge of anarchy or of corruption, in proportion as each, again, is inclined to vindicate to itself a connexion with that original condition.

On the one hand, no antagonism had found expression in primitive Christianity; and on the other, it is not possible for an antagonism ever to appear in the place of another, unless this other has previously ceased to exist.

§ 53. Since, for this very reason, every antagonism of the kind referred to, within the boundaries of Christianity, seemed destined also to disappear again, the perfection of a system of special Apologetics will consist in this,—that it shall also include within itself, in a divinatory manner, the forms for this disappearing [i.e. an indication of the forms in which, or the conditions under which, it may be expected to occur.]

We by no means intend, by what is here observed, to attribute to special Apologetics a prophetic tendency. But the more correctly, in this respect, the peculiar, essential character of Protestantism is apprehended, the more tenable reasons will special Apologetics furnish towards averting false attempts at union; since every such attempt rests upon the assumption that the antagonism has already, to a certain extent, ceased to exist.
SECTION THE SECOND.—PRINCIPLES OF POLEMICS.

§ 54. Morbid phenomena of a historical organism, (comp. § 35) may have their origin, on the one hand, in a recession of vital energy, or, on the other, in the fact that something heterogeneous, mixed up with the organism, becomes organized for itself therein.

It is not necessary to revert, in connexion with this subject, to the analogy of the animal organism; the same type may be distinctly observed, without going any further, in the morbid affections of States.

§ 55. Since the impulse to make Christian piety the object of a community does not necessarily stand in a relation of equality to the strength of this piety itself; it is possible that sometimes the one and sometimes the other of these may, relatively, be weakened and recede.

The union of both in their highest perfection certainly constitutes the normal condition of the Church's health; a condition, however, which cannot be taken for granted at any one point in her historical career. On the other hand, from the very circumstance that this state of health is capable of being described only as consisting in the perfect unity of the two things mentioned, it follows that one-sided deviations are possible in both directions.

§ 56. Those conditions by which it is especially made manifest that Christian piety itself has become morbidly weakened, are comprehended under the name Indifferentism; and the problem is, therefore, to determine where that which appears to be a debility of the kind in question, actually begins to have a morbid character, and in how many different forms this condition presents itself.

The expression here employed is commonly understood to signify indifference with regard to the characteristic stamp of Christian piety; in which case, assuredly, piety may yet exist, without having any precise stamp at all.—We may remark
farther that, frequently, certain conditions are placed to the account of a debility of the kind referred to, which are susceptible of a totally different explanation.—That in the case of actual Indifferentism, the impulse to Christian fellowship must also be weakened, is a thing of course; but this is then merely a consequence of the malady, not the cause of it.

§ 57. Those conditions which indicate especially a weakening of the impulse to fellowship, are designated by the name Separatism; which, therefore, is likewise to be more strictly defined as to its limits and its subdivisions.

A distinction, stricter than that which we commonly meet with, is to be made between Separatism, properly so called, and an inclination towards Schism; especially since the former, notwithstanding its entirely negative character, often assumes the appearance of the latter. It is manifest that when the impulse to fellowship is present in its full strength, it must also pervade all the members [of the community]. It is therefore weakened, in proportion to the number of those who consciously and designedly exclude themselves [from the community], notwithstanding that they affirm themselves to be in the possession of the same Christian piety.

§ 58. Since the peculiar, essential character of Christianity expresses itself, chiefly, in doctrine on the one hand and in polity on the other: it is possible also for a heterogeneous element to become organized within the Church, on the one hand in doctrine, as Heresy (Hæresis), on the other hand in polity, as Division,* Schism; and each of these, therefore, requires to be defined as to its limits and its forms.

In most cases (though not as a matter of necessity), if a deviation from received doctrine becomes diffused, there will also arise out of it a distinct Community; but this, being merely a consequence of the former, does not constitute a division in the strict sense. In like manner, within the sphere of a division, it will generally (though not necessarily),

* Spaltung is, strictly, a division which has not yet led (and possibly may not even lead hereafter), to a formal separation (Trennung).—Ta.
be the case, that a deviation in point of doctrine will also find development; but the doctrine thus arising needs not on that account to be heretical.

§ 59. None of the notions here laid down are capable of being either discovered by a merely empirical, or deduced by a purely scientific process; on the contrary, they can be determined only by that critical method of proceeding which is everywhere predominant in these investigations; for which reason they must be increasingly verified by actual use, in order to become wholly trustworthy.

So far as Division and Heresy are concerned, it is necessary, on account of the great multiplicity of the phenomena involved, that the process should be based upon a certain classification, which becomes authenticated by the fact, that the phenomena presented to view can with facility be taken up under it. With regard to Indifferentism and Separatism, the critical process becomes authenticated in proportion as it prevents that which is yet sound from being, through excessive strictness, declared to be morbid,—and the contrary.

§ 60. It must be shown, concerning that which is asserted to be morbid, that as to its contents on the one hand, it contradicts or tends to destroy the essential character of Christianity, as the latter has found expression in doctrine and in polity; and that as to its origin on the other hand, it does not cohere with that mode of development which proceeds from the fundamental facts of Christianity.

The more the results of these two processes coincide with and elucidate each other, the greater is the certainty which appears to attach to the decision.

§ 61. In periods in which the Christian Church is divided, it is for the special Polemics of every particular Christian Church-Community to pursue the same path as the general discipline.
The circumstances of the case are the same. Only that in such periods, on the one hand, as a matter of course, Indifferentism and Separatism find a home, originally, in the partial Church-Communities, and become general evils only in so far as they are present in a like degree in several Christian Communities existing side by side; and, on the other hand, that which is opposed to the peculiar and essential character of one of these partial communities merely, ought never to be designated by the expressions heretical or schismatic.

§ 62. Since the first beginnings of a heresy always make their appearance as opinions held by individuals, and those of a division as fraternizations on the part of individuals; and since, on the other hand, a new partial Church-Community cannot well make its first appearance in any other than precisely the same way: it is necessary that the principles of Polemics, when perfectly developed, should furnish to our hands the means of distinguishing, with regard to primal elements of this sort, whether they are such as will pass over into morbid conditions, or whether they include within themselves the germ from which a new antagonism is likely to be developed.

As this proposition is, generally, of the same tenor with that contained in § 53, so, too, we have to remark here to the same effect as in that place; with reference, namely, on the one hand, to false tolerance as it respects that which is of a morbid character, and, on the other, to the advocacy of a reasonable liberty for that which is about to develop within itself a new diversity.

Concluding Observations on Philosophical Theology.

§ 63. As each of these two disciplines, Apologetics and Polemics, excludes the other, so is each of them, at the same time, conditionally dependent on the other.

They exclude each other, by the opposite character of their contents, (comp. §§ 39 and 40), and by the oppositeness of their direction, (comp. § 41). They are conditionally de-
PENDENT on each other, because that which is morbid in the Church is capable of being discovered only by a reference to some definite representation of the peculiar, essential character of Christianity, and because, at the same time, in the investigations by which this representation is established, it is necessary that the morbid phenomena should also be taken up, preliminarily, as a portion of that given matter which the critical process requires for its basis.

§ 64. These two disciplinae, therefore, can attain to perfect development only by means of each other, and along with each other.

And, for this very reason, only by a process of approximation, and only after a variety of transformations. Compare § 51; what is said there being true also with regard to Polemics.

§ 65. Philosophical Theology, it is true, supposes the material of Historical Theology as already known; but it is itself the first to lay a foundation for such a view of Christianity as may properly be called historical.

This material is identical with the given matter (comp. § 32) which lies at the basis of the investigations respecting the peculiar and essential character of Christianity, as well as of those which have to do with the antithesis of the healthy and the morbid, (comp. § 35). But it is the result of these investigations which first determines the value of the individual momenta in connexion with the whole development, and, by consequence, the historical view of the entire career of Christianity.

§ 66. Philosophical and Practical Theology occupy, on the one hand, a common position of contrast with regard to Historical Theology; but, on the other hand, they have also a relation of contrast between themselves.

The former assertion is true, because the two first-mentioned disciplinae have an immediately practical, Historical Theology, on the contrary, a purely contemplative direction. For although, certainly, Apologetics and Polemics are in their na-

* That is, a contemplation accompanied by insight. Comp. § 188.—Tn.
ture theories, from which we ought perhaps to distinguish actual services of an apologetical or polemical character, still the purpose of the former first receives its accomplishment in the latter, and the former are laid down only for the sake of the latter. On the other hand, the two are in contrast, partly, as first and last, Philosophical Theology determining in the first instance the objects with which Practical Theology has to deal,—and partly, because Philosophical Theology attaches itself to certain constructions of pure science [as its points of connexion and departure], while Practical Theology, on the contrary, lays hold, in the manner of a Technology, on the department of the particular and individual.

§ 67. Since every man's Philosophical Theology includes within itself, essentially, the principles of his entire mode of thinking in reference to Theology, it is also necessary that every Theologian should produce for himself, entirely, this part of his system.

There is no sort of intention here to deprive any Theologian of the liberty of professing his adherence to a system of Philosophical Theology which may have emanated from another; only it must be appropriated thoroughly, as a matter of clear and firm conviction. But especially is it requisite that every theologian should be in possession of Philosophical Theology in its entirety and completeness, without regard, so far as this division of Theology is concerned, to the distinction laid down in §§ 14–17; because here, namely, all with which we have to do is in the nature of first principles, and every particular is connected in the most intimate manner with the whole. That all theological principles, moreover, have their place in this portion of the whole, follows immediately from §§ 65 and 66.

§ 68. Both the discipline of Philosophical Theology still await their farther development.

This fact is explained, in part, by a reference to the relations [i. e., of the great divisions of Theology amongst themselves] which have here been exhibited. Further, also, Apologetics, on the one hand, have been made to relate too strictly and exclusively to properly apologetical services, the occasions for
which presented themselves only at intervals, while, on the contrary, the *propositions* belonging to this discipline found their place, not without serious prejudice to the clear survey of the whole field of study,—in the "Introductions" to Dogmatics. It is only within the most recent period, that they have begun to receive again a special elaboration, in their more general design and their true comprehensiveness. Polemics, on the other hand,—chiefly because their proper direction was misapprehended,—had, for a considerable time past, ceased to be wrought out and discoursed upon as a theological discipline.
PART THE SECOND.

OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

---

INTRODUCTION.

§ 69. Historical Theology, (comp. § 26), viewed as to its contents, forms a part of the science of Modern History; and when it is thus regarded, all the natural divisions of the latter science are co-ordinate with it.

It belongs especially to the inner side of the science of History, the History of Modern Civilization and Morals; in which Christianity has manifestly introduced a development of its own. For, to represent Christianity as having been merely and purely a source of perversions and retrograde movements, is to take a view of the subject which has grown quite out of date.

§ 70. Regarded as a theological discipline, the historical knowledge of Christianity is, in its more immediate character, the indispensable condition of all intelligent inoperation upon the further development of Christianity; and in this connexion, the other parts of the science of History are merely subordinated to its service.

From this it is seen at once, what a different turn the study and mode of treatment of the same mass of facts will respectively take, when these facts have their place in the theological discipline of which we are treating, and when they come before us in the general science of History; while, nevertheless, the principles of historical investigation do not cease to be the same for both departments.

§ 71. Whatever makes its appearance in any department of History as an individual Momentum, is capable
of being viewed either as a sudden *origination*, or as a gradual *development* and further *progress*.

In the department of *individual* life, every *beginning* is a sudden *origination*; but, from that point forward, all the rest is mere *development*. In the proper department of History, however,—the department of *social* life,—the two are not strictly opposed to each other; and only on account of a *preponderance* of either is one *momentum* viewed in the one way, another in the opposite.

§ 72. The *total career* of every historical Whole, consists of a manifold *alternation* of *momenta* of both kinds.

Not as though it were in and of itself *impossible* that an entire career of this kind should be viewed as a *continuous development* from a single point of commencement. But nothing more is requisite than that it shall be possible for us to look at the *energy* itself [which is the *subject* of development], as being also a something *manifold*, the elements of which do not all become apparent at the same time,—or to trace, in the development itself, the differences of a *quicker* and a *slower progress*,—(and it will hardly be the case that both these conditions will fail),—and we are then at once constrained to assume the existence of *intervals* of an opposite character.

§ 73. A series of *Momenta* in which *quiet progress* uninterruptedly predominates, exhibits a *state* of *order*, and constitutes a historical *Period*; a series of those in which *sudden origination* predominates, exhibits a *destructive revolution* in the relations of things, and forms a historical *Epoch*.

The longer the continuance of the latter state of things, the less possible would it be for the *identity* of the *object* to be maintained; because, in such a case, all contrast between the enduring and the changing comes to an end. The longer, therefore, the object maintains its position as one and the same, the greater preponderance is there of such states as belong to the former class.

§ 74. Every historical Whole is capable of being viewed,
not only as a unity, but also as a something composite, the different elements of which, (although only in a subordinate sense, and with a constant relation to one another), have each of them a career of its own.

Such distinctions present themselves, in some form or other, on every hand; and there is the greater reason for directing a special attention to them, in proportion as the one part seems to be at rest while the other is in motion, and the two, consequently, appear relatively independent of each other.

§ 75. There are, therefore, two modes of proceeding, in order to combine the infinity of material presented by a historical career, in such a manner that it shall be possible to take a proper survey of the whole. Either, the whole career is divided into several periods, according to the revolutionary intervals which present themselves, and each of these periods is made to comprehend all that has happened within its own limits, in relation to the object treated of; or, the object itself is divided vertically, so that several parallel series are made to present themselves, and the course of each series in particular is followed throughout the whole length of time [to which the history extends].

Of course, the two modes of division may also be combined, the one being rendered subordinate to the other: in such a manner that either every period is divided into parallel series, or else every principal series, by itself, is cut up again into periods. The attempted delineation is the more imperfect, in proportion as these processes of division are conducted arbitrarily, or, at least, in proportion as mere externalities are made to constitute the basis of them.

§ 76. A historical object demands, preferentially, the former mode of division, in the same degree in which its various members are less independent of one another in their progress, and revolutionary nodes of development are strongly prominent therein; and when the case is
the reverse of this, the second method is to be preferred.

For, in the latter case, an original organic division predominates; in the former, a marked difference in the character of different periods.

§ 77. The more strongly the contrast between periods and epochs makes its appearance in a historical career, so much the more difficult is it in the case of the latter, —but so much the more easy in that of the former,—to separate the different elements (§ 74) from one another.

For, in periods of transformation, every kind of interaction is more lively, and every thing of an individual character is more dependent upon a common impulse; whereas, on the contrary, a quiet course of things favours the prominent appearance of the organic division.

§ 78. Since not merely the collective course of all human things in general,—but also, within this, the entire succession of manifestations of one and the same force,—constitutes a Whole: every coming forth to view of a minor historical Whole may be looked at in two ways,—on the one hand, as the origination of something new, which did not exist before,—but also, on the other hand, as the forth-formation of something which had existence somewhere.

This is evident at once from § 71. That which, at any given point in the course of time under observation, is certainly to be regarded as something new in relation to all that is running on side by side with it, may yet have a more intimate connexion with some one earlier momentum of the course than with all the rest.

§ 79. Thus, too, the career of Christianity admits of being treated, on the one hand, as a single Period [in the history] of one branch of the religious development; but also, on the other hand, as a particular historical Whole, which takes its rise as a new thing, and pursues its own
secluded course in a series of periods separated by epochs.

That here, expressly, only one branch of the religious development is under discussion, may be shown by a reference to § 74. In whatever manner we group the great multiplicity of forms which religion has assumed, there will always be some more nearly related to Christianity than the rest, so as to admit of being combined with it in one and the same group.

§ 80. Historical Theology, viewed as a theological discipline, connecting itself wholly with Christianity, can adopt, for its own purposes, only the latter mode of treatment.

Compare §§ 69 and 70. But, moreover, the Christian Faith could not be what it is, if the fundamental fact thereof were not posited, in an exclusive manner, as something original.

§ 81. Viewing the historical material of Christianity from the stand-point of the constitutive principle of Theology, we find that that which occupies the most immediate relation to Church-Guidance is the historical knowledge of the existing momentum, as being that out of which the Future is to be developed. This, consequently, forms one of the special divisions of Historical Theology.

Its purpose is, that we may be able rightly and appropriately to work upon what is healthy and upon what is morbid, as well as to help forward any members of the organization that have remained behind; and also to employ what is applicable, out of other departments, in connexion with our own.

§ 82. But since the Present can be understood only when it is viewed as a result of the Past: it follows, that the knowledge of the entire previous career of Christianity forms a second division of Historical Theology.

The remark is not to be understood as if this second division were a sort of auxiliary science in relation to the first; on the contrary, they are both related to Church-Guidance in the
same way, and are not subordinate, but co-ordinate, to each other.

§ 83. The more a historical career is occupied in [the process or experience of] diffusion,—so that the inward life-unity, in proportion to the degree of the extension, appears more and more exclusively in contact with other forces,—in the same proportion do these forces, also, participate in [bringing about] the individual states which present themselves; so that the peculiar and essential character of the object is presented to view in the purest manner, only in those states which are of the earliest occurrence.

This, also, is equally true with regard to all historical phenomena of a kindred nature, and is properly the reason why so many nations mistakenly regard the earliest period of the life of humanity as the age of its highest perfection.

§ 84. Since, now, the Christian Life, also, has become continually more and more compounded and complicated, while, on the other hand, the final end of its theology consists in this,—to give a purer representation of its peculiar, essential character in each successive moment yet to come: the knowledge of Primitive Christianity naturally presents itself to our attention as a third special division of Historical Theology.

Primitive Christianity, it is true, is also included in the total career of Christianity; but it is one thing to treat of it as a series of momenta, and another to bring under observation that only,—derived even from different momenta,—which shall furnish materials for setting forth the pure notion of Christianity.

§ 85. Historical Theology is completely included within these three divisions,—the knowledge of Primitive Christianity, the knowledge of the entire career of Christianity, and the knowledge of the state of Christianity at the present moment.
Only, the order in which we have deduced them is not also the proper order in which to study them. On the contrary, the knowledge of Primitive Christianity, as connecting itself immediately with Philosophical Theology, forms the first stage, and the knowledge which relates to the Present, as constituting the transition to Practical Theology, the last.

§ 86. As, in dealing with any division of History, all that facilitates an acquaintance with the scene of action and with the outward relations of the object, or that is necessary towards the understanding of monuments of all kinds, is to be regarded in the light of auxiliary science; so also does Historical Theology call to its aid, as auxiliary sciences, first of all the other divisions of the same department of History (comp. § 40), and then, further, all that is necessary in order to the understanding of documents.

Accordingly, these auxiliary branches of knowledge are partly historical in the stricter sense, partly geographical, partly philological.

