

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1847.

---

No. I.

---

---

ART. I.—*Discourses and Reviews upon Questions in Controversial Theology and Practical Religion.* By Orville Dewey, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah in New York. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1846. pp. 388. 12mo.

THE author of these discourses stands in the very first rank of Unitarian literature. As a pulpit orator, his reputation is distinguished, and the post which he occupies in our greatest city adds importance to whatever he may choose to utter. For these reasons, and because it is some time since a polemic volume has been produced, on the side of Anti-trinitarianism, we are disposed to subject it to a serious examination.

With a few exceptions, which shall be noted in their proper place, these essays are not chargeable with the usual offensiveness of controversial writing. Dr. Dewey possesses all the qualifications which are needed to give seemliness and polish to the form of his opinions. He shines more to our apprehension, in the gentle glow of sentiment, than in the conflict of reasoning. Nothing is more characteristic of the whole work, than a disposition to avoid bold statement of positions, sharp cutting of defin-

ART. VI.—*What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development.* By Philip Schaf. Translated from the German. 12mo. pp. 128. 1846.

ALL writers on Church History agree in making the development of doctrine or the progress of theological opinion an essential part of it. But they differ greatly as to the relative position and proportions of this topic in the system. And this very difference is what determines, to a great extent, the character of every treatise. Some historians allow the subject of organizations and forms of government to give shape and complexion to the whole, leaving the progress of the truth to occupy a secondary place. Others assign the same priority to rites and forms of worship; others to the persons by whose influence the fortunes of the church in different periods have been controlled. A fourth class occupy the foreground of their picture with the moral influence of Christianity and the subjective experience of its members. The fault of all these methods is not that they introduce or even render prominent their favourite topics, but that in so doing they neglect and throw into the back-ground one which ought to be the most conspicuous, to wit, the progress of the truth and the formation of opinion. The whole experience of historiography evinces that where due regard is paid to this, the others will assume their proper places. It is in fact the life and soul of all Church History, upon which it is dependent for its very being, and from which its form must be derived as by a vital attraction.

The modern Germans are entitled to the praise of having recognised, in theory and practice, the relation thus sustained by the History of Doctrine to Church History in general. A remarkable proof of their advanced position, as to this point, is afforded by the certain fact that *Dogmengeschichte* or the history of doctrines is an original and almost an exclusive growth of German soil. The surrounding nations, far from being in possession of the thing, are unacquainted with the name, and when they do begin to treat the subject, are compelled to borrow the ungraceful German word above used, or to forge a barbarous corruption of it, which must be expounded at some length before it can convey the sense of the original. Such is the English name

*Dogmatic History*, which we remember to have seen, and which approximates as nearly to the German as *Dogmatics* to *Dogmatik*. The want of an established and familiar name, in this case, is by no means accidental or unmeaning, but an index to the real fact, that the thing itself is wanting or unknown. Indeed it is only in the German schools that the division of scientific labour has been pushed so far as to require or admit of such minute and separate attention to a single vein or subject of research, however copious and important it may prove when opened and explored. While in other nations this department is still treated but as one of the divisions of church history, and sometimes as the least important, the German theologians have already carried their analysis so far that some of them begin to hint at the necessity of adding to the history of doctrines the history of that history itself.

For such refinements we may not yet be prepared, but in the causes which have led to them in Germany the learned world has reason to rejoice. For in this very quarter lies the real strength of the German theologians. There could scarcely be a greater error of the kind than that of suffering the just dislike and dread of German speculation, which exists among us, to deprive us of the fruits of their historical researches. This is the more to be deprecated, because transcendental notions are of safe and easy carriage, and if not imported lawfully will certainly be smuggled in by that class of writers and translators whose ambition is to gain the greatest éclat at the least expense of thought or study. Such a trade would moreover be promoted by the sheer impossibility of ascertaining whether the imported stuff be genuine or spurious, which of course must always be a mystery in cases where the quality of being unintelligible may be just as well a proof of depth as of absurdity. Those systems of philosophy which will not suffer you to laugh at nonsense, lest you should be found deriding wisdom unawares, are of course the easiest to propagate, as every man may have his own prophecy or revelation, and the weaker any prophet, the better is he able to endure the test of transcendental inspiration, that of setting comprehension at defiance.

But while this extreme facility attends the importation and diffusion of the German speculations, their immense historical researches are in danger of exclusion from our market and our

libraries, because there must be study, and sound scholarship, and common sense, employed in their transmission. It is highly worthy of remark that those young gentlemen and ladies, to whom we are chiefly indebted for our fashionable German wares, have either wisely or instinctively confined themselves to that class of commodities which any one can deal in without danger of mistake, and shunned the more substantial stuff which cannot be successfully handled without some little modicum of scholarship and judgment.