§ 87. For the purpose of that normal treatment of the subject which has already been pointed out, we cannot suitably define the boundary of Primitive Christianity, in relation to the further historical career of Christianity, otherwise than by taking the former expression to signify that period in which Doctrine and Community, in their mutual connexion, first went through the process of becoming, and did not as yet exist in their definitive constitution.

Even this definition, however, might easily be stretched out too far, because doctrine and fellowship, in their mutual connexion, continue always in the state of becoming; and a fixed boundary arises immediately, only when we exclude every age in which there already existed a difference of fellowship on account of a difference of doctrine. But too narrow limits, also, might be given to our definition, if one were to start from the assumption that a definitively constituted
community existed as early as from the day of Pentecost downwards; and it receives a due degree of extension, only when we maintain, that the Christian Community, properly so called, was first definitively constituted when, with consciousness and universal recognition, Jews and Heathen had become united therein; and the same principle holds good also with regard to doctrine. Thus, both definitions agree tolerably well with that external one which assigns Primitive Christianity to the age of Christ's immediate disciples.

§ 88. Since that knowledge of Primitive Christianity which has to be elicited for the purpose specified, is to be obtained only from the written documents which originated within the said period of the Christian Church, and rests entirely upon the correct understanding of these writings; the division of Historical Theology now before us, bears also, specifically, the name of Exegetical Theology.

Since the largest portion of that which is included in the other two divisions [of Historical Theology] also depends upon exposition, the appellation is certainly arbitrary; but still it may easily be justified, on account of the peculiar value of the writings with which we are here concerned.

§ 89. Since it is necessary that every Theologian should form his own exposition for himself, on account of the intimate connexion which it has with Philosophical Theology, the proper place of all [theological] principles: here, too, we find but little that one can allow himself to derive from the contributions of special proficients (comp. §§ 17 and 19) [in this department of study].

For the most part, merely that which we are obliged to borrow, for the purposes of exposition, from the auxiliary sciences.

§ 90. The knowledge of the further career of Christianity may either be exhibited as a whole, or be divided

Because, namely, the History of the System of Doctrine is nothing else than the developement of the religious conceptions of the Community. The combination of the two, as well as the History of the Community in its separate delineation, bears the name Church History; as that of the System of Doctrine, exhibited apart, bears the name Dogma-History.

§ 91. Both branches in conjunction, as well as each by itself, present, when viewed in the direction of their length, an uninterrupted stream, in which, nevertheless, it is possible, by means of the notions of Periods and Epochs (comp. § 73), to find certain nodes of development, which may serve the purpose of giving fixity to the distinctions existing between such points as are separated by an epoch, and belong, therefore, to different periods; as also between such as lie within the boundaries formed by the same two epochs, but in such a manner that the one contains rather the result of the first, and the other appears rather as a preparation for the second.

If we yet further conceive of intervening points, containing, in any given period, the maximum of the development of its commencing epoch, but still continuing to represent the zero of its closing epoch; this process, carried out through both branches and through all their periods, will furnish a plexus of the most valuable momenta.

§ 92. Since the total career of Christianity presents an infinity of details, there is room here, in the highest degree, for the distinction between that which is common property, and that which is the property of the special proficient.

The plexus just mentioned, wrought up in outline into an analogue of continuity, constitutes the minimum, the possession of which is necessary for everyone; the investigation and completion of matters of detail, even when parcelled out
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amongst a large number of persons, forms an inexhaustible department of labour.

§ 93. *It is not every momentum* that is equally well adapted for delineation as a whole, having an inward connexion of its own; but this adaptation belongs in the highest degree to the point of culmination of a period, and least of all to a point occurring in the midst of an epoch, or in immediate proximity to the latter.

It is always the case that, during a revolution, nothing but that which is matter of detail can come under discussion; in its isolation, too, and hardly otherwise than in the form of controversy. In the immediate proximity of an epoch, it is true, the want of a connected delineation may already become perceptible, but the attempts which may be made to meet this want cannot have any other than an imperfect result. This is apparent even in the first beginnings which were made by the Church after the apostolic period; as well as amongst ourselves in the earliest times of the Reformation.

§ 94. In the case of those periods which admit of a satisfactory solution of the problem, a spontaneous separation ensues between the exhibition of the doctrine of the period in question, and the delineation of its social condition.

For although the same peculiar, essential character, either of the Church, or of some partial Church-Community, finds expression in both, yet the two depend upon co-efficients so different, that they must be, to a considerable extent, independent of each other in the changes they undergo, and therefore also in their condition at any given moment.

§ 95. The delineation of the social condition of the Church in any given momentum, constitutes the problem of *Ecclesiastical Statistics.*

It is only within a short period that this topic has begun to be treated of in its proper order, as the object of a distinct discipline; and therefore much yet remains to be done, as it respects both matter and form.

§ 96. Even when a separation exists, the problem
nevertheless continues to be, for every individual Church-Community, essentially the same.

In this case, each Community will certainly have an especial interest in being most exactly acquainted with its own condition; and, in so far, an inequality will occur; which, however, occurs also when the Church is not divided. On the other hand, it cannot but be a circumstance productive of great mischief, when the persons entrusted with the guidance of any one of these individual Church-Communities are not acquainted with the true condition of the rest.

§ 97. The connected exhibition of the System of Doctrine as currently received at any given time,—whether by the Church in general, (that is, when no separation is found to exist),—or, otherwise, by any distinct Ecclesiastical Party,—we designate by the term Dogmatics or Dogmatic Theology.

The term doctrine is taken here in its fullest comprehensiveness of meaning. The appellation Systematic Theology, which is still frequently employed to designate this branch of our science,—and which, with reason, suggests especially that the System of Doctrine is not to be delivered as a mere aggregate of single propositions, but that the connexion ought to be clearly made manifest,—nevertheless conceals, on the other hand, to the detriment of the subject, not only the historical character of the discipline before us, but also its relation to Church-Guidance as constituting its purpose and aim; from which concealment manifold misapprehensions must needs arise.

§ 98. In periods in which the Church is divided, it is possible only for each party itself to effect a dogmatic treatment of its own System of Doctrine.

Impartiality and equality would not be attainable,—either upon the supposition that a theologian of one party should attempt a connected treatment of the doctrinal systems of other parties in a parallel order, (since, for him, only one of these connexions has the character of truth, the other not),—or again, if he should confine himself to a connected treatment
of that system to which he adheres, merely adducing the deviations of other systems in their appropriate place, (because then, the latter would be torn out of their natural connexion). The former process takes place, nevertheless, so far as the leading points of doctrine are concerned, under the title of Symbolics; and the other, under the title of Comparative Dogmatics.

§ 99. Both discipline, Statistics and Dogmatics, are likewise of an infinite extent; and occupy, therefore, the same position with the second division of Historical Theology, as it respects the difference between that which is common property, and that which constitutes the department of the special proficient.

This is immediately evident with regard to Ecclesiastical Statistics. But in the department of Dogmatics, too, not only is every individual doctrine susceptible of determination to an extent which is almost infinite, but the exhibition of it, moreover, in connexion with the deviating modes of conception peculiar to other times and places, affords an endless task.

§ 100. It is necessary that every one should form for himself his own historical view, as it respects both the knowledge of the entire career of Christianity, and that of the momentum which lies immediately before him.

Otherwise, that activity in the Guidance of the Church, which has each of these branches of knowledge, in an equal degree, for its basis, would not possess the character of an independent personal activity.

§ 101. If, for this purpose, it is necessary to make use of historical delineations,—which can never be wholly free from peculiar views and judgments of the delineator,—it is necessary that every one should possess the art of separating therefrom, in as pure a state as possible, the material which he is to elaborate for himself.

This again, applies to Dogmatics and Statistics, not less than it does to Church History.
§ 102. As for the entire department of Historical Science, so also for Historical Theology, *Historical Criticism* is the universal and indispensable *Organon*.

It is contrasted with the *material* auxiliary sciences before adverted to, in that it is a *form of scientific skill*, which *effectuates a certain purpose*.

---

**SECTION THE FIRST.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.**

§ 103. The Christian Writings which are derived from the period of Primitive Christianity are not *all*, on this account, objects of Exegetical Theology; but only in so far as they are held capable of contributing to the *original*, and therefore (comp. § 83), for all periods, *normal representation* of Christianity.

It is involved in the nature of the case, and is, besides, completely established as a matter of fact, that there *also* existed, in the very first instance, an *imperfect*, and consequently to some extent *false apprehension*,—and therefore also a like *representation*,—of the Christian Faith in its distinctive individuality.

§ 104. The *collective body* of the documents just referred to as containing that which is of a normal character, forms the *New Testament Canon* of the Christian Church.

Consequently, the correct *understanding* of this Canon is the sole essential *problem* of Exegetical Theology, and the collection itself is the sole original *object* with which the latter has to deal.

§ 105. To this New Testament Canon *belong essentially* both those normal documents which relate to the effectual working of Christ upon, and *in conjunction with*, his disciples, and likewise those which relate to the *joint* labours of his disciples, as directed towards the establishment of Christianity.
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This, moreover, is what we are to understand by the ancient division of the Canon into εὐαγγέλια and ἀποστολάς. There exists no reason in the nature of the case, for laying down any distinction between these two constituent portions in respect of canonical dignity. Which, however, would in a manner be done, if it were to be maintained that the two were related to each other as origin and progress; and still more so, if one were at liberty to deny to the activity of the disciples, when left to itself, the attribute of normal dignity.

§ 106. Since neither the temporal limit of Primitive Christianity, nor the personale thereof, can be determined with precision; it follows also that the external boundary-line of the Canon cannot be established with perfect fixity.

In regard to both in common,—period and persons,—it would, indeed, be possible to lay down a settled formula which should designate the Canonical; but this formula would, nevertheless, fail to lead to any certain distinction with regard to what is actually before us, on account of the uncertainty which prevails with regard to the personality of several individual authors.

§ 107. The unsettledness just referred to, consists in a wavering of the boundary-line which separates the department formed by the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers from that of the Canonical Writings.

For, the period of the Apostolic Fathers lies between that in which the Canon first began to be formed, and that in which it already possessed a separate existence. And the term Apostolic Fathers is to be understood here as having such a compass of meaning, that the uncertainty spoken of applies to the first part of the Canon in the same manner as to the second.

§ 108. Since the notion of normal dignity, too, is one

* Left to itself—that is, in so far as Christ's outward presence was concerned. Schleiermacher never intended to deny the presence of the Spirit of Christ in and amongst the disciples; which, in truth, is just what gives to their activity its normal character.—Tr.
which cannot be reduced to fixed, immutable formulæ; neither is it possible, with perfect certainty, to lay down the limits of the Canon by the help of internal reasons for determination.

If we reckon the normal character, as applied to individual propositions, to include on the one hand perfect purity* [in the propositions themselves], and on the other hand, a certain copiousness in the inferences and applications which admit of being developed from them; we have no reason to assume the existence of the first characteristic, absolutely, anywhere but in Christ alone; and with regard to the second, also, we must concede that in all other [teachers], natural imperfection might possibly exert an obstructive influence.

§ 109. Christian Writings of the Canonical Period to which we deny the attribute of normal dignity, we designate by the term Apocrypha; and as against these also, therefore, the limit of the Canon is not completely fixed.

Most of the New Testament Apocrypha, it is true, bear this name merely because they were supposed, or because they professed, to belong to the canonical period. The term itself, used in this sense, is arbitrary, and it would be better to exchange it for some other.

§ 110. It is necessary that the Protestant Church should vindicate its claim to be still occupied continually in the more precise determination of the Canon; and it is this which constitutes the highest exegetico-theological problem for the higher Criticism.

The New Testament has received its present form by means of the Church's decision; although this decision may not be capable of being precisely quoted, or of being pointed out in any single act. It is a decision to which we do not concede an authority exalted above all inquiry, and we have a right, therefore, to make the wavering which has existed a point of connexion for new investigations. The problem referred to is the highest, because it is a matter of more importance to

* Freedom from every admixture of error.—Tr.
determine whether a work is canonical or not, than to decide whether it is to be assigned to a certain author, or to some other; the result of the latter inquiry having, possibly, no effect at all upon its canonical character.

§ 111. It is within the province of this Criticism to institute investigations under both the following heads: namely, whether certain matter to be found in the Canon is not, strictly speaking, uncanonical; and whether there does not exist, out of the Canon, matter which is canonical, but which has not been recognized as possessing that character.

Quite recently, there was an investigation of the latter kind in progress; those of the former class have, properly speaking, never been discontinued.

§ 112. Both problems apply not merely to entire books, but also to single sections and passages thereof.

An uncanonical book may contain new canonical passages; even as, in a canonical book, the greatest part of that which has been interpolated by a later hand will be uncanonical.

§ 113. As the higher Criticism solves its problem, for the most part, only by approximation; and as there exists no other measure with regard to the fitness of a particular decision, than that which is afforded by the congruence of internal and of external indications: so here, too, the main questions are simply these,—with what degree of determinateness it is indicated by external signs, that an article under investigation belongs either to the subsequent period of the Apostolic Fathers, or to the region—remote from the Church’s centre—of the Apocryphal mode of treatment,—and how far internal indications suggest, that the mode of apprehension and of thought by which the article is characterized are not such as to connect themselves strictly with what is essential in the Canonical representation.

So long as these two classes of indications are in opposition
to each other,—or so long as, in each class, some are ranged on the one side and some on the other,—it is not possible to arrive at a critical decision.—That under the term centre of the Church, neither any given space, nor any official dignity, is here to be understood, but only the perfection of the [Christian] spirit* and [of Christian] insight, is a point which probably needs no discussion.

§ 114. It would be possible for Criticism to have detected both these classes of articles, and to have arrived, with perfect certainty, at a new and different determination of the question as to what is canonical and what is not, without its being necessary, on that account, that the Canon itself should be differently ordered.

It would not be necessary: because, surely, the uncanonical may be acknowledged to be so, although it retains its old position; and a like recognition may be extended to that which is proved to be canonical, although it remains excluded from the Canon. In that case, however, it must be permissible to have the Canon in two forms; that which has been handed down historically, and that which has resulted from the application of the detective processes of Criticism.

§ 115. The same may be said with regard to the position occupied by the books of the Old Testament in our Bible.

That the Jewish Codex does not contain any normal exhibition of peculiarly Christian dogmas, is a principle which will, probably, be almost universally acknowledged. It is not, however, on this account necessary,—although it must also continue to be permissible,—to deviate from that usage of the ancient Church which unites the Old Testament with the New so as to form a whole, the Bible.

§ 116. The multiplication of the books of the New Testament by means of copies from the originals, was

* Gesinnung—disposition, habitual temper of mind, inward character.

—Th.
necessarily subject to the same accidents which attended
the same process in the case of all other ancient works.

Ocular demonstration has long ago subverted all the pre-
judices which formerly prevailed with regard to this matter.

§ 117. Even the surpassing number and variety of
copies which we possess of most of these books, affords
no security against the possibility that, in the case of
some single passages, the original reading has neverthe-
less been lost.

For, this loss may have occurred at a very early period,—
even in the first transcript; and possibly also, it may be re-
marked, in such a manner that the damage could not be made
good again.

§ 118. The definitive problem of the lower Criticism,
—that of discovering the original reading, throughout,
as accurately as possible, and in the way best adapted
to carry conviction along with it,—is altogether the same
in the department of Exegetical Theology as it is else-
where.

The terms lower and higher Criticism, are employed here
according to established usage, without any intention either
of vindicating their propriety, or of defining more closely
their limits with respect to each other.

§ 119. Therefore the New Testament Critic, also, is
both bound to follow the same rules, and entitled to make
use of the same means, as are applicable elsewhere.

Hence it cannot be forbidden, in case of necessity (comp. §
17), to hazard conjectures; nor can any special rules have
existence, which are not necessarily capable of being deduced
from such as are common.

§ 120. In the same degree in which Criticism solves
the problem presented to it, there must also result a
minute and connected History of the Text of the New
Testament, and vice versa; so that each of them serves
as proof and warranty in relation to the other.
Even such true services as may be rendered in the way of conjecture, must be able to appeal to some momenta or other in the history of the text; and on the other hand, again, any striking emendations which may be made must necessarily serve also to illustrate the history of the text.

§ 121. In connexion with the theological purpose of an occupation with the Canon, the restoration of the original is of immediate value only where the normal contents are in some way or other concerned.

This principle, however, is by no means to be limited in its application to Dogmatic Passages, as they are called,—but is to be extended to all that admits of being employed in any way, in connexion with such passages, as parallel or illustration.

§ 122. This forms the basis of the distinction which,—since the critical problem is a thing of infinite extent,—it is necessary to lay down here, between that which is to be required of every Theologian, and that which constitutes the department of special proficiency.

The requirement here mentioned is properly of force, only in reference to the Protestant theologian; for strictly speaking, the Roman Catholic theologian has the right to demand* that the Vulgata shall be delivered to him in such form and manner that there shall not be any critical problem left remaining.

§ 123. Since it is possible for every theologian (taking the word even in its broader sense) to find himself in such a case (comp. § 121) as also to need, for purposes of exposition (comp. § 89), the possession of a critical conviction: it is necessary, in order that he may be able, by an independent effort, to avail himself of the labours of the specially proficient, and to choose between the results at which they have respectively arrived,—that he should be in possession, as well of the critical principles and rules which are applicable to the case supposed, as

* That is, on the principles of his Church, which he accepts as true.—Tr.
also of a general acquaintance with the most important critical sources, and with their value.

A meagre guide to these acquisitions is to be found, on the one hand, in the Prolegomena to the critical editions; and the like is also furnished, on the other hand, along with and amongst the divers matters which it is usual to call Introduction to the New Testament.

§ 124. It is to be required of every special proficient in the department of New Testament Criticism, that he shall have mastered all that pertains to a constituting of the Text, completely and consistently, according to the same principles throughout; and also to the proper and suitable getting up of a Critical Apparatus.

These are problems of a purely philological character. It is, however, not easy to conceive that a philologer should, apart from any interest in Christianity, apply his skill to the solution of these problems in relation to the New Testament, since there are other writings to which this book is far inferior in point of linguistic importance. If, however, Theology should at any time be destitute of special proficient in this department, it would also follow that we should no longer have any security with respect to that which is requisite to be accomplished for the theological purpose of the study before us.

§ 125. In all that has been said hitherto (§§ 116—124), we have been proceeding upon the assumption, that none but he who has to do with the Canon in its original language is in a position to construct an interpretation for himself.

Otherwise, the critical problem would be of no moment except for the translator; and this, too, only within the limits described in § 121.

§ 126. Since it is not possible for even the most masterly translation to do away with the irrationality [non-equivalence] of languages; it follows that no discourse or writing is to be perfectly understood, except in its original language.
By *irrationality* is meant simply this well-known characteristic,—that neither a *material* nor a *formal* element of one language is *wholly resolvable* into a like element of another. Therefore, a discourse or writing which is presented through the medium of a translation—and consequently also the translation itself, as such—can be perfectly intelligible only to him who is capable of tracing it back to the original language.

§ 127. The original language of the books of the New Testament is *Greek*; but a good deal that is of importance (according to the principle laid down in § 121), is to be looked upon as being in some cases an *immediate translation* from the *Aramaic*, and in others, as having been *mediately influenced* by that language.

The assertions formerly put forth, that certain individual books of the New Testament were originally *written* in Aramaic, hardly require to be any longer taken notice of. Much, however, of that which has been preserved in the shape of *discourse* or *dialogue*, was originally *spoken* in Aramaic. The *mediate* influence referred to is to be found in that modification of the language which is known under the name of *Hebraism*.

§ 128. Even the manifold *references*, direct and indirect, which occur in books of the New Testament to those of the Old, suffice to create the necessity for a closer acquaintance with the *latter*, and therefore, for a knowledge of them in their original language also.

The more so, since these references relate, in part, to passages of great importance, in regard to which it is necessary to form an interpretation for one's self; and where, consequently, a correct judgment as to the relation which the common Greek translation of the Old Testament bears to the original language is indispensable.

§ 129. The more *limited* the diffusion and the *productivity* [copiousness] of a dialect, the less capable is it of being fully understood except in connexion with all that are *akin* to it. This principle, applied to the Hebrew language, makes it necessary that, in order to the fullest
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understanding of the Canon, there shall be also a competent acquaintance with all the Semitic dialects.

For this reason, the Arabic and Rabbinical dialects have, from the first, been brought to bear upon the interpretation of the Bible.

§ 130. This requirement, however, which includes a great deal that is, immediately, altogether foreign to the purpose of our theological studies, is to be enforced only in the case of those who aspire to a mastery in the department of Exegetical Theology, and that in the particular direction to which it refers.

In reference to this purely philological tendency, we may repeat the observations made at § 124.

§ 131. But we have to expect from every theologian, in so far as the department of Philology is concerned, a thorough knowledge of the Greek language (especially the prose form of it) in its various developments; an acquaintance with both the original languages of the Old Testament, and, by means of this knowledge, a clear insight into the nature and extent of the Hebraism of the New Testament; and finally,—in order that he may be able to make use of the labours of such as have attained to special proficiency,—in addition to an acquaintance with the literature of the entire department, he should have, in particular, an independently formed judgment with respect to what constitutes excess and defect, the natural and the affected, in the application of Orientalism.*

For in this respect, faults are constantly committed in both

* I apprehend that Schleiermacher means to enforce the necessity of a sound and independent judgment, not merely with regard to what constitutes the legitimate use, for the purposes of exposition, of an ascertained Orientalism, but also with regard to the determination of the previous question,—whether a given expression really has this character or not.—Ta.
directions,—on the one hand from partiality, on the other from prejudice.

§ 132. The perfect understanding of a discourse or writing is a work of art, and involves the need of an Art-Doctrine, or Technology, which we designate by the term Hermeneutics.

We apply the term Art, even in a more restricted sense, to every compound production in connexion with which we have a consciousness of certain general rules, the application of which in detail cannot be reduced, again, to other rules. It is a common, but unjustifiable practice, to restrict the use of Hermeneutics to larger works, or difficult matters of detail, exclusively. The rules which may be adopted, can form a Technology only when they are drawn from the nature of the entire process, and when, therefore, they also comprehend the entire process.

§ 133. Such a Technology has existence, only in so far as the precepts admitted form a system resting upon principles which are immediately evident from the nature of thought and of language.

So long as Hermeneutics continue to be dealt with merely as an aggregate of isolated observations, general and particular,—no matter how acute or how worthy of recommendation the latter may be,—they do not as yet deserve to be called a Technology.

§ 134. Protestant Theology cannot accept any representation with regard to the Canon, which should exclude from the pursuits that have reference to the latter, the application of the Technology in question.

For this would be possible only upon the supposition that, in some way or other, the existence of a miraculously inspired, perfect understanding of the Canon was taken for granted.

§ 135. The New Testament Scriptures, on account of their inward contents, as well as of the outward circumstances with which they stand connected, are especially difficult of interpretation.
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For the former reason,—because we have here the communica-
tion of peculiar religious notions, in their first develop-
ment, by writers who, for the most part, belonged to the less
cultivated circles of society, who employed a language which
was not vernacular to them, and employed it in an irregular
manner,—and such a communication is very liable to be mis-
understood. For the latter,—because we are ignorant, to a
great extent, of the circumstances and relations which modify
the course of thought, and our first discovery of them has to
be made from the documents themselves.

§ 136. Inasmuch as, by reason of the peculiar pur-
pose which Exegetical Theology has in view, the New
Testament Canon ought to be dealt with as a whole,
while on the other hand every individual document
which it contains, considered in and for itself, consti-
tutes a separate whole; we have further to entertain
this special problem,—the effecting of a mutual adjust-
ment and combination between the two modes of treat-
ment here specified.

The entire exclusion of the one or the other of these stand-
points, resulting as it does from opposite forms of theological
one-sidedness, has, in all ages, served to introduce error and
confusion into the business of exposition.

§ 137. The Special Hermeneutics of the New Testa-
ment can consist only of more precise determinations of
the general rules [of Hermeneutics], made with a refer-
ence to the peculiar circumstances of the Canon.

It is all the more a matter of necessity that the progress of
New Testament Hermeneutics towards the stricter form of a
Technology should be but gradual, from the circumstance
that their first foundations were laid at a time when even
general Hermeneutics existed, as yet, only in the form of a
collection of observations.

§ 138. There are two forms which the Technology of
interpretation may be made to assume; but in whatever
way we choose to take it, it constitutes the proper centre
of Exegetical Theology.
Either, General Hermeneutics may be made wholly prominent, so that the special portion shall assume the shape of corollaries; or, vice versa, Special Hermeneutics may be organized in a connected manner, and the general principles may then be introduced merely in the way of reference. — It is true, certainly, that [Hermeneutical] practice is subject to conditions derived from Philology and Criticism; but the principles [of Hermeneutics] exert, themselves, a most decided influence, both upon the operations of Criticism, and upon the more subtle class of observations in Philology.

§ 139. Here again, therefore, no reason presents itself for a man's venturing to rely upon others; on the contrary, it is necessary that every one should strive to attain as high a degree of mastery as possible.

The further the subject-matter with which we have to deal has been elaborated already, the less proper is it that this mastery should seek to show itself in the particular path of new interpretations.

§ 140. No document can be perfectly understood, except in connexion with the entire circle of mental representations out of which it has proceeded, and by the help of an acquaintance with the life-relations both of the writers and of those for whom they wrote.

For, every document bears the same relation to the collective life of which it is a part, that a single sentence does to the whole discourse or writing in which it occurs.

§ 141. The historical apparatus for the exposition of the New Testament embraces, accordingly, an acquaintance with the earlier and later Judaism, as also with the intellectual and civil condition of those localities in which and for which the New Testament Scriptures were composed.

The books of the Old Testament, therefore, constitute at the same time the most general auxiliary to the understanding of the New: after them come the Old and New Testament Apocrypha, and the later Jewish writers in general, as also the historians and geographers of the period and locality in ques-
tion. All these aids require, in like manner, to be used in their original language,—critically,—and according to the rules of Hermeneutics.

§ 142. Up to the present time, many of these sources of aid have not been used, either in their greatest possible completeness, or with a due degree of caution.

Both parts of the assertion are true especially with regard to the contemporary and the more recent Jewish writings.

§ 143. This collective apparatus, therefore, claims the activity of a number of theologians for a long time to come, in order that the previous labours of such as have been masters in this department may be corrected and supplemented.

Viewed in another direction, these labours go back into the department of Apologetics, inasmuch as the opponents of Christianity are in the habit of endeavouring, again and again, to explain Christianity wholly by means of that which was previously given, and moreover do not always represent it, [even on this basis], as having been a progress and improvement. That which belongs to the department before us, however, is simply the preparation, in due purity and completeness, of the historical material.

§ 144. As much of this as is adapted to be common property, is usually delivered, partly under the title Jewish and Christian Antiquities, and partly in combination with divers other matters, in the so-called Introduction to the New Testament.

In the latter, which, perhaps, in general, stands in need of a transformation, one still misses a great deal which, nevertheless, belongs especially (according to § 141) to this head, because we need to bring it with us to the reading of the New Testament. That which a man may allow himself to derive from the labours of special proficients in this department, consists, on the one hand, in collectanea from individual sources, and, on the other, in commentaries upon the separate books of the New Testament.

§ 145. As yet, the chief problem of Exegetical Theo-
logy is not by any means to be looked upon as completely solved.

Not even when we leave out of sight the circumstance that there are individual passages, some of which will never be corrected with perfect certainty, while others of them will never be explained to the satisfaction of all.

§ 146. With regard, also, to the auxiliary branches of knowledge which belong to this department, a twofold problem continues to present itself,—the problem of a constant advance towards the completion of their material, and towards the conversion of that which has already been elaborated, into common property.

Even the first study, under the guidance of such as are masters in the art, must not merely lay the foundation for the last, and furnish the commencement of practice in accordance with the precepts of Technology; but must also at least unlock the various individual departments of study, in reference to that mastery which is yet to be attained in them.

§ 147. A continued occupation about the New Testament Canon, which should not be prompted by a personal feeling of interest in Christianity, could only be directed against the Canon.

For, the purely philological and historical gain which the Canon promises to afford, is not sufficiently extensive to entice a man to the kind of occupation referred to. But even the investigations of opponents (comp. § 143.) have been of great service; and will become so again on future occasions.

§ 148. It is necessary that every occupation about the Canon which is not connected with a philological spirit and philological skill, should keep within the limits of the department of edification; for in that of theology, it could only serve to create confusion by its pseudodogmatic tendency.

For the sort of proceeding referred to cannot be founded in a pure and strict desire to understand [what is taken up in this manner.]
SECTION THE SECOND.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY IN THE MORE RESTRICTED SENSE; OR, CHURCH HISTORY.

§ 149. Church History,—taking the word in its more extended signification (comp. § 90),—is that knowledge which relates to the total development of Christianity, from the time of its having obtained a settled footing as a historical phenomenon.

What Christianity has wrought in an outward direction, abstractedly from the development here referred to, does not belong to the department before us.

§ 150. Every historical mass is capable of being viewed, on the one hand, as a single indivisible Being and Doing which is in the state or process of Becoming,—and, on the other hand, as a compound which is made up of an infinite number of individual momenta. The properly historical manner of contemplation is that in which the two aspects are intimately combined.

The one is merely the characteristic spirit of the whole, viewed in its aspect of mobility,—particular facts not being allowed to separate themselves; the other is merely the enumeration of its states in their diversity, without their being combined into a unity in the identity of their common impulse. The historical manner of contemplation includes both elements; the combination of a body of facts into a single image of the inward [principle or spirit], and the exhibition of this inward [principle] in the evolution of the facts.

§ 151. In like manner also, every fact constitutes a historic individuality only in so far as these two elements are posited identically; the external, a change in what is co-existent,—and the internal, a function of the [characteristic] energy, [conceived of as] in motion.

In this mode of expression the internal is posited as soul, the external as body, the whole, consequently, as a life.

§ 152. The observation and retention in the memory
of *local changes*, is an operation all but mechanical; whereas, on the other hand, the [ideal] *construction of a fact*, the combination of the external and the internal into a historical *view*, *is to be regarded as a free intellectual activity.*

It is on this account, too, that where the *observation* of a thing by several persons has been wholly the same, they nevertheless differ in their *apprehension* of it as a fact.

§ 153. The description of *local changes*, as such, in their contemporaneousness and succession, is not *History*, but *Chronicle*; and a thing of this kind, having reference to the Christian Church, would not be able to make good its claims to be regarded as a *theological discipline*.

For, of the entire career of Christianity, it would not present that [portion or aspect] which sustains any [immediate] relation to *Church Guidance*.

§ 154. It is only for the sake of *continuity*, that such events as are not properly to be regarded in the character of historical *elements*, require to be also taken up into the historical apprehension.

To this class belong *changes* amongst the *persons* who were influentially active in distinguished positions, where, at the same time, the peculiarity of their personal character did not exercise any perceptible influence upon their public proceedings.

§ 155. *Historical apprehension is a talent*, the development of which in each individual is effected, though in a different degree, by means of his own *historical life*, —but which can never wholly dispense with the *mechanical expertness* before referred to [§ 152].

As in ordinary life, so also within the domain of Science,—an excited *selfish* interest, and consequently also every thing of a *party* character, contributes more than any thing else to *falsify* the historical view.

* Compare the note on this word at § 65.—Tr.
§ 156. Historical knowledge with regard to that which is not a matter of personal experience may be obtained in two ways: immediately, but with much labour in the formation of a connected view,—by using the sources; easily, though only medially,—by the use of historical descriptions.

Hardly will it be possible to do without the latter in any department of History; certainly not in that of Church History.

§ 157. What we call sources, in the more restricted sense of the word, are monuments and documents which testify to a fact by the circumstance that they themselves constitute a part of it.

In this stricter sense of the word, even historical descriptions by eye-witnesses are no longer sources. Still, they are the more deserving of the name, in proportion as they approximate to the nature of a chronicle, and merely give again, quite in an unpretending way, what the writers themselves observed.

§ 158. It is possible to attain to a historical apprehension of one's own in the use of historical descriptions, only by effecting an exclusion of that which has been introduced by the author.

This process is facilitated when we are able to compare several accounts of the same series of facts; especially if they are taken from different points of view.

§ 159. The knowledge of any given condition of the whole, as presenting an image of the inward [principle or spirit] (comp. § 150), is attained only by combining, in their proper relations, a mass of individual facts which have a mutual connexion.

This, therefore, is the greatest service which the talent of historical apprehension is capable of rendering; it is that which implies and includes within itself every thing besides.

§ 160. As a theological discipline, Church History, in
the more extended signification of the term (comp. § 90),
ought especially to distinguish between that which has
proceeded from the characteristic energy of Christianity,
and that which has its foundation partly in the nature of
the organs set in motion, and partly in the influence of
heterogeneous principles; and to endeavour to measure
each in its advance and its recession.

Only, it was a very infelicitous method, to divide the de-
scription itself; on this account, into that of favourable and
unfavourable occurrences.

§ 161. From the first appearance of Christianity, and
therefore as early as the age of Primitive Christianity,
we are able to distinguish,—and also to separate from
one another in the historical delineation,—various func-
tions of this new, efficacious principle; which, again,
are themselves susceptible of manifold subdivision.

This, also, is true universally, in relation to all important
historical phenomena; in relation not merely to all religious
communities, but also to those which have a civil character.

§ 162. No one of these functions, however, admits of
being perfectly understood in its development, apart
from its relation to the others; and every division of
time which is capable of being treated apart as a rela-
tive whole, becomes what it is through the reciprocity of
the influences which these functions exert upon one
another.

For the living energy is posited entire in every momentum,
and can be apprehended, therefore, only by having regard to
the reciprocal dependence of all the different functions.

§ 163. The entire career of Christianity, therefore, is
to be completely apprehended only by adopting a very
manifold [many-sided] combination of both methods of
proceeding, it being necessary that each should supple-
ment at one point what has been defective in the other
at another.
While we are engaged in tracing the course of one function only, the prospect of the total life continues removed from our immediate observation, and we must reserve it to ourselves as a subsequent object to make good this defect. While we are occupied in bringing together into a single picture such traits as exhibit themselves contemporaneously, it is not possible for us to form an accurate estimate of the individual elements, and we must reserve it as a subsequent object to measure the latter by a comparison with what is homogeneous to them, but of earlier and of later occurrence.

§ 164. In the process of historical contemplation, the more we split up these different functions into the individual and minute, the more frequent must be the interposition of points which unite again what has been disjoined. The larger the dimensions assigned to the parallel masses, the longer may the observation of these individual portions be continued without interruption.

The periods, therefore, may be so much the greater, and must be so much the smaller, in proportion as the functions which are treated of are of greater or of smaller dimensions, respectively.

§ 165. The most important epoch-points, however, are always those which not only have a like value as it respects all the functions of Christianity, but are also of importance in relation to the historical developement out of the Church.

Since the appearance of Christianity, itself, constitutes at the same time a turning-point in the history of the world,—other epochs approximate in importance to this, only in the degree in which they resemble it in this respect.

§ 166. The formation of Doctrine, or the progress of the religious self-consciousness to distinctness,—and the fashioning of the Common Life,—or, of the impulse to fellowship, gratifying itself in each by means of all and in all by means of each,—are the two functions which are most easily separable, in the developement of Christianity.
This may be perceived from the fact, that great changes sometimes occur on the one side, while on the other every thing remains in the old position,—and that a certain point of time may be of importance in relation to the one side, as constituting a node of development, while it appears to be of no consequence with respect to the other.

§ 167. The formation of the Ecclesiastical Life is especially co-determined (comp. § 160) by political circumstances, and by the condition of society upon the whole; the development of Doctrine, on the other hand, by the state of science upon the whole, and especially by the dominant philosophes.

This co-determination is natural and unavoidable, and is not, therefore, a condition which, in and of itself, marks the existence of morbid states; but it certainly contains the ground of their possibility. Epoch-points of a more general character which proceed from a new development of knowledge, will also manifest themselves in the Christian Church most of all in the history of doctrine; such, on the contrary, as proceed from developments in the civil condition [of society] will also manifest themselves chiefly in the ecclesiastical life.

§ 168. On the side of the Ecclesiastical Life, again, the particulars most easily separable are, the development of the System of Worship [Cultus], that is, of the mode in which religious life-moments are made a matter of public communication; and the development of Morals, that is, of the common stamp which the influence of the Christian principle impresses upon the different departments of action.

The System of Worship bears the same relation to Morals as the more limited department of Art (in the stricter sense of the word) does to the more indefinite one of Social Life in general.

§ 169. The development of the System of Worship is especially co-determined by the nature of those means of delineation, suited to its purpose, which are to be
found in [any given] society, and by the manner in which these are distributed among its members. The progress of Christian Morals, on the other hand, by the state of development and distribution of the spiritual faculties in general.

With regard, namely, to the former particular: that communication or circulation of religious excitements† which is to be effected in accordance with the excitements themselves, is dependent solely upon delineation. With regard to the other: all those motives of which the religious sentiment has to possess itself, are at rest in the condition here referred to.

§ 170. Both, however,—Morals and Worship,—are also, in their progress, so intimately connected with each other, that whenever they differ too greatly as to the degree of movement or repose [prevailing in each respectively], it follows that either the System of Worship gets the appearance of having degenerated into empty usages or into superstition, while the Christian Life gives proof of its existence in the department of Morals,—or else, on the contrary, it seems as if, while Christian piety maintained itself by means of the System of Worship, the prevailing morals presented merely the result of motives foreign to Christianity.

These different modes of judgment serve as the manifestation of an internal antagonism existing amongst the members of the community, and having a connexion with the disproportion referred to in the text.

§ 171. The more sudden the occurrence of any important changes in either of these two departments, the more numerous are the re-actions to which they are exposed. Those only, on the other hand, which take

* The reader will scarcely need to be told that the term is here employed in its general, and not in its Dogmatical acceptation.—Tr.
† The word is used in its good sense. Every religious emotion, every quickening of the spiritual life, must image itself, visibly or audibly, or both, if others are to be made partakers of it.—Tr.
place more slowly, approve themselves as having a character of thoroughness.

The former assertion, however, is self-evident, only with regard to such changes as do not extend to several departments at the same time. It is easy, therefore, prematurely to regard changes of this kind as epoch-points, where, nevertheless, they often leave but few effects behind.

§ 172. Slow changes cannot be apprehended under the form of continuous series; on the contrary, they admit of being brought to view only at certain points, which are to be made individually prominent, and which exhibit the advances effected from one season to another.

These points, moreover, must not be selected arbitrarily, but must have a resemblance, although only in a subordinate sense, to those which constitute epochs.

§ 173. The historical apprehension, in this department, is the more perfect, the more definitely the relation of the Christian impulse to the moral and the artistic constitution of society presents itself to view, and the more convincingly that which belongs to the healthy developement of the religious principle is separated from what is weakly and morbid.

For in this way the claims of Church-Guidance upon a scientific knowledge of Christian History are satisfied.

§ 174. The Ecclesiastical Constitution,—especially in the Evangelical Church, where it is destitute of all outward sanction,—can only be considered as appertaining to the department of Morals.

This proposition, rightly understood, lies beyond the range of all those controversies which yet prevail with regard to the [Ecclesiastical] Law of the Evangelical Church, and merely expresses the essential difference between a civil and an ecclesiastical constitution.

§ 175. Those greater nodes of developement which also exert an influence out of the Church, upon the civil
life, will manifest themselves within the Church most immediately and most strongly in its Constitution.

Just because no other section of Christian Morals is so intimately connected (comp. § 167) with political circumstances.

§ 176. The highest degree of suitability belongs to that arrangement, in which the historical delineation of the collective Christian life is made to follow the order of development of the Church's Constitution.

For, this constitution exerts the most direct influence upon the System of Worship,—is indebted for its stability to the state of morals upon the whole,—and constitutes, at the same time, the expression of the relation between the religious and the civil communities.

§ 177. The System of Doctrine is developed, on the one hand, by means of that reflection which is continually directed towards the Christian self-consciousness in its different momenta, and on the other hand, by means of that effort which has for its object to establish, with more and more of general agreement and of precision, the expression by which this consciousness shall be represented.

Each of these tendencies is a check upon the other, the one having an outward, the other an inward direction. For this reason, different periods are characterized by the preponderance of the one or the other.

§ 178. The order in which, according to what has just been said, the different points of doctrine come forth to view, and the principal masses of the didactic dialect shape themselves, must be capable of being understood, at least in a general way, by a reference to the peculiar, essential character of Christianity.

For it would be contrary to the order of nature, if such conceptions as are most closely allied to this essence, were to be developed last of all.

§ 179. It is only in a morbid condition of the Church
that individual and personal (or it may be even extra-ecclesiastical) circumstances, can exert any considerable influence upon the course and the results of that occupation which has to do with the System of Doctrine.

If this has, nevertheless, not unfrequently been the case, still, writers of history, especially those of a more recent date, have placed far more to the account of such circumstances than the truth warrants us in doing.

§ 180. In proportion as it is impossible for the development of the System of Doctrine to keep clear of fluctuation and dissension, in the same proportion is prominence also given to the effort, to prove, on the one hand, the agreement of a given statement with the utterances of Primitive Christianity, and on the other hand, to establish it by a reference to certain propositions conceded elsewhere, and not deriving their origin from the Christian Faith, and which, accordingly, will be philosophemes.

Both these efforts would be made,—though probably at a later period, and in a different degree,—even if no controversy existed; for an impulse to the former is supplied by the characteristic social spirit of Christianity, and to the latter by the necessity of convincing ourselves of the existence of an agreement between the religious self-consciousness, when it has attained to distinctness, and the action of the speculative productivity.

§ 181. Only during the prevalence of a morbid condition can these two efforts become opposed to each other in such a manner, that the one party shall resolve not to proceed, in the determination of doctrine, beyond the declarations of Primitive Christianity, while the other introduces propositions of philosophy into the Christian System of Doctrine, without even caring to prove, by a reference to the Canon, that they also appertain to the Christian consciousness.

The former class present obstacles to the development of
the System of Doctrine,—the latter, in an equal degree, interfere with and falsify its principle.

§ 182. A knowledge of the changes which take place in the mutual relation of the two tendencies referred to, is essential to an understanding of the doctrinal development.

Through the neglecting of such momenta, we but too often get a mere chronicle instead of history, and the theological purpose of the discipline is lost altogether.

§ 183. Equally important is it to take knowledge of the relations subsisting between the movements of theoretical doctrines and those of practical dogmas; and where these movements become broadly distinct from each other, it is natural to separate Dogma-History, properly so called, from the History of Christian Morals.

On the whole, certainly, there have been more manifold and more violent agitations in connexion with the formation of the System of Faith [Glaubenslehre], properly so called; this, however, renders it the less allowable for the opposite tendency to be overlooked.

§ 184. If we take into consideration how many auxiliary branches of knowledge are required in order to follow out these different branches of Church History; it is manifest that this department of labour is of infinite extent, and that it postulates a broad distinction between that of which every one must be possessed, and that which is furnished only by the united labours of all who attain to special proficiency in the department before us (comp. § 92).

To these auxiliary branches of knowledge belong,—if every thing is to be understood in its connexion,—the entire science of History, so far as it has any relation to the periods in question, and,—if every thing is to be derived from the sources,—the entire study of Philology, so far as it concerns the matter in hand, and especially Diplomatic Criticism [the Criticism of Documents].
§ 185. It can only be observed, in general, that out of this infinite circuit of acquisitions, every theologian must be in possession of that which he requires in order to an independent participation in the Guidance of the Church.

This formula,—to all appearance a very narrow one,—supposes, however, that in addition to his particular, local activity, every theologian strives to exercise a general influence also; although it may not be possible distinctly to point out the latter in its effects.

§ 186. Since, now, at any given time, the existing state of things out of which a new momentum is to be developed, is capable of being understood only by a reference to the Past in its totality, while nevertheless its immediate connexion is with the most recent occurrence that has formed an epoch: it follows, that a correct view of the latter, rendered intelligible by means of all the principal revolutions which have preceded it, according to the degree of its connexion with them, is the first and principal thing required.

It is manifest that, in such a case, no particular regard can be had to the question, whether the prevailing character of the existing momentum is not already that of a preparation for the epoch which is to come; for this question must itself receive its immediate solution from a view of the relation [actually] sustained by the former towards the latter [for which, of course, we must wait until the coming epoch presents itself as a fact.]

§ 187. In order, however, that these observations may not retain the character of a mere series of single, unconnected pictures, it is necessary that they should be combined by means of the plexus (comp. § 91)—not meagrely filled up—of the chief momenta belonging to every branch of Church History in every period.

And this, as it is designed to be the foundation of an indepen-
dent activity, must also be, as far as possible, a survey constructed from accounts of various character.

§ 188. But this, too, grows into a living historical view,* such as also to possess an impulsive energy, only when the entire career of Christianity is apprehended at the same time (comp. 150) as the exhibition of the Christian spirit in its [state or aspect of] movement, and when, consequently, every thing is referred to one inward [principle].

Not until it has assumed this form, is it possible for the knowledge of the entire career referred to to exert an influence upon the Guidance of the Church.

§ 189. Every local exercise of influence calls for a more precise acquaintance with the particular department in which it takes place; and this knowledge must approximate to completeness in the same degree in which it bears more directly upon the Present.

The rule becomes modified, of course, according to the extent of the locality; it being often the case that the smallest locality, that which is occupied by a single congregation, has no separate history of its own, but can only claim attention as forming part of a larger whole.

§ 190. It is necessary, however, that every one should also exercise himself in personal research, and the use of the sources, at least in connection with some one small portion of History.

Whether it be that in the pursuit of this study, he merely makes a careful and constant reference to the sources, or that he attempts an independent construction from them. Otherwise, a man could hardly have at his command even so much of Historical Criticism as is requisite in order to a right use of accounts which are at variance with one another.

§ 191. A pursuit of the Study of Church History,

* See the marginal note to § 65, and the text of § 152. Etymologically (though not according to prevailing usage) one might perhaps say intuition. —Ta.
proceeding beyond the measure just laid down, must be directed towards the accomplishing of something new.

Nothing is more unprofitable than a heaping up of historical knowledge which neither serves to any practical purposes, nor is communicated to others in the way of delineation.

§ 192. These new services may tend towards a correction or completion of the material, as well as towards an increase of truthfulness and liveliness in the delineation.

The deficiencies which still exist in all these respects are unmistakeable, and are easily to be explained.

§ 193. In the pursuit of the study of Church History, it is not possible for the interest of the Church and the interest of Science [that is, as apprehended and sympathized with by the individual] to become contradictory the one to the other.

Since we are content to abstain from laying down rules for others, we limit the application of this proposition to our own Church; to which, as an inquiring and self-forth-forming community, even the most perfect impartiality cannot be productive of injury, but only conducive to progress. The liveliest degree of interest, therefore, which the Evangelical Theologian may feel in his Church, must not be allowed to prejudice either his investigation or his delineation. And just as little is it to be feared that the results of his investigation will weaken his interest in the Church; in the worst case, they can but impart to it the impulse to co-operate in the removal of the imperfections which are discerned.

§ 194. The labours of any individual in the department of Church History must, on the one hand, take their rise from his own inclination, and, on the other, be determined by the opportunities which present themselves to him.

A lively interest on behalf of Theology will always know how to bring the former into connexion with the latter, or even to provide the latter for the use of the former.
SECTION THE THIRD.—THE HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRESENT CONDITION OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 195. Under this head we have to do (comp. §§ 94—97) with Dogmatic Theology,—or the knowledge of the doctrine now current in the Evangelical Church; and with Ecclesiastical Statistics, or the knowledge of the existing social condition in all the different sections of the Christian Church.

We must leave it to the further carrying out of our plan, to justify us in assigning this place to Dogmatic Theology; which, in other systems, (also under the name of Systematic Theology), has been made to occupy quite a different position. Here we have only to show that the two disciplina mentioned in the text, exhaust the heading prefixed, in its whole extent. This is clear from the consideration that as the Church is altogether a Community, there is, strictly speaking, nothing in it to be known which would not form a part of its social condition. The System of Doctrine is taken up apart from the latter topic, merely because its delineation admits of and requires a peculiar mode of treatment. It is true that there are other parts of the social condition, with regard to which the same thing might also take place; but these have not, hitherto, been specially elaborated as theological disciplinae. But if, in periods when the Church is divided, (according to § 96), it is possible only for each Church-Community in particular to elaborate its own system of doctrine in a dogmatic form: the question arises, how is the Evangelical Theologian to arrive at a knowledge of the doctrine which is current in other Christian Church-Communities, and what is the place which our outline is to appropriate to this purpose? The most direct method is, to have recourse to the dogmatic representations which they themselves give of it; which become for him, however, mere historical reports. On the other hand, the place to be assigned to this knowledge in our Outline, is to be found in the History of Christian Doctrine, followed down as far as the existing momentum; for
which history the said representations constitute the genuine sources. But Statistics, too, in treating of each individual Community, may have a place specially devoted to the statement of its doctrine.

I. Dogmatic Theology.

§ 196. A dogmatic treatment of the System of Doctrine, apart from personal conviction, is not possible; on the other hand, it is not necessary that all those elaborations of it which have reference to the same period of the same Church-Community should agree amongst themselves.

One might be disposed to deduce both the propositions which are here contradicted, from this fact, that the dogmatic treatment has to do merely (comp. §§ 97 and 98) with the doctrine current at the given time. But the man to whom this doctrine is not a matter of conviction,—though he may, indeed, furnish a report concerning it, and concerning the manner, too, in which its inward connexion is conceived of,—cannot establish this connexion by means of the exhibition which he gives of it. Yet it is the latter circumstance alone which gives to the mode of treatment a dogmatic character; the former is merely a historical exhibition, such as may be given in like manner of all systems by one and the same man, if possessed of the requisite knowledge.—On the other hand, there is, in the Evangelical Church, no necessity for entire agreement, for this reason, that even at one and the same time, different views have currency side by side. Every thing namely, is to be looked upon as having currency, which is officially asserted and officially heard, without calling forth an official contradiction. The limits of this difference, therefore, certainly, are sometimes broader and sometimes narrower, according to time and circumstances.

§ 197. We should not give the name of a system of Dogmatics, either to the laying down and supporting by proof of a body of propositions which were prevailingly
characterized by a deviation from the views generally current, and which expressed merely the conviction of the individual; or, on the other hand, to such a system as, in a period marked by the prevalence of diverse theories, would only consent to admit that, in regard to which no controversy existed.

No one will deny the former part of this assertion. But the controversial question, too, proceeding thence,—as to whether text-books can be admitted to have a dogmatic character, when they merely give a historical report concerning the current system of doctrine, and, on the other hand, lay down in connexion with proof such propositions, exclusively, as might have an official prohibition adduced against them,—serves as a further confirmation of our notion.—A purely ironical composition of this kind will, for the most part, prove so meagre and indefinite, that there will be everywhere a want, not only of the middle terms which are necessary to effect a proof, but also of that precision in the definition of notions, which is necessary to procure for the delineation the confidence of the reader.

§ 198. The immediate use of Dogmatic Theology in connexion with Church-Guidance is, to show in how many ways, and up to what point, the principle of the current period has developed itself on every side; and how the terms of improved configurations which belong to the Future are related thereto. At the same time it furnishes the department of practice with the norm for the popular mode of expression; by way of guarding against the recurrence of old forms of confusion, and of preventing by anticipation the occurrence of new ones.

This practical interest is to be referred exclusively to the conservative function of Church-Guidance; and it was from this that the gradual formation of the system of Dogmatics originally proceeded. The division enunciated in the former sentence of the paragraph is explained by what was said in
general with regard to the contents of every individual momentum (comp. § 91).

§ 199. In every momentum which admits of a separate delineation, (comp. § 93), that which, in the System of Doctrine, is derived from the last preceding epoch, bears in the most marked degree the character of having been ecclesiastically determined; and that, on the contrary, which serves rather to prepare the way for the succeeding epoch, presents itself as originating with individuals.

The former seems ecclesiastically defined, not only in a higher degree than the latter, but also in a higher degree than that which has been derived by transmission from earlier periods.—There is the more reason for tracing back the latter to individuals merely, in proportion as we may be unable, for the present, distinctly to anticipate a new configuration.

§ 200. All points of doctrine which are developed by the dominant principle of the period, must agree amongst themselves; whereas, on the contrary, all others, so long as we can but say of them that they have not this for their point of departure, appear as forming an unconnected plurality.

The dominant principle itself, however, may be variously apprehended, and this may give rise to a number of dogmatic delineations, connected in themselves, respectively, but differing from one another, and all laying claim, perhaps not without reason, to a like degree of ecclesiasticity.—When the heterogeneous, isolated elements become connected, they either present themselves to view as constituting a new apprehension of the principle already dominant, or else they announce the development of a new principle.

§ 201. As a complete acquaintance with the state of doctrine embraces not merely that which is essentially interwoven with the further development, but also that which, although as a personal theory it was not unimportant, yet, as such, again disappears; so also must a
comprehensive dogmatic method of treatment give a proper degree of attention to *everything that has a contemporaneous existence* in the Church Community with which it is connected.

A place will always, of necessity, be found for this, if, in the attempt to establish the *connexion* laid down, [that is, as being the *true inward connexion* of the System of Doctrine] *comparisons* and *parallels* are not neglected.

§ 202. A dogmatic delineation is *perfect* in proportion to the degree in which it possesses, along with the *assertory* character, a *divinatory* character also.

In the former is manifested the author's *confidence* in his own theory; in the latter, the *clearness* with which he apprehends the existing state of things upon the whole.

§ 203. Every element of doctrine that is constructed in the spirit of a desire to *hold fast* that which is already *matter of general acknowledgment*, along with the natural *inferences* therefrom,—is of an *orthodox* character; every element constructed with a tendency to keep the System of Doctrine in a state of *mobility*, and to make room for *other* modes of apprehension, is *heterodox*.

It seems to be too great a limitation of these terms, when they are applied exclusively to the relation which doctrinal opinions bear to a certain *norm* that has been set up; the same antagonism may also be found where there is no such norm in existence. Rather may we say that, according to the explanation given above, it is possible for the *Symbol* to have its own *origin* from the orthodox *tendency*; and so it has happened, often enough. What, on the other hand, may appear strange in our explanation, is, that it does not refer at all to the *contents* of the propositions, in and for themselves; and yet this, also, is easily justified upon a closer reflection.

§ 204. *Both classes of elements are alike important*, as in relation to the historical progress of Christianity *in general*, so also in relation to every important *momentum* as such.
As, notwithstanding any degree of uniformity which might exist, there would still be no true unity without the former class of elements; so, notwithstanding any measure of diversity, there would still be no conscious, free mobility without the latter.

§ 205. It is false orthodoxy, to wish for a continued retention, in the system of dogmatic treatment, of that also, which, in so far as the public communications of the Church are concerned, is already completely antiquated; and which, moreover, does not, by its scientific expression, exert any determinate influence upon other particulars of doctrine.

It is evidently necessary that a doctrinal definition to which these remarks become applicable, should be rendered moveable again, and that the inquiry should be conducted back to the point at which it stood previously.

§ 206. It is false heterodoxy, to manifest hostility, in the system of dogmatic treatment, to such formulæ as have their well-grounded point of support in the communications of the Church; and the scientific expression of which, too, does not create any confusion as it respects their relation to other particulars of Christian Doctrine.

This principle, therefore, does not by any means extend to justify that servile spirit of accommodation, which would allow the retention of all that happens to be used by a number of persons for the purpose of edification, even though it may not be in accordance with the fundamental doctrines of our faith.

§ 207. A dogmatic delineation [of the System of Doctrine] intended for the Evangelical Church, will avoid both these forms of irregularity: and notwithstanding that mobility of the latter which we sought to vindicate, will still find it possible to be orthodox in regard to all the chief particulars of doctrine; but it will also be compelled,—notwithstanding that it confines
itslf exclusively to that which has currency,—to give a start, in particular places, to some things which are heterodox, also.

The natural relation of the two elements will,—if this discipline is symmetrically developed from its proper notion,—always be that which is here laid down; and a change in this respect will become necessary, only when one of the two extremes has been for a long time predominant.

§ 208. Every dogmatic theologian who either innovates, or cries up what is old, in a one-sided manner, is but an imperfect organ of the Church: and if occupying a falsely heterodox stand-point, he will declare even the most strictly proper orthodoxy to be false; and if a falsely orthodox stand-point, he will combat even the mildest and most inevitable heterodoxy as a destructive innovation.

These fluctuations have been the principal cause which has hitherto almost continually prevented the Dogmatic Theology of the Evangelical Church from developing itself in a peaceful progress.

§ 209. Every doctrine which is taken up into the dogmatic combination, must support by proof the manner in which it is specifically determined; on the one hand, by an immediate or mediate tracing back of its contents to the New Testament Canon, and on the other, by the agreement of its scientific expression with the construction which is put upon certain kindred propositions.

All the propositions, however, upon which, in this sense, it is possible to fall back, are subject to the same rule; so that here there is no other subordination than this,—that those propositions are least in need of either of the operations specified, which have their popular, their Scriptural, and their scientific forms of expression most nearly identical with one another, so that every fellow-believer verifies them at once by a reference to the certainty of his own immediate
religious self-consciousness.—This distinction will probably survive as a relic of another, which, as it was commonly understood, is already to be considered antiquated; the distinction between *Fundamental* Articles, and others [which were regarded as not fundamental.]

§ 210. If any important change takes place in the treatment of the *Canon*, there must also be a change in the mode of proof of individual doctrines, notwithstanding that their contents remain the same without alteration.

The orthodox dogmatic interest should never be allowed to form an obstacle to exegetical inquiries, or to dominate over them; but the falling away of individual proof-passage, as they are called, does not, in and of itself, constitute a testimony against the correctness of a current *doctrine*. On the other hand, canonical proof which continues to maintain its validity, must needs impart security to a doctrine against the heterodox tendency.

§ 211. In regard to the propositions which definitively express the peculiar character of the *existing period*, a tracing of them back to the *Symbol* may stand in the place of canonical proof, provided we are still able to appropriate the interpretation which was then current [that is, at the time when the Symbol was composed].

In these cases it will also be advisable to make this agreement with the Symbol conspicuous, in order the more distinctly to distinguish these propositions from others [of a different character] (comp. §§ 199, 200, 203.) The principle, however, does not by any means apply to propositions which have been transferred from *earlier* periods into the Symbol of the current one, by a process of mere repetition.

§ 212. Since the peculiar character of the doctrine of the Evangelical Church is inseparable from that *antagonism* between the Evangelical and the Romish Churches to which the issue of the Reformation first gave fixity; it follows, too, that every proposition which
is to be traced back to our Symbols, is completely worked out only in so far as it bears within itself the antithesis to the corresponding propositions maintained by the Romish Church.

For it would not be possible, either for a proposition in regard to which the antithesis had already, on our part, been abrogated, or for one with which this antithesis had nothing to do, to find sufficient verification in a reference to the Symbol.

§ 213. The strictly didactic form of expression, which, by means of the connectedness subsisting amongst the individual formulæ, gives to the dogmatic procedure its scientific stability, is dependent, at any given time, upon the existing condition of the philosophical disciplines.

Partly on account of the logical relation of the formulæ to one another, and partly because many of their notional definitions are based upon elements which belong to Psychology and to Ethics.

§ 214. The dialectic element of the System of Doctrine is capable of entering into conjunction with every system of philosophy that does not, by the principles it maintains, exclude or deny the religious element,—either in general, or in that particular form of it to which Christianity professes immediately to belong.

Therefore, all decidedly materialistic and sensualistic systems,—which, however, perhaps, will hardly be allowed to pass for truly philosophical at all (and all properly atheistic systems will also have the same character)—all such systems are to be excluded from being employed in connexion with the discussion of Dogmatics. It is a difficult thing to lay down, in general, limits which shall be stricter than those now specified.

§ 215. Individual doctrines may therefore be differently apprehended in contemporary dogmatic systems, and may also be expressed differently at different periods, while
in both cases no diversity presents itself in their religious contents.

By reason of the diversity which characterises the co-existing or successive Schools and their terminologies. It is only in consequence of misapprehension, however, that such differences come to be also matter for a dogmatic controversy.

§ 216. In like manner, an appearance of similarity may arise between propositions, the religious contents of which have, notwithstanding, more or less of diversity.

Not only is it possible, in detail, for the difference of different theological schools belonging to the same Church to conceal itself behind the identity of the scientific terminology; but it is also possible for Protestant and Catholic propositions, especially where they have a certain degree of remoteness from the leading-points of the Symbols, to appear of like import.

§ 217. The Protestant treatment of Dogmatics must strive to bring into distinct consciousness the relation sustained by every separate article of doctrine to the antagonism that governs the period in which we live.

This is a want in the department of Church-Guidance, which can be satisfied only in the way pointed out; a department in which incorrect views with regard to the state of this antagonism—(as to whether, and where, by the approximation of the opposing parties, it is already in process of disappearing,—or, on the contrary, as to whether, and where, it is first beginning to develop itself more definitely)—must needs be productive of the most awkward confusions.

§ 218. Dogmatic Theology in its entire compass is a thing of infinite extent, and requires that a separation shall be made between the department of special proficiency and that of common property.

This distinction, however, of course, relates merely to the extent of the material to be elaborated; not to the certainty and strength of the conviction, nor to the manner in which it is obtained.

§ 219. It is to be demanded of every Evangelical
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Theologian, that he be occupied in the formation of a personal conviction with regard to all passages, properly so called, of the System of Doctrine: not merely as these have been developed from the principles of the Reformation considered in themselves, and in opposition to the Romish doctrines; but also in so far as there is anything new which has taken shape, and which possesses a historical significance, at least in relation to the current momentum, that is not to be overlooked.

By a passage, I understand such a proposition or body of propositions, as, on the one hand, has a determinate place in the Canon and the Symbol, and, on the other, cannot be passed by without its resulting that other propositions or bodies of propositions, of the same compass and value, become obscure and unintelligible.—The expression, be occupied in the formation of a conviction, does not by any means involve the existence of a sceptical state, but merely that maintenance of an inward receptivity with regard to new investigations, which is essential to the spirit of our Church; a receptivity, in so far as it is possible, on the one hand, that there may be a change in the treatment of the Canon, and, on the other, that a new source may be opened up in relation to the dogmatic phraseology. This requirement, too, relates, immediately, not to faith in that aspect in which it is the common possession of all Christians; but to the strictly didactic construction of the enunciations which have reference to it.

§ 220. The study of Dogmatics must therefore commence with the understanding and testing of one or more strictly-connected exhibitions of that which has been ecclesiastically determined; by way of a further development of the Symbols, which, from their very nature, are but fragmentary.

A knowledge of Dogma-History, (although only in the same manner in which it is possible for the laic, also, to be in possession of its essential features), must necessarily be taken for granted at the outset of this proceeding.—For the rest, we should distinguish between, and group together, respectively,
such delineations as develope their propositions, for the most part, from the letter of the Symbols, and such as profess to continue faithful to the spirit of the Symbols, although they subject the letter of them, likewise, to the operations of Criticism.

§ 221. In relation to the new matter, which is not to be understood by means of the Symbol,—and in so far as it belongs to this department,—it must be left to reflective observation to decide, in the first instance, whether or not this new matter contains several particulars which point backwards to a common origin, and give indication of a common design.

For, in proportion as this is the case, may we the more safely suppose that the views in question have obtained a historical footing.

§ 222. An accurate knowledge of all contemporary methods of treatment and all controversial questions in agitation, as well as of all venturesome opinions, and a settled judgment as to the foundation and value of these various forms and elements, constitute the department of special proficiency in connexion with Dogmatics.

This settled judgment is to be understood with a reservation of that fresh receptivity (comp. § 218), which is not less necessary to the Master than to the beginner.—By venturesome opinions are to be understood not merely the ephemeral phenomena of a capricious and ill-regulated personality, but also every thing which, as being, properly speaking, morbid, is to be traced back to anti-Christian, or at least to anti-Evangelical impulses, and becomes an object for the practical application of Polemics.

§ 223. In the preceding delineation, little regard has been had to the now prevailingly customary division of Dogmatic Theology, into the discussion of the theoretical side of the System of Doctrine, or Dogmatics in the stricter sense,—and the discussion of its practical side, or the Christian Doctrine of Morals; the less so, because
this separation cannot be looked upon as essential; even as it does not possess, either in general, or in relation to the Evangelical Church, the character of originality.*

Neither the designations theoretical and practical, nor the terms Doctrine of Faith [System of Faith, Glaubenslehre] and Doctrine of Morals, are perfectly accurate. For the Christian rules of life are also theoretical propositions, when viewed as developements of the Christian notion of the Good; and they are propositions of faith, not less than those which are dogmatical in the proper sense, since they have to do with the same Christianly-religious self-consciousness,—only that they have to do with it in its manifestation as impulse, [and not as taking the form of conception or of feeling.]

—Now, although it cannot be denied that the treatment of the two in combination belongs to a period in the history of the theological sciences which must be regarded as in many respects imperfect, still, a progressive improvement, even in this department, may very well be conceived of, apart from a separation of the kind referred to.

§ 224. If this separation affords to both kinds of propositions, respectively, the advantage of being more easily apprehended in their connexion, it has been accompanied by an additional, special advantage as it regards the Christian Doctrine of Morals, in that the latter is now subjected to a more extended treatment in detail.

This last-mentioned advantage, however, is not essentially a consequence of the separation. For it is possible to conceive of a treatment of the two in combination, in which the proportion [of attention given to each respectively] should be the reverse of that which actually existed before the separation; and then the separation would have led to the same advantage in favour of Dogmatics. It may be urged as a set-off against the advantage first named, that a well-ordered, lively combination of the two appears to furnish an especial security against the facility with which it is possible for the dogmatic propositions, properly so called, to degenerate into

* That is, it does not originate spontaneously and independently; it is in its nature purely consequential.—Tr.
lifeless formulæ, and the ethical into merely outward pres-
scriptions.

§ 225. The division of this department may very easily give rise to the supposition of its being possible that, in conjunction with altogether diverse apprehensions of the System of Faith, there might nevertheless be but one and the same apprehension with regard to the System of Morals,—and vice versa.

This error has already obtained a very profound hold upon our ecclesiastical commonwealth; and it can be effectually counteracted only by our taking up the position which the scientific treatment of the matter affords.

§ 226. This division finds a considerable amount of justification, as well in the fact that the verification by means of the Canon and the Symbol assumes, in the case of the ethical propositions, a form differing a good deal from that which it has in the case of the dogmatical,—as also in the circumstance that the respective terminologies derive their origin from different departments of science.

In this respect we have, it is true, connected the theological sciences, in general, with Ethics, and the disciplines dependent upon the latter; but if we look at Dogmatic Theology in particular, we must admit that the terminology of the System of Faith, properly so called, has its origin, to a great extent, in that philosophical science which, under the name of Rational Theology, had its place in the System of Metaphysics,—whereas, on the other hand, the Christian Doctrine of Morals is able to draw, for the most part, only from the Duty-Doctrine of the philosophical system of Ethics.

§ 227. The separation of the two disciplines has also generated a perverted eclectic mode of proceeding, it having been supposed that one might, without any injurious results, proceed upon the basis of a different philosophical school, when dealing with the Christian Doc-
trine of \textit{Morals}, from that to which reference is made when dealing with the System of \textit{Faith}.

It is only necessary to have realized, in one's own mind, the \textit{possibility} of an \textit{undivided} treatment of Dogmatic Theology, in order to discover that the proceeding referred to is absolutely inadmissible.

\textbf{§ 228.} The separate mode of treatment is \textit{the more appropriate}, in proportion as the \textit{progress} of the period, in relation to the development of the dominant principle and the tension of the prevailing antagonism,\textsuperscript{*} has been marked by \textit{less of actual uniformity} in these two departments [Doctrine, or Faith, and \textit{Morals}],—or at any rate, in proportion as there has been less of uniformity in the \textit{sequence} of the \textit{scientific observation} upon the \textit{actual course} of events.

In regard to \textit{morality itself}, we should, perhaps, have no sufficient reason for asserting that the antithesis between Protestantism and Catholicism is less developed than it is in regard to Faith; but that in our \textit{systems of Christian Morals}, this antithesis has not, by a great deal, been so fully worked out as in our Dogmatics, seems to be undeniable.

\textbf{§ 229.} It cannot be denied that there are \textit{many} elaborations of the Christian Doctrine of \textit{Morals}, in which there appears but a faint glimmering of the proper type of a \textit{theological} discipline, and which are but little distinguishable from \textit{philosophical} systems of \textit{morals}.

That this must exert a most mischievous influence upon Church-Guidance, is perfectly clear. In the case of an \textit{undivided} treatment of the whole subject, it would be \textit{impossible} for such a result to take place, with respect to the propositions belonging to the Doctrine of \textit{Morals}, except the System of \textit{Faith} were also to renounce its proper character.

\textbf{§ 230.} The separate treatment of these two branches

\textsuperscript{*} Or \textit{antithesis}, if we think of the antagonism as \textit{expressed in doctrine}. In German, both notions are expressed by the same word, (\textit{Gegensatz}).

—Tr.
of Dogmatic Theology will be the less liable to objection, in proportion to the completeness with which all that was said in §§ 196—216 [respecting the System of Doctrine in general,] is also made to apply to the Christian Doctrine of Morals, and in proportion to the care which is taken, in treating each of the two disciplines, to re-establish its connexion with the other by means of particular allusions.

The former part of this observation cannot be carried out into detail here. The possibility of the latter particular is evident from what was said at § 224.

§ 231. It always remains desirable that the undivided method of treatment should also, from time to time, obtain currency again.

That this should be hardly possible without occasioning the resulting mass to lose all regular form, is a thing which could happen only where one went very much into detail.

II. ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS.

§ 232. In the collective condition of an ecclesiastical society, we distinguish between its internal state* and its external relations; and in the former of these, again, between the contents which may be pointed out therein, and the form in which the society exists.

Many particulars, certainly, seem to admit of being included in the one leading division just as readily as in the other; but yet, always in a different connexion; so that the circumstance does not detract from the correctness of our classification.

§ 233. In periods when the Christian Church is not outwardly one, the problem now before us embraces all the several Church-Communities which may happen to exist.

* Beschaffenheit—quality, state as made up of qualities; in short, the mode of being of a thing at a given time.—Tz.
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Every one of these is then to be individually taken into consideration; and the relations of each to the rest find their place, as a matter of course, in the second half of the discipline upon which we are engaged.—But even if there were no definitive separation of individual Church-Communities from one another, still, individual portions of the Church would be found to differ so much from other portions, in regard as well to their inward character, as to their relations, that classifying divisions must be made, notwithstanding.

§ 234. The contents of any Ecclesiastical Community at a given point of time, depend upon the degree of strength and of uniformity with which the characteristic general spirit of the said Community pervades the entire mass appertaining to it.

Immediately, therefore, and in general, [they are equivalent to] the condition of its health in relation to Indifferentism and Separatism (comp. §§ 56, 57.) This, again, is discovered by looking, on the one hand, at the exponents of the development of the System of Doctrine, regard being had to the unanimity or multifariousness of the results, and to the manner in which the Congregation is interested in this function; and on the other, at the influence of the ecclesiastical common-spirit upon the other departments of life, and especially upon the life of Divine Worship [that department of life which has to do with Divine Worship.]

§ 235. The greater the differences which exist in these respects in Church-Communities of considerable extent, the more contrary is it to the design of the discipline before us, that we should content ourselves with mere average statements.

That which is most instructive for the purposes of Church Guidance would be lost, if no comparison were instituted, with reference to the most important points which come into consideration, between those masses which are characterized by the largest amount of dissimilarity.

§ 236. The essential nature of the form under which a Church-Community exists, or, of its Constitution, depends upon the manner in which the Guidance of the
Church is organized, and upon the relation of the entire body to those who take part in the Guidance of the Church, or, to the Clerus in the broader sense of the word.

The great variety of these constitutions renders it necessary to distribute them into certain principal groups; in doing which, however, care should be taken that we do not lay too much stress upon their analogy with political forms, and also that we do not, while attending to their general character, lose sight of their specific differences.

§ 237. The delineation of the internal state is perfect in proportion to the extent of the means which it presents of estimating correctly the influence of the Constitution upon the inward condition, and of the latter upon the former.

For this stands connected with the greatest problem of Church-Guidance; and where such a reference is not made, all accounts belonging to this department remain mere dead notices, as do all statistical figures apart from intelligent combination.

§ 238. The external relations of a Church-Community, —which can only be relations to other communities,— are, on the one hand, relations to communities of a like nature, (namely, those of Christianity and of individual Christian communities, towards such as are extra-Christian, as also those of Christian communities to one another), and, on the other hand, relations to communities of a different kind,—and amongst these especially, to civil society, and to science, in the entire compass of the term.

We regard the latter as a community, for this reason, if for no other,—that all scientific communication is subject to conditions imposed by language,—and every language, surely, forms a distinct region of fellowship; so that the relations of the same Church-Community may be altogether different in different regions of language.
§ 239. Every Church-Community stands towards those with which it is in contact in a relation of communication as well as of re-action; which is capable of being diversified by gradation to the most manifold extent, from a junction of the maximum of the one with the minimum of the other, to the opposite proportion.

By contact is to be understood, not merely local contiguity, but intercourse of any kind. Reaction, moreover—even apart from all Polemics that may happen to have an outward direction—is involved, on the one hand, in the common reference [made by all parties] to the Canon, and on the other hand, in the activity which aims to promote a progressive improvement from without—which can never be regarded as wholly wanting.

§ 240. The relation of Ecclesiastical Communities to particular wholes of knowledge fluctuates between two forms of one-sidedness: the one of these occurring, when the Church will not allow validity to any knowledge except that which she can herself appropriate for her own special purpose, and which, therefore, she can also herself bring forth; and the other, when the objective consciousness claims to have attributed to it that verity which belongs to the self-consciousness.

For, at both these points, the two communities in question exclude each other. In the middle, between the two, there lies, as a common point of approximation, a mutual active recognition. The problem is, to show clearly what position an existing relation [between two such communities] occupies, with reference to these principal points.

§ 241. The same may be said of the relation between Church and State. Only that in this case—in which formulæ of a more determinate character are developed,—we more readily perceive, on the one hand, that it is not easy for a mutual recognition to take place, without some small preponderance being given to the one side or
to the other,—and, on the other hand, that Evangelical Christianity, especially, assigns definite limits to its claims.

That this is not the place for a theory with regard to the relation just mentioned, may be understood as a matter of course. Many of the topics, [Oerter, loci] however, which are here pointed out, are also treated of in what is called Church Law [Kirchenrecht]; only, as the name itself indicates, the municipal stand-point predominates in the view which is there taken of them.

§ 242. According to these its essential outlines, the department of Ecclesiastical Statistics is capable of being carried out to an unlimited extent.

Moreover, it requires, as a matter of course, perpetual renovation; inasmuch as, after the occurrence of any change, the existing elements of Church History receive accessions.

§ 243. That, amongst ourselves, theologians but too frequently restrict themselves to an acquaintance with the condition of the Evangelical Church, and indeed, merely of that part of it in which their own circle of activity is situated, is a circumstance which has a most injurious influence upon the ecclesiastical praxis.

There is nothing which contributes so much to favour a persistence in the customary and traditional, as a want of acquaintance with other, but yet kindred, states of things. And nothing gives rise to a more rugged one-sidedness, than the fear lest one should be obliged to recognise good elsewhere, which is wanting within his own circle.

§ 244. A general acquaintance with the condition of the whole of Christendom, in the leading relations here specified, and in proportion to the degree in which each part of it is connected with the circle of his own activity, is what we have to require as indispensable on the part of every Evangelical Theologian.

The obligation to become more intimately acquainted with that which is nearer and more allied,—which certainly follows from the above,—is, however, only of a subordinate cha-
racter. For it is possible for the individual rightly to exercise an efficient influence upon the Church-Community to which he himself belongs, only when he works upon it as upon an organic part of the whole,—a part which has to maintain and to develope itself in its relative opposition to the other portions.

§ 245. Much yet remains to be accomplished by special labour in this department, as it respects both matter and form.

During the most recent period, it is true, a large amount of material has been provided; but it has seldom been apprehended from the right point of view. And of the more comprehensive class of works, the number is still so small as to render it impossible that the best form can yet have been discovered.

§ 246. The merely outward description of things as they are, is in relation to this discipline what Chronicle is in relation to History.

In the present state of the discipline, however, it is a merit to bring to general knowledge, even in this way, such things as are but little known, or of an irregular character. Mere topographical and onomastic, or bibliographical notices, are, of course, the least profitable thing of the kind.

§ 247. A detailed inquiry into the present condition of Christianity, not proceeding from an interest in favour of the Church, nor assuming any relation to Church-Guidance,—in the event of its being also carried on without a scientific spirit, could only result in an uncritical gathering; and on the other hand, the more scientific its character, the more would it lean towards a sceptical or polemical tendency.

From the nature of the objects investigated, it is impossible that the impulse should originate from a purely scientific interest. If, therefore, the interest in favour of the cause is wanting, an interest opposed to it must be operative. A similar remark may be made with regard to Church History.

§ 248. Supposing that the religious interest is unaccom-
panied by a scientific spirit, the labour, instead of yield-
ing a true result, will merely be subservient to the sub-
jectivity of the person or his party.

For where there is the prevalence of a powerful interest, which has its origin from the self-consciousness, nothing but the scientific spirit is capable of affording security against uncrirical partiality.

§ 249. The discipline which is usually called Symbolics, is merely put together out of certain elements derived from Ecclesiastical Statistics, and is capable of retiring again within the latter.

It is a collocation of that which is characteristic in the re-
spective systems of doctrine of the Christian parties still extant; and since this cannot be presented to view after the manner of Dogmatics (comp. §§ 196, 233), with the adduction of proof in support of the [systematic] connexion, the deline-
ation must be purely historical. The name,—which does not exactly answer to the thing, because, namely, all parties are not in possession of Symbols in the proper sense of the word,—can only be intended to affirm, that the account given fol-
ows as its authority the most classical and the most generally recognized representation of each particular mode of faith. It is necessary, however, in the discipline with which we are occupied (comp. § 234), that an account of this kind should form the basis for an exhibition of the relations of the System of Doctrine within the Community; and the difference is merely this, that the system of doctrine of a community is described, in the latter case, in connexion with the other cir-
cumstances of the community, but, in Symbolics, in connexion with the systems of doctrine of other communities,—(although we have already (comp. § 235*) recommended that the com-
parative method should be adopted for the purposes of Sta-
tistics, also).

§ 250. Biblical Dogmatics, too, approximate more closely to the method of Statistics, in the treatment of

* This seems to be the reference intended. In the original, by an evident mistake it is printed § 335.—Tr.
the System of Doctrine, than to Dogmatics, properly so called.

For, the method of combination we adopt is so very different; and, on the one hand, the reference [which we are able to make] to the Old Testament Canon, is, in relation to the Biblical propositions of the New Testament, but a very insufficient substitute for our reference to the New Testament Canon [in relation to Dogmatic propositions now current in the Church], and on the other hand, in the former process, [the immediate derivation of a system of Biblical Dogmatics from the New Testament], there is wanting throughout the farther development of later times, which development has so become a part of our conviction, that we cannot appropriate the system of Biblical Dogmatics in that manner which is essential to a strictly dogmatic treatment. The exhibition of the [systematic] connexion of the Biblical propositions in their characteristic dress is therefore, prevailingly, of a historical character. And inasmuch as every comprehensive picture (comp. 150) of a period which is posited as a unity, constitutes, strictly speaking, the Statistics of that period and that portion, Biblical Dogmatics merely form part of such a picture of the Apostolic period.

Concluding Observations respecting Historical Theology.

§ 251. Although, in the Christian Church, the pre-eminent influence of individuals upon the mass diminishes, upon the whole, still it is appropriate, in relation to Historical Theology more than to other departments of History, that those periods which, (as constituting, even though but in a subordinate sense, epochs, are to be apprehended each as a unity,) should be delineated in connexion with the lives of certain eminently influential individuals.

This influence diminishes, because, in Christ, it was absolute, and there is no individual of later times whom we place on a footing of equality with the apostles, of whom, nevertheless, there were but few that exercised any distinct personal in-
fluence. The farther we advance, the more numerous do we always find the contemporary individuals by whom any new revolution was effected. This, however, is by no means to be limited to the period of the so-called Fathers of the Church. But we may perhaps say, that each individual is the better fitted to exercise such an influence, in proportion as he answers to the notion of a Prince of the Church [§ 9], but that the farther we advance, the less reason have we for expecting to meet with persons of this kind. It is often the case, too, that particular variations in the System of Doctrine, which are worthy of note as an indication and foreboding [of something yet to come], are best rendered intelligible by viewing them in connexion with the lives of their authors.

§ 252. That knowledge of the historical career which it is necessary for the purposes of Philosophical Theology (comp. § 65) to take for granted, must be merely such a knowledge as belongs to the department of Chronicle (which is independent of the system of theological study); whereas, on the other hand, the scientific treatment of the historical career in the several branches of Historical Theology, supposes at the outset a possession of the results of Philosophical Theology.

This, as may be seen from previous observations, is true not less of Exegetical and Dogmatic Theology, than of Historical Theology in the more restricted sense of the term. For all the leading notions of the science are definitively determined in those investigations which constitute Philosophical Theology.

§ 253. This circumstance, taken in connexion with the present state of Philosophical Theology (comp. § 68) furnishes an explanation, if not of the great diversity which appears in the various elaborations of the several branches of Historical Theology, yet at least of the want of a common understanding as to the original seat of this diversity.

For the diversity itself would continue, [even if Philosophical Theology were less imperfectly developed], because what
wass aid in § 51 of Apologetics, and extended in § 64 to Polemics also, must be true in regard not merely to the different configurations which Christianity receives in different Church-Communities, but also to the not unimportant diversities which further obtain within each of these communities in particular. But if every several party has properly elaborated its Philosophical Theology, it will also necessarily become evident, which of these diversities are connected with an original difference in the mode of apprehending Christianity itself, and which are not so.

§ 254. It is necessary that Philosophical and Historical Theology should become still more decidedly separate and distinct from each other; and yet, on the other hand, they can attain to their proper perfection only in company, and by means of each other.

All branches of Historical Theology suffer from the circumstance that Philosophical Theology has not yet been properly elaborated in its distinctive character (comp. § 33.) But Philosophical Theology would become altogether an arbitrary thing, if it were to break away from the obligation of supporting all its propositions by the clearest apprehension of History. And just in the same way would Historical Theology lose all stability, if it refused to connect itself with the clearest development of the elements of Philosophical Theology.

§ 255. In the present state of things, it is just as possible that the accusation which may be brought against an individual, of proceeding, in the department of Historical Theology, according to arbitrary hypotheses, may be unreasonable, as it is also that there may be foundation for such a charge.

It has foundation, when any one seeks to constitute the elements of Philosophical Theology by a process of mere construction, and then interprets events accordingly. It is unreasonable, when all that the man does is merely to make no secret of the fact that his Philosophical Theology, as it grows up for him along with the Historical, also furnishes its own confirmation, in its aptness with regard to the latter.
§ 256. The same remark applies to the case in which an individual is accused of transforming Historical Theology into an unintelligent Empiricism.

The charge has foundation, when any one lays down, as something empirically given, those notions which ought to be made out in the department of Philosophical Theology, in order that he may use them in that of Historical Theology. It is unreasonable, when a man does nothing more than protest against the construction of these notions a priori, and insist upon the necessity of the critical method (comp. § 32).
PART THE THIRD.

OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 257. As Philosophical Theology brings to intelligent consciousness the feelings of pleasure and dissatisfaction which arise in contemplating the condition of the Church at any given period: so is it the problem of Practical Theology, to regulate, with intelligent consciousness, and to conduct to the attainment of its object, that deliberate activity which is developed from the mental emotions connected with the said feelings.

As Philosophical Theology is here apprehended in the influence of its results upon an immediate life-momentum, so, too, is Practical Theology viewed as to the manner in which its results take hold of a similar life-momentum.

§ 258. Practical Theology, therefore, is for those only in whom an interest in the welfare of the Church, and a scientific spirit, exist in combination.

For, without the former, there is no origin for either the feelings or the mental emotions just referred to. And without a scientific spirit, there will be none for that deliberate activity which allows itself to be guided by precepts; on the contrary, that impulse to activity which is disaffected towards knowledge looks with contempt upon rules.

§ 259. The problems which have to be dealt with by every theologian, respectively, who seeks to put forth this deliberate-influence, arise out of the manner in
which he judges concerning the state of the Church at the
time being; according to the notion which he entertains
with regard to the essential character of Christianity, and
of his own particular Church-Community.

For since the problem, stated generally, is merely the
Guidance of the Church, his purpose, in every individual
case, can be but this,—to make all that seems to him good,
productive, and on the other hand, to make that which is of
the opposite character inoperative, and to effect a change with
regard to it.

§ 260. Practical Theology does not aim at teaching
us rightly to apprehend these problems; but, supposing
this to have been already accomplished, it has to do
merely with the proper mode of proceeding to be adopted
in disposing of all problems which are capable of being
brought under the notion of Church-Guidance.

If Philosophical and Historical Theology have been mas-
tered, distinctly and in proper measure, nothing further re-
mains to be done, theoretically, towards the right apprehen-
sion of the problems referred to. For, in that case, it is also
possible for the given condition to be rightly appreciated in
its relation to the aim of Church-Guidance; and consequently
also, for the problem to be stated accordingly. We may ad-
mit, however, that for the purpose of laying down precepts
as to the mode of proceeding to be adopted, it is necessary that
the problems should be classified, and arranged in certain
groups, the notion of Church-Guidance being taken as the
starting-point of this classification.

§ 261. If we choose to consider these rules as means,
by which the end is to be obtained, it follows, surely, (on
account of the subordination of the means to the end,) that everything must remain excluded from these precepts,
which, while it tended, perhaps, to advance the solution
of an individual problem, might yet, at the same time,
in general, loosen the ecclesiastical bond of union, or
weaken the energy of the Christian principle.

The case is one of so frequent occurrence, that this canon
becomes necessary. Manifestly the individual good working of such a means can be but accidental; even supposing that it does not rest upon a mere illusion,—in which case the solution, after all, would not be the right one.

§ 262. In like manner, because the agent can apply the means only with the same spirit [temper, disposition] by virtue of which he wills the end,—it follows that no problem is to be solved by means which are at variance with either of the two elements of the theological spirit.

We may observe, again, that the two things which we here specify,—modes of proceeding that run counter to the scientific spirit,—and such as, while appearing to promote the ecclesiastical interest in some particular connexion, expose it to danger upon the whole,—have both been of sufficiently frequent occurrence in the ecclesiastical praxis.

§ 263. Since, however, all deliberate inoperation upon the Church with a view to the purer exhibition of Christianity thereon, is nothing else than Soul-Guidance; and since, on the other hand, no other means whatever are applicable to this purpose than certain definite operations upon the minds of men,—that is, therefore, again, Soul-Guidance: it cannot be productive of advantage,—since means and end are entirely coincident with each other,—to regard the rules referred to as means; they should, on the contrary, be regarded simply as methods.

For means must be something situate without the end, and consequently, not willed in and along with the end itself; which can be said here only with regard to what is in the very highest degree external, while all that occupies a nearer position is itself contained in the end, and constitutes a part of it. Which relation, of the part to the whole, is what appears most prominently in the expression Method.

§ 264. The classification of the problems which present themselves in the department of Church-Guidance, and the specification of the modes of proceeding to be
adopted, are processes which admit of being traced back into each other.

For every particular problem, viewed both notionally, and in its actual occurrence, is a portion of the collective end in view, namely, Church-Guidance, precisely as every method to be applied in the case of the several problems is but a part of the same thing. These matters, therefore, do not admit of being kept apart from each other, as if they were two principal divisions of the discipline now before us; inasmuch as the classification, too, merely specifies the method with a view to the solution of the collective problem.

§ 265. All the precepts of Practical Theology can be but general expressions, in which the nature and manner of their application to individual cases is not co-determined beforehand (comp. § 132); that is, they are rules of art in the more restricted sense of the term.

In all the rules of a mechanical art, this application is co-included beforehand; whereas, on the contrary, the precepts of the higher arts are all of the kind referred to in the text, so that the proper treatment of any matter in hand, in conformity with their rules, always requires, in addition, a special talent, which must be applied to discover the right course of procedure.

§ 266. These rules, therefore, cannot suffice to make a theologian of any and every one, even supposing him to be in possession of the theological spirit; on the contrary, they can but serve for the guidance of him who has the will to be a Practical Theologian, and who, as to his inward constitution and the preparation enjoyed by him, is capable of becoming one.

By this it is not intended to be affirmed, either that gifts of nature altogether peculiar, and granted only to a few, are necessary to the exercise of this office, or that the entire course of preparation must precede the resolve to seek it.

§ 267. As Christian Theology in general, and consequently the Practical department of it also, first became able to develope itself when Christianity had ob-
tained a historical significance (comp. § 2–5), and this was possible only by means of the organization of the Christian Community; so is all Church-Guidance, properly so called, based upon a determinate configuration of the original contrast, between those who occupy a position of prominence, and the mass [of Church Members.]

Without a contrast of this kind, capable of the most manifold gradations, but founded conformably to the order of nature in the relation of the mature to the immature, all progress towards the better could take place only in a uniform development, not by means of any deliberate guidance. On the other hand, apart from a determinate configuration of this contrast, the guidance referred to could be nothing more than a relation existing between individuals; and the community, therefore, would consist merely of unconnected elements, and could never operate as a whole,—the condition upon which, notwithstanding, its attainment of a historical significance depends.

§ 268. This determinate configuration consists in the method of circulation which has been established for the purposes of equalization and advancement, and by virtue of which the religious energy of the pre-eminent stimulates the mass, and the mass, again, calls forth the activity of the former party.

That there results in this way a certain equalization, and a nearer approach on the part of the mass towards the position occupied by the pre-eminent, is in accordance with the nature of things; but advancement is attainable only upon the supposition that the religious energy, in the Community generally, and especially amongst the pre-eminent, is in a state of increase.

§ 269. In harmony with all that has been said hitherto, we shall, accordingly, have to take into especial consideration the form which this contrast assumes for the purpose of an efficient operation by means of religious representations [conceptions, ideas], and that which
it assumes for the purpose of influence upon the life; or, the guiding activity in the System of Worship, and the guiding activity in the ordering of Morals.

Phenomenally, it is true, these two things are very decidedly distinct; but, in so far as the formula is concerned, they certainly constitute but an imperfect antithesis. For the System of Worship itself exists only as a matter of Morals which has been reduced to a certain order; and since the ordinances [of the Church relative to Morals] are destitute of all external sanction, their validity, again, depends simply upon the before-mentioned efficient influence by means of mental representations. This two-fold relation [of the primary contrast], however, will still maintain its right to be recognized.

§ 270. Since those who are pre-eminent, are so only in virtue of possessing both elements of the theological spirit; while, on the other hand, the existence of these two elements in a precise equilibrium is nowhere to be taken for granted: we shall also find, that there is one species of guiding activity which is more clerical in its character, and another which is more theological, in the stricter sense of the word.

It cannot be proved that this difference is coincident with the preceding; still less that it subdivides only one member of the classification founded thereupon. Consequently, the two distinctions are to be regarded, preliminarily, as co-ordinate and as crossing each other.

§ 271. Christianity first acquired a historical character, when the Christian Community had come to consist of a Union of several locally determinate Congregations, each of which, again, had reduced the contrast beforehand to a definite form, (this being the process by which they first became Congregations). There is, therefore, a guiding activity which has for its object the individual Congregation as such, and which, accordingly, continues to be merely local in its character—and
a guiding activity directed towards the whole, which has for its object the organic Union of Congregations, that is, the Church.

This antithesis, too, is not a perfect one, inasmuch as it is possible that something may proceed, mediately, out of the guidance of the individual Congregation, which shall have a bearing upon the whole; and in like manner, it may happen that a guiding activity which is determined from the standpoint of the whole, affects but a single Congregation. In the actual course of history, both [forms of activity] present themselves in a manner very well defined.

§ 272. In periods in which the Church is divided, those Congregations only which are of one and the same Confession are organically united; and the general guiding activity, in its definitive character or application, is confined exclusively to the circle which is thus bounded.

There are also, certainly, influences which are put forth by one Church-Community upon others; but they cannot have the character of a guiding activity. — But even if no such division existed, still, with the present diffusion of Christianity, outward reasons would make the existence of a universal Church-Guidance, comprehending all Christian Congregations upon the earth, a thing impossible.

§ 273. Since, now, the modes of procedure to be adopted must be regulated by the manner in which the contrast before-mentioned has been apprehended and reduced to form; it follows that the theory of Church-Guidance must also be different for every differently constituted Church-Community; and what we are able to do, therefore, is merely to lay down a Practical Theology for the Evangelical Church.

Nay, not completely even for this; since within its limits also, too many differences of worship, and especially of constitution, present themselves. What we shall have immediately in view, therefore, will be merely the Evangelical Church of Germany.

§ 274. We regard the antithesis which was last enun-
cisted, in § 271, as presenting the highest basis for a division of our present subject; and we denominate the guiding activity which is directed towards the whole, Church-Government, and that which is directed towards the individual local Congregation, Church-Service.

Not as though it lay in the nature of the case, that these must needs be the leading divisions in our classification; but because this arrangement is the most appropriate to the present condition of our Church. Elsewhere, circumstances exist in which there would be little to be said concerning Church-Government, in the sense which the word bears here; because in those instances the tie by which a number of congregations are held together is but a very loose one.—For the rest, another mode of appellation for our two divisions suggests itself; namely, if we call the one Church-Government, we might denominate the other, Congregation-Government. But the appellation employed above has been preferred for the same reason for which this was adopted as our leading classification,—namely because the Union of Congregations which we call, by way of special distinction, the Church, is that which comes out most prominently to view, and it is therefore proper to connect the other division, also, with this totality; since, moreover, the care of an individual portion can only appear as a service which is rendered to the whole.

§ 275. The contents of Practical Theology are included exhaustively in the Theory of Church-Government (in the more restricted sense) and the Theory of Church-Service.

The antitheses, namely, which were specified above, in §§ 269 and 270, must be taken up and carried out within these two leading divisions.

§ 276. The order of arrangement is, in and of itself, a matter of indifference. We prefer to begin with the department of Church-Service, and to let that of Church-Government follow.

It is a matter of indifference, because, in any case, in the treatment of the antecedent division, regard must be had to
the *notion* of that which is to be dealt with subsequently, and
to its possible *varieties of form*.-It is, however, the *natural*
order, that those who devote themselves, in general, to the
work of Church-Guidance, should *commence* their public ac-
tivity in the department of Church-Service.

**SECTION THE FIRST.—THE PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH-SERVICE.**

§ 277. The local *Congregation*, which is a body of
Christian households of the same Confession, inhabiting
the same locality, and united together for the purposes
of a common devotion, is the *simplest* organization, of a
perfectly *ecclesiastical* character, in which it is possible
for a guiding activity to have existence.

The usage of the language still presents us with the terms
"National Congregation" (Landesgemeine), "Congregation
of a District" (Kreisgemeine); but in these cases a strictly
*common* exercise of devotion is not always to be found. It
also affords the term "Domestic Congregation" (Hausge-
meine); but the guiding activity in this instance is not one
which proceeds distinctively from the *religious* interest.

§ 278. If a Church-Service is to have existence at all,
the antagonism between preponderant *activity* and pre-
ponderant *receptivity* must be definitely *adjusted* by agree-
ment, at least in so far as certain determinate *momenta*
are concerned.

Without *determinate momenta*, there can be no *common*
life; and without *agreement* as to who shall communicate
and who receive, this common life would be a mere *confusion*.
If we suppose the greatest possible *parity* to exist amongst
the members of the Congregation, the *distribution* of the parts
referred to assumes an *arbitrary* character: but even in the
case of the greatest *imparity*, receptivity [in some degree]
must still be incumbent upon *all*.—The *determining* of this
relation, as it respects every several Congregation, appertains,
in the nature of the case, to the department of Church-Go-
vernment.
§ 279. The guiding activity in Church-Service consists (comp. § 269) on the one hand of the *edifying*; which is exercised in connexion with the System of *Worship*, or assembling of the Congregation for the purpose of awakening and animating the devout consciousness; and on the other hand, of the *governing*, which acts not merely by the regulation of *Morals*, but also by an influence which is exerted upon the lives of *individuals*.

Above (§ 269), this second aspect [of the guiding activity] could be indicated only in the form in which it also has significance in connexion with Church-Government. Church-Service, however, would fail of attaining a large part of its object, if the guiding activity were not also directed towards *individuals*.

§ 280. The edifying activity in the *system* of Christian Worship rests preponderantly upon the imparting of the religious consciousness* when it has arrived at the condition of *thought*; and a *theory* in regard to this matter is possible only in so far as the said impartation may be regarded as possessing the character of *Art*.

This "preponderantly" applies, indeed (comp. § 49) to Christianity generally, [as compared with other religions]; but within its sphere, again, to the Evangelical form of it in particular.—*Thought* is to be taken here in that broader sense in which the elements of poetry are thoughts too. *Art*, in a certain sense, there must be, in every connected series of thoughts. The theory referred to must include at once these two questions—in what degree Art is here requisite or allowable, and by what methods the end in view is to be attained.

§ 281. The *material* of the System of Worship, in the stricter sense, can consist only of such representations [Vorstellungen] as also have their place in the body of the Church's doctrine; and our theory has therefore to determine, with respect to this material, what elements of the common doctrine are adapted, and in what *way*

* That is, of course, not the *faculty*, but its *contents*.—Ta.
they are adapted, to the purpose of the communication referred to.

Those representations are materials in the stricter sense, which have to be communicated on their own account, in opposition to those which merely serve as illustrations and means of exhibition to the former.—And since the same representations are wrought up in the most various methods, from the popular to the severely scientific, from the language of conversation to that of oratory and poetry, it must be determined which of these shades of difference are adapted to the purposes of the System of Worship, either generally, or in various [particular] connexions.

§ 282. Since the system of Christian Worship,—and the Evangelical form of it, again, in particular,—is compounded of elements prosaic and poetic: we have to treat, in relation to the subject of form, first of the religious style, prosaic as well as poetic, in its adaptation to Christianity; and then also, on the other hand, of those different relations of commixture between the two [kinds of] elements, which are of possible occurrence in the Evangelical System of Worship.

The Theory of Ecclesiastical Poesy belongs at least thus far to the Doctrine of Church-Service,—that even the process of selection [for the purposes of Christian Worship] from what exists already, must be conducted according to the same principles [by which every true Poet of the Christian Church is guided in the process of composition.]

§ 283. Uniformity and variety [alternation of different parts or elements in the same or in different services of Worship] have an unmistakeable influence upon the effectiveness of all delineations of the kind referred to; and hence this question also requires to be answered,—namely, how far,—treating the matter purely with reference to the interests of worship,—consideration for that which has an established existence must be sacrificed to a better insight, or the contrary.
Viewed immediately, the question seems to be in place here, only in so far as it is capable of being decided within the Congregation itself, without the intervention of the Ecclesiastical Government. But since it is also possible, notwithstanding, that the Congregation may be altogether free in this respect, it is best that the whole subject should be brought into the present connexion.

§ 284. Highly conformable as it is to the spirit of the Evangelical Church to regard Religious Discourse as the proper centre [kernel] of the System of Worship, yet nevertheless, that form of it which prevails among us at the present time, and which we designate distinctively by the term Sermon, is, in this precise shape, a thing of merely accidental character.

This is sufficiently evident, if we look merely at the history of our System of Worship; it becomes still clearer, when we inquire what it is, upon which the great inequality in the effectiveness of these discourses properly depends.

§ 285. Since the discipline which we call Homiletics usually takes for granted that this form is firmly established, and makes all its rules relate principally thereunto; it would be better to get rid of this restrictedness, and to treat the subject in a freer and more general manner.

The distinction between Sermon (in the proper sense) and Homily,—a distinction which, for some time past, has begun to be so far taken notice of that the latter [the Homily] is made to constitute the subject-matter of a special theory,—is far from satisfying the requirement of the proposition which we have laid down.

§ 286. In the Evangelical Church, we find the System of Worship consisting almost everywhere of two elements: one, which is left entirely to the free productivity of the individual by whom the Church-Service is conducted, and another, in which he merely occupies the position of an organ of the Ecclesiastical Government.
OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

In the former aspect he is especially the Preacher, in the latter the Liturgus.

§ 287. The liturgical element can be a matter of discussion here, only upon the supposition that in it too, certain room is still afforded for a free self-determination; and only in the degree in which this is the case.

The question with regard to this self-determination can be decided only from the stand-point of Church-Government. It could be dealt with here, only in so far as it might be possible to show that a total negation [of the self-determination contended for] is at variance with the proper notion of the System of Worship in the Evangelical Church.

§ 288. Since the Service of the Church in the System of Worship is essentially connected with certain organic activities which produce an effect simultaneous with the proceeding itself: it is to be determined whether, and to what extent, these activities may also become a matter for the application of rules of art; which are to be laid down accordingly.

These rules, then, would be an application of Mimetica, in the broader sense of the word, to the department of religious delineation.

§ 289. Since the proceedings of Church-Service are connected with a certain limited space [apartment], which is capable in like manner of producing, by its character, an impression simultaneous with these proceedings; it is to be determined how far such an impression is allowable or desirable, and rules upon this head are to be laid down accordingly.

Since the circumscribing of the space [occupied] is merely an outward condition, and consequently a collateral circumstance, not a part of the System of Worship itself, the rules here spoken of would be necessarily a mere application of the Theory of Decorations to the department of religious delineation.

§ 290. If we look solely at the antagonism between
the preponderantly productive and the preponderantly receptive within the Congregation, regarding the latter as in a condition of parity; [we shall find that] there may be in the Congregation a guiding activity producing an effect that is common [to all the members]: but in so far as, amongst the receptive, any portion is found to lag behind the general body, the condition of these, as individuals, is a matter for the application of the guiding activity.

The latter form of this activity is already known under the name of Pastoral Care [Seelsorge, Care of Souls]; and we treat of this first, because the removal of an imparity such as is here supposed, appears ever as the first problem to be dealt with. The former we call the regulative activity; and it gives origin to modes of life as well as to individual works performed in common.

§ 291. The immediate objects of the Pastoral Care, in the broader sense of the word, are those persons of immature age who are to be educated in the Congregation; and the Theory of that activity which is to be directed towards them, and which forms a part of the organization of Church-Service, is denominated Catechetics.

The name is taken merely from an accidental form of the immediate practical duty [to which the theory refers], and is consequently too circumscribed, as an expression for the whole extent of the problem involved.

§ 292. The business of Catechetics can be rightly ordered only when an agreement is established amongst all who have part therein, as to its points of commencement and of termination.

To this extent, therefore,—supposing that the required agreement does not occur of itself,—the practical business, as well as the theory [of Catechetics], is dependent upon the ordering [regulative] activity.

§ 293. By reason of the end in view, which is, to make the immature like the mature, in so far, namely,
as the latter are the *receptive*, the business [of Catechetics] must consist of *two parts*: namely, that the former become equally receptive with the latter] in relation to the *edifying* activity, and also equally receptive in relation to the *ordering* activity (comp. § 279); and the object is to be attained in both its parts by one and the same process.

The former is the vivification of the religious consciousness towards the side of *thought*, the latter the awakening of the same consciousness towards the side of *impulse*.

§ 294. In so far, however, as it is necessary that the end in view should be at the same time to prepare them for a greater approximation towards [the position of those in whom there is a *preponderant self-activity*: it is to be determined how this may take place without disturbing their relation to the other [members of the community who belong to the class of the] mature.

As Catechetics, in general, fall back upon Pædagogics as [furnishing the] Technology [which they require], so this, too, is a *general pædagogical problem*, which, however, at the same time, assumes a *special form* in connexion with the department of religion.

§ 295. Since Religion is to be developed in both directions (comp. § 293), not merely in its *contrast* to the sensible [or sensuous] *self-consciousness*, but also in its Christian character and in the Evangelical form: it is necessary also that the *relation of the individual* and the *universal* tendencies [or aspects of this development] to each other, in regard both to *equalization* and to *progress* (comp. § 294), should here be determined.

It is the more necessary that this problem should be embraced by the theory [of Catechetics], from the circumstance that within the latest period, most notable errors in regard to this point have presented themselves.

§ 296. It is possible for those individuals who live
within the local limits, or in the vicinity, of a Congregation, in the character of religious aliens, to become, for a similar reason, objects for the exercise of a similar activity: and it is necessary, with a view to such cases, that we should be provided with a theory respecting the proper treatment of convertendi.

The more accurately the principles of Catechetics are laid down, the more easy will it of necessity be to derive from them such others as are necessary for the case here specified.

§ 297. But since this form of activity is not based upon so natural a foundation [as the catechetical]: it would be desirable to lay down certain signs by which it may be known whether there is sufficient motive for such a proceeding.

For it is possible, in this matter, to err in both directions; by a too ready confidence, and by a too timorous hesitation.

§ 298. Conditionally, the Theory of Missions might also find a point of connexion here; a theory which, up to the present time, is as good as altogether wanting.

In order that this connexion may be effected in the easiest manner, it is necessary, certainly, to start from the assumption that all efforts of the kind referred to are successful only where a Christian Congregation has existence.

§ 299. Individually, those members of the Congregation may become objects for the exercise of the Pastoral Care, who, from inward or outward causes, have lost their parity with the rest; and the occupation which has to do with these persons is denominated Pastoral Care, in the more restricted sense of the term.

Since, namely, in the actual state of things, parity is ever but the minimum of disparity,*—those who occupy the least advanced position amongst the like, are not the persons intended to be referred to here; this latter class, indeed, being

* In other words, those who are said to be, in any respect, alike or equal, are, strictly speaking, simply those who are least unlike or least unequal.—Tn.
always to be found, but the others [those referred to in the text] only accidentally.

§ 300. Now since, in the case adduced, a special relation has to be formed [between the Pastor and the individual]: it is necessary that our theory should determine, in the first place, whether this connexion may originate, in every instance, in either of the two possible ways,—with the party that needs or the party that communicates,—or which way is the right one under any given circumstances.

The great diversity which prevails in different portions of the Evangelical Church, as it respects the treatment of this matter, has not, up to the present time, been either reduced to theory* or got rid of.

§ 301. Since such a loss of parity, proceeding from inward causes, can manifest itself only in an opposition to the edifying or to the ordering activity: it is in the next place to be determined whether, and in what manner, in conformity with the spirit of the Evangelical Church, the mode of proceeding to be adopted should be compounded of these two elements; and lastly, also, whether, supposing that the Pastoral Care does not attain its end, its business is to be regarded always and exclusively as not yet finished, or whether, and when, and how far, the connexion of those who have become unceptive with those who sustain the office of guidance may be looked upon as done away.

The cessation of this connexion would also draw after it, as a natural consequence, the cessation of the connexion with the Congregation as such.

§ 302. With regard to that exercise of the Pastoral Care which is rendered necessary by the operation of outward causes, we have only, in addition to the solution

* Literally, constructed, (ideally or logically); exhibited in a systematic connexion which of itself suffices to render the diversity intelligible.—Tz.
of the first problem (comp. § 300), to determine in what way the official activity of which we are speaking may be made to harmonize with the social activity [or influence] of the receptive who belong to the Congregation.*

For the questions started in § 301 can hardly be connected with any doubt in the case before us; since here we have only to supply that deficiency which is experienced in consequence of the momentary suspension of participation in the common life [of the Congregation]. The edifying activity, in this case, approaches too nearly to the character of ordinary conversation to require a special theory.

§ 303. The regulative activity within the Congregation (comp. § 290) appears limited in relation to Morals, partly by the more comprehensive inoperations of the Ecclesiastical Government, partly by the irrefragable claims of personal liberty.

One can only say "appears," for it is necessary that those who sustain the office of guidance should be restrained by their own personal sense of liberty from invading the province of the latter. The very same influence, on the other hand, ought also to withhold those who sustain the guiding office in the department of Church-Government from invading, in the pursuit of a centralizing tendency, the province of the Congregation.

§ 304. Since the Evangelical System of Morals, as well as of Doctrine, in opposition to [that of] the Catholic Church, is still in process of development: we have simply, in general, to lay down rules concerning the manner in which,—starting from any given condition,—the collective life may gradually be brought nearer to that

* I take the passage to mean, that both the forms of service or influence here specified,—that of the Minister, and that of sympathizing fellow members of the Congregation,—are necessary to compensate the temporary loss suffered by the patient, and should be secured accordingly; but that they must at the same time be kept from clashing with each other,—or rather, be combined in such a manner as to produce the greatest possible amount of benefit.—Tn.
form which is in accordance with the *maturer insight* of such as have gone on in advance [of the rest, and of their own former position].

It is possible, on the one hand, that the given state of things may yet contain within itself, unperceived, sundry elements derived from Catholicism; or, on the other, that it may, in consequence of mistake, have stepped beyond certain limits which Christianity itself lays down.

§ 305. Since the life of man, in the Christian Congregation, as well as elsewhere, is subject withal to certain determinations derived from *social* and *civil* relationships: it should be specified in what manner we may also procure for the influence of the Christian and Evangelical spirit a *larger validity* within the department thus indicated,—in so far as it is possible for such an effect to result from *local* determinations [as distinguished from *general* ordinances].

Here, universally, we can speak only of the *method of proceeding* to be adopted; the *material* of the ordering activity being dependent upon the current apprehension of the System of Christian Doctrine, especially the Doctrine of Morals.

§ 306. Since it is also necessary that the calls to a union of energies, for the purpose of all such *works in common* as are contained in the *notion*, and [are to be accomplished] within the *local limits* of the Congregation, should also have their origin from the ordering activity: it is of importance that the *boundary* of the latter (comp. § 303) should be defined.

The problem is, to separate that which forms a part of *official* labour, and [as such] has a *constant and continuous existence*,—for example, the entire province of the Diaconate, in the original sense of the word,—from that which can proceed only from the *personal* relation of individuals, sustaining the office of guidance, towards a portion of the entire body.

§ 307. We have here treated of Church-Service as
one undivided department, without seeking to impose any restrictions with regard to the different ways in which it is possible to distribute the occupations it involves.

Otherwise, we should have been obliged to anticipate here the theory of Church-Government. Here, again, therefore, we can but follow the ancient method, by grouping together, at this stage, all who take part in the occupations of Church-Service, under the term Clerus.

§ 308. Only in this general way, therefore, is it possible for us also to deal with the question as to whether any, and what sort of influence should be exerted by the ecclesiastical relation between Clerus and Laity upon the association of the former with the latter, as well in civil, as in social and scientific relations.

The problems which it has been usual to discuss under the title of Pastoral Prudence, appear here in an altogether subordinate character; and their solution depends upon the settlement of the question, whether any, and what specific difference obtains between those members of the Clerus who conduct the exercises of Worship, and the rest.

Section the Second.—The Principles of Church Government.

§ 309. If Church-Government has its foundation in the form which is given to a connexion subsisting between a complexus of Congregations: it follows that we have, in the first place, to note down the multiplicity of relations which are of possible development, between the Ecclesiastical Government and the [individual] Congregations, and to determine whether there are any forms which, by the peculiar character of the Evangelical Church, are definitively excluded, or any others which are definitively postulated.
OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

It is taken for granted, namely, that the form of such a connexion neither contradicts the essential character of Christianity, nor does away with the spontaneous activity of the individual Congregations.

§ 310. Since the way and manner in which, in such an enclosed complexus, those in whom spontaneous activity is predominant become organized with a view to the exercise of Church-Government, and the manner in which the operation of this Government, and the free, spontaneous activity of the Congregations are mutually stimulated and restricted, form the internal Church-Constitution of the body: the tendency of the problem stated above is, to refer the latter [the internal Church-Constitution], so far as the Evangelical Church is concerned,—as well in its multiplicity [of ecclesiastical developments] as in its antagonism towards the Catholic Church,—to certain principles.

On the one hand, the solution must base itself upon certain propositions of Dogmatics, and on the other, it can be successfully accomplished only by making an appropriate use of Church History and Ecclesiastical Statistics.

§ 311. Since the Evangelical Church does not, at the present time, form but one single complexus of Congregations, and since, in different portions of it, there is even a difference of internal constitution, while on the other hand its Theology ought to be the same for all: it is necessary that the Theory of Church-Government should put its problems in that form and manner in which they are the same for all possible Evangelical Constitutions, and are capable of being solved from the position of any and every one of the latter respectively.

The expression “at the present time,” is merely intended to premise that the impossibility of any manner of outward unity for the Evangelical Church is at least not decidedly made out.
§ 312. Since every historical whole is capable of a continued existence only by means of the same energies through which it originated: it follows that the Government of the Evangelical Church consists of two elements: the fixed,—that is, the form which the antagonism [between the Government and the Congregations] assumes for the given complexus,—and the unfixed,—in other words, that free inoperation upon the whole body, which may be attempted by every member of the Church that believes himself called to do so.

Not merely with regard to the rectification of doctrine, but also with regard to its Constitution, or fixed Church-Government, the Evangelical Church originated in the first instance from this free inoperation; in the absence of which, moreover, (since the fixed Church-Government is identical with the Constitution), an amendment of the Constitution could not take place in any conceivable way.—In order that the last definition [in the text of this ¶] may be kept from appearing to have a tumultuary tendency, it is only necessary to bear in mind, that if a man who does not belong to the predominantly productive class were nevertheless to believe himself a subject of the call referred to, any experiment which he might make would of itself come to nothing.

§ 313. The purpose of these two elements can be but one and the same: (comp. § 25) to exhibit more and more clearly, in the Evangelical Church, the Idea of Christianity, according to the peculiar manner in which it is apprehended by the said Church,—and to win for it a constantly increasing mass of energies. In the pursuit of this object, however,—while the organized element, the Ecclesiastical Power or (more correctly) Authority, may be concerned in the way of ordinance or restriction, the unorganized element, or free, spiritual power, can be so only in the way of stimulus and warning.

It being understood, nevertheless, that the Ecclesiastical Power is also destitute of every outward sanction for that
which it enunciates; so that, essentially, the difference comes to this,—that the enunciations just adverted to operate as an expression of the spirit and sense of the Community, while on the other hand, the free spiritual power seeks to introduce into this general sense and spirit something which was not there previously.

§ 314. The condition of a historical whole is the more satisfactory, in proportion as these two kinds of activity have a more lively hold upon each other, and in proportion as the action in both departments is connected more decidedly with the consciousness of the relative antagonism which subsists between them.

The Ecclesiastical Authority has therefore to combine the two following objects, and the Theory [of Church-Government] must seek to discover the requisite formula (comp. § 310): [the observance of] its preponderant obligations, to maintain and to strengthen the principle which was constituted by means of the last preceding epoch,—and yet at the same time also to favour and to protect the manifestations of the free spiritual power, which alone is capable of initiating [new] reformatory developments. In like manner it should be shown with regard to this free spiritual power, how, without sacrificing in any degree the strength of [private] conviction, it may nevertheless content itself with what is capable of being brought into life through the agency of the Ecclesiastical Authority.

§ 315. Since an ecclesiastical connexion of the larger kind can exist only in the case of a certain degree of parity, or a certain facility of equalization, amongst the Congregations by which it is constituted: the Ecclesiastical Authority has, in every case, a share in the fashioning and maintenance of the antagonism [or contrast] between Clerus and Laity in the [several] Congregations.

That is to say, only a share: because the Congregation is prior in point of time to the ecclesiastical Nexus; and because its very being [as a Congregation] depends upon the existence within it of this antagonism.
§ 316. Since this participation is capable of varying in degree from a maximum to a minimum, our Theory has first to settle [the particulars of] this diversity, and then to determine to what different circumstances and conditions every mode [of adjustment] is respectively appropriate, and whether it should be the same for all the functions of Church-Service, or should differ as they differ.

For it is self-evident, from a reference to all similar cases, that in this seemingly continuous transition from minimum to maximum, certain points admit, nevertheless, of being fixed so as to furnish us with leading distinctions.

§ 317. Since, further, this parity cannot be regarded either as unchangeable, or as always self-renewing, and must consequently be at the same time a work of the Eclesiastical Authority: it is necessary to determine the form and manner in which the influence thus implied should be exerted,—that is, to define the notion of Eclesiastical Legislation.

"At the same time": because, namely, it must, in a certain sense, be already in existence, before the Eclesiastical Authority.—The term legislation, [in this connexion], always continues to have a character of inexactness, "because the Eclesiastical Authority is likewise destitute of every outward sanction.

§ 318. Since, now, this parity can become immediately apparent only in Worship and in Morals, and these two things, on the other hand, ought to be in themselves the adequate expression of the prevailing piety of any [given] locality: the problem thus arises, of making the ecclesiastical legislation a means of uniting the two, and of keeping them united.

It is involved in the nature of the case, that this object can be attained only by a process of approximation; and that the theory, therefore, must aim chiefly at confining the fluctuation which takes place between the preponderance of the
one element and that of the other, within as narrow limits as possible.

§ 319. Since these two things can continue to exist as the expression of the ecclesiastical Unity, only in so far as they respectively retain their identity; and since, on the other hand, every thing which is an expression and means of delineation [of some other thing], in so far as it has this character, gradually changes its significant value: the problem thus arises, in connexion with the work of legislation, of recognising the freedom and mobility of each, as well as consolidating its uniformity.*

This will also, at the same time, have the effect of at least confining within certain definite limits the relation of the Ecclesiastical Authority to the department of Church-Service, in the constitution of the Systems of Worship and of Morals.

§ 320. In case of an opposition arising within the Congregation,—whether it proceeds from individuals (comp. § 299) who have fallen out of a state of unity with the whole body, or from a recession of [the principle or sentiment of] unity in general,—it must, further, be competent to the Ecclesiastical Authority, as being itself the highest expression of the Spirit of the Community, to bring the matter to a decision, provided no agreement can be arrived at within the Congregation.

This decision obtains effect, always, only in so far as the opponents are also minded not to cease from seeking the satisfaction of that impulse which leads them to wish for Christian fellowship, in this particular ecclesiastical Union.

§ 321. In so far as the Ecclesiastical Authority operates towards this end, either by means of general regulations, or at least (where it interposes specially) in accordance with such regulations: it is necessary that

* That is, its constant identity and self-consistency: Gleichförmigkeit, not Einförmigkeit.—Ta.
the question be here determined, whether, and under what circumstances, in an Evangelical Church-Union, Church Discipline,—or, it may be, Excommunication,—is to be permitted.

The question with regard to the latter applies, namely, in so far as it is possible [under each particular Ecclesiastical Constitution] for the Ecclesiastical Authority to declare that the relation of an individual member towards the Congregation or the Church-Union has come to an end. That with regard to the former, arises in so far as it is supposed that where an opposition [comp. § 301] has occurred, it cannot be properly brought to an end, except by a public acknowledgement of its impropriety [on the part of its author or authors].

§ 322. With regard to the relation of the Ecclesiastical Authority towards the System of Doctrine, views of such opposite character still obtain currency, that it seems impossible to find a common starting-point; so that a theory [of this relation] can be laid down only conditionally.

Nay, it would not be easy even to bring the different parties to a mutual understanding with regard to the place where the controversy ought to be decided, and consequently, as it were, to the choice of an umpire.

§ 323. Setting out on the one hand from the fact, that the Evangelical Church-Union has arisen in connexion with, and it may almost be said out of, the assertion of the principle, that it is not competent to any authority to fix or to alter the System of Doctrine; and on the other hand, from the fact that notwithstanding the existence of a plurality of Evangelical Church-Unions, following different maxims, we nevertheless recognise the existence of one Evangelical Church, and of a community of doctrine attesting this unity: we believe ourselves at liberty to state the problem only in the manner following. It is to be determined in what way the Ecclesiast-
tical Authority of every Union respectively,—recogniz-
ing the principle that changes in the doctrinal propo-
sitions and formulæ commonly received may be permitted
to arise out of the researches of individuals, only when
[the results of] the latter have been taken up into the
conviction of the Congregation,—may be able to protect
this efficient activity of the free spiritual power, and yet
at the same time to hold fast the unity of the Church [as
founded or embodied] in the principles of its origin.

Of course it is by no means intended to exclude the possi-
bility of the exercise of this efficient activity of free research,
also, on the part of those who operate as constituting the Ec-
clesiastical Authority; on the contrary, all we have to do in
such a case, is to insist the more strongly upon the principle
that they must not do this in the manner and under the offi-
cial character [Firma] of the Ecclesiastical Authority.—But
the problem must be stated in a manner totally opposite to
that which is here adopted, if we start from the hypothesis
that the Church exists as one, only by means of a uniformity
of doctrine so exact, that the degree of this exactness is capa-
bles of being specified.

§ 324. What was said above (comp. § 322) applies
also to the rights and obligations of the Ecclesiastical
Authority, as it respects the relation of the Church to the
State, inasmuch as no method of proceeding which
could possibly be prescribed would have the good for-
tune to meet with general recognition.

There seems to be but thus much observable: that in those
cases in which the Evangelical Church is wholly separate from
the State, no one cherishes a wish that it should be other-
wise; but where a closer connexion exists between the two,
there is a division of opinion within the Church.

§ 325. Setting out on the one hand from the principle,
that if the Church does not wish to be a secular power,
it must not be willing, either, to be entangled in the or-
ganization of the secular power; and on the other hand
from the principle, that what such members of the Church as stand at the head of the Civil Government, do within the department of the Church, they can do, nevertheless, only in the form of Church-Guidance: we are able to state the problem only in the manner following. It is to be determined in what manner the Ecclesiastical Authority has to labour, under the various circumstances which may be given, for the accomplishment of this object: that the Church shall be kept from falling, either into an impotent independence with regard to the State, or into a servitude, no matter how respectable, towards the latter.

The theory required, is one which it is in the highest degree difficult to lay down, and one which at the same time yields but little advantage; because, if the Ecclesiastical Authority finds already existing, either a fusion of the Church with the political organization, or a mode of proceeding in ecclesiastical matters in which the influence of an outward sanction is employed, it can, under its own proper form, work against such a state of things only indirectly, and must look for every thing further to the gradual inoperations of the free spiritual power.—And how little agreement there is even with regard to first principles, is best illustrated by the circumstance, that where the Church is in a state of servitude unaccompanied by respectability, some will always prefer to acquire respectability in this state of servitude, and others, on the contrary, to remain of no repute, provided they may but become independent.

§ 326. Supposing the State to have taken up into its own organization the entire organization of educational institutions, the same problem presents itself yet again, in a special connexion: inasmuch as there is then,—in reference to that spiritual culture by which alone the Evangelical System of Worship can be maintained, and a free spiritual power continue to have existence in the
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Church,—a like danger of impotent independence or of opulent servitude.

In connexion with this department, the following dilemma,—a difficult one, and one which does not admit of a simple solution—may, under unfavourable circumstances, very easily arise: whether the Church-Union shall content itself with that apparatus—no matter how meagre—which it is able to procure and to take care of for itself, independently; or whether it shall venture to draw also from sources in which there is an admixture of non-Evangelical elements.

§ 327. Since the various isolated Unions of Congregations which, taken together, form the Evangelical Church, are each exactly limited,—partly by outward circumstances which are subject to change,—partly by differences in their Systems of Morals or of Doctrine, the value attached to which differences is likewise subject to change; and since, on the other hand, the largest number of them find their independence endangered by this limitation: there arises, for every one of them respectively, the problem of keeping itself open to a closer connexion with the rest, and of preparing the way, within its own interior, for the accomplishment of this connexion, so that no favourable opportunity of calling it into existence shall be lost by reason of neglect.

This problem also marks the end of the province of the Ecclesiastical Authority; for not only does every previously existing Church-Government, upon the solution of this problem, become extinct as to its separate being, but the solution itself, too, (because it goes out beyond the province of the isolated Authority), can only be called forth by the free spiritual power.

§ 328. Since the unfixed element of Church-Government (comp. § 312), which, in the Evangelical Church, we designate by the term free spiritual power, being an activity on the part of individuals, which is directed to-
wards the entire body, supposes the existence of a
publicity as free from limitation as possible, in which the
individual has an opportunity of giving utterance to his
sentiments: it follows that this element is to be found
especially, at the present time, in connexion with the
profession of the Academical Theologian and the Ec-
clesiastical Writer.

In connexion with the former of these expressions, our
thoughts should not be directed exactly towards that merely
accidental form [of instruction by means of lectures] which
still obtains [in our Universities]. Nevertheless, an oral de-
elivery, exercising, in various ways, a stimulating influence
upon large masses of youth destined to the work of Church-
Guidance, will always continue to be in the highest degree
desirable.—The latter term does not comprehend, in its pre-
sent connexion, those who merely commit to writing their
performances in the department of Church-Service [e. g.
sermons, prayers, &c.]

§ 329. These two characters will accomplish the most
general efficiency of which they are capable (comp.
§§ 313, 314), only in the degree in which they respec-
tively approximate to the notion of a Prince of the
Church (comp. § 9.)

They have each of them less need of that equipoise which
is referred to in § 9, in proportion as their productive power
is exercised within the province of a special scientific profi-
ciency. In the same degree, however, will they also fail to
exert any general exciting influence upon the government of
the Church.

§ 330. Since the Academical Instructor, dealing with
youth who are especially animated by the religious in-
terest, has to make the scientific spirit, in its theological
application, for the first time a matter of thorough
consciousness in them: it is necessary to specify the me-
thod in which this spirit may be quickened, without
weakening the religious interest.
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How little we are yet in possession of such a method, may be learnt from an experience the examples of which are but too numerous. For the rest, we forbear the inquiry as to whether the appropriate method is of a universal character, or whether its selection turns upon different considerations in the case of different disciplinæ.

§ 331. Since the existing [amount and form of theological knowledge] suffices the less to satisfy [the theologian], in proportion as the individual disciplinæ come to be pervaded by a truly scientific spirit: it is necessary to lay down a method of proceeding by which it may be possible to combine that encouragement and guidance which are directed towards the advancement of the theological sciences, with a correct valuation of their previous results, and a faithful preservation of the good which has been thereby deposited within the Church.

A like experience evinces the same want in this case as in the last; and undeniably, much of the over-strained difference that exists between the heralds of the New and the worshippers of the Old, is imputable to the prevailing method of instruction.

§ 332. In so far as the literary activity is directed towards the combating of that which is false and pernicious: it is necessary to specify for the Theological Writer in particular, the method by which he may, on the one hand, not merely discover, but also procure recognition for, the True and Good to which the False and Pernicious is found attached, and with which it is connected,—and on the other, may point out to the individuality in which these things make their appearance, its proper relation to the prevailing want of the Church.

The principle, that all error has being only in so far as it is attached to some truth, and all that is bad only in so far as it is attached to something that is good, forms the essential condition of all controversy and of all correction.—The latter
part of the problem rests, on the one hand, upon the assumption that the Erroneous and Prejudicial, if not supported by a marked individuality, is capable of exerting but little influence; and on the other hand upon this,—that in the Church, it is possible for every kind of talent to find some mode of manifestation which shall conduce to the common benefit.

§ 333. In so far as this activity seeks to recommend and to obtain recognition for that which is new: it is necessary to find a formula indicative of the manner in which the exhibition of the antithesis, and that of the connexion, between the New and the Old, may be most effectively sustained.

For if there were no antithesis, it would not be new; and if there were no connexion, it would be impossible to find a point of junction for it [in the existing system].

§ 334. Since it is an easy thing for that which is matter of public communication to become diffused beyond the circle in which it is properly understood: this circumstance gives rise to the problem, of managing the delineation just referred to in such a manner, that it shall have an attraction for those only who may also be expected to make a legitimate use of it.

The rule which was formerly, almost exclusively, recommended and applied for this purpose, to employ none but the learned [Latin] language as the vehicle of representations likely to be either misinterpreted or abused, is no longer adapted to existing circumstances.

Concluding Observations on Practical Theology.

§ 335. It was not possible, in this case, to speak of a separation between that which is obligatory upon every [theologian], and that which constitutes a special proficiency.

For the separation can be grounded only upon limitations
which are accidental, or all but personal, and presents itself, in such cases, spontaneously. Regarded in and for himself, every one who is called to the work of Church Guidance, [as a Practical Theologian] is capable of every kind of efficient activity [here specified]; and there exist not so much different separable departments, as different degrees, merely, of attainable perfection.

§ 336. The problems [of Practical Theology], especially those which occur in the department of Church-Government, will be most correctly stated by him who has most thoroughly and completely developed his Philosophical Theology. The most correct methods will suggest themselves to him who lives upon the most manifold Historical basis in the Present.* The proper carrying out of these methods must be most effectually promoted by [appropriate] natural endowments and general culture.

If there were no requirement here of all the several departments treated of in this encyclopaedian outline, the outline itself would be incorrect [inasmuch as Practical Theology deals immediately with that which is also the end or reason of Theology considered as a whole]; as the requirement, again, would be, if it embraced any thing incapable of being contained in any encyclopaedian outline.

§ 337. The present condition of Practical Theology evinces that that which occupies the last place in the study of every individual theologian, presents itself also in a similar position in the development of Theology upon the whole.

Because (if there were no other reason) it supposes as its antecedent the complete development of Philosophical Theology (comp. §§ 66 and 259).

* The following paraphrase may perhaps render the last clause of this sentence more readily intelligible: "who, having a conscious, living interest in the Present, has also most largely and most accurately traced out its historical antecedents."—Tz.
§ 338. Since, in the Evangelical Church, both Church-Service and Church-Government are essentially conditioned by the antagonism of this Church towards the Church of Rome:—it constitutes the highest perfection of Practical Theology, to fashion both, [Church-Service and Church-Government], at any given period, in such a manner as shall be best adapted to the existing state of this antagonism with reference to [that is, as approaching, or receding from] its point of culmination.

This involves a specific reference to the highest problem of Apologetics (comp. § 53).

THE END.

ANDREW JACK, PRINTER.
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