It is on this ground that we deprecate the indiscriminate proscription of all German writings, as entirely insufficient to exclude the refuse and the offal of their market, while it must infallibly exclude the sound and wholesome food which they contain. As such food we have no hesitation in describing the results of their historical researches, when contrasted with their speculative philosophy and theology. Their own belief, we well know, is that their historical achievements derive all their value from the new philosophy by which they were preceded and accompanied. But this is an assertion which can only be answered by another, and we therefore simply say that we know better. However limited our knowledge of the subject, and however dubious our right as βάρβαροι to venture an opinion, we are not to be deprived of our conviction, that, so far as we do see, we see distinctly that the historical literature of Germany compared with its philosophy, is gold compared with moonshine. We may be decried as mercenary Yankees for preferring gold to moonshine; but we want to *buy the truth*, and if Germany will give us all her sterling gold, we will gladly undertake to furnish moonshine for ourselves.

We boldly say, moreover, that the historical labours of the Germans, far from owing all their value to the German speculations, are of value just so far as they exclude them, and in many instances because they do exclude them. The most effective antidote to empty speculation is afforded by the presence of abundant materials and a definite object. The man who has something tangible to work upon, and something definite to do with it, will not be very strongly tempted to spin nothing out of his own brain, as if in defiance of the maxim, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. Nothing has so effectually served to redeem the

German mind from the reproach which its philosophy had brought upon it, as the admirable zeal and skill with which the historians of that country have gone down to the depths and back to the head-springs of historical tradition, seeing all for themselves, and working up what they discovered into new and living combinations. The more thoroughly the interest and labour of this noble undertaking have engrossed their thoughts and made them oblivious of what they had been taught at school to call philosophy, the more complete and massive are the monuments which they have reared to tell their own names to posterity when the finest gingerbread and cobweb work shall have been swept out and forgotten.

That this diversity arises from the nature of the work performed, and not from the personal peculiarities of those who are engaged in it, is clear from the extraordinary fact that one and the same person has been known to work in granite with his right hand and in egg-shells with his left. In proof of this, let any competent but unsophisticated reader compare Philip Marheineke's inimitable History of the German Reformation with any of his speculative writings on theology or metaphysics. The former work has been advantageously compared by Dr. Schaf with that of Merle d'Aubigné. However fair the parallel may be, it would have answered more important ends to have compared Marheineke with Marheineke himself. In proof of all that we have said, if there were not another instance to be quoted, we should still rely on this and boldly appeal (*sit venia verbo*) from Philip drunk to Philip sober. We should also use it as an argument to show that the best cure for philosophy falsely so called is something to do and something else to do it with. If all the teeming German minds now striving, like the wise men of Laputa, to extract sunbeams out of cucumbers, could be engaged by some great impulse in historical researches, we should gain a treasure of imperishable knowledge, and lose what? The next phase of Hegelianism.

*de hinc* } All this, we know, is very arrogant and foolish from a certain stand-point, but if we stand on any, it must be our own, and we might as well concede that black is white at the suggestion of one neighbour, as that nonsense is sense at the suggestion of another. As long as we are suffered to say anything, we think it best to say what we believe and (in our own conviction) know to

be the truth. That this expression of opinion is the offspring of no blind national antipathy, is clear enough, we trust, from the explicitness with which we give to the historians of Germany that cordial admiration and applause which we are bold enough, perhaps absurd enough, to withhold from her philosophers.

There is one objection to this view of the matter, which we choose to notice briefly, were it only for the sake of showing that we are aware of it, and have not formed our judgment in ignorant despite of it. We mean the deference paid to this same philosophy by those very Germans who excel in the more substantial parts of learning. If these men, whose vast talents and extraordinary learning are acknowledged, think that there is something solid in what we regard as mists or shadows, may not this belief of ours arise from mental incapacity to see what they see? We very cheerfully admit the possibility of any thing suspended on our own deficiency or weakness; but in further condescension to that weakness, let the reader weigh the following suggestion. If the men who built the Pyramids had been accompanied throughout the work by others who were blowing bubbles, and who steadfastly maintained that the aforesaid bubbles were of vast use in cementing the materials of the structure, it is very conceivable that the builders, though unwilling to exchange employments with their neighbours, might begin to think that there was some mysterious virtue, after all, in the saponaceous vesicles continually floating in the air around them. Still more conceivable would such a notion be, if these stout labourers had all been taught in childhood that the Bubble was a sacred thing, never to be spoken of with levity, and very indispensable even in cases where it seemed most inappropriate, for instance, when combined with stone, or brick and mortar. This we believe to be the case in Germany; that is to say, the elementary ideas of philosophy imparted in her schools involve the very thing which English minds revolt at. The boy grows up with the idea that philosophy is essentially transcendental, in the sense of being something beyond ordinary comprehension; in other words, that there can really be no philosophy without a mixture of what children in America and England are allowed to laugh at by the name of nonsense. Our practice may in this respect be weak and wicked. We are not prepared

at present to defend it. What we now contend for is that the very different practice of the Germans will account for the effect in question, without making it a necessary proof that after all there must be something where no eyes have ever yet seen anything unless they looked through spectacles of German manufacture. It is well known that the Turks consider madmen as inspired, and it is easy to imagine that the Turkish children listen with great reverence and awe to what would in Germany be pitied or unfeelingly derided. It is also easy to imagine that the full-grown Turk may cherish the impressions of his childhood, and bear witness to the wisdom of the lunatic's effusions, although very careful to talk otherwise and still more to act otherwise himself. How far would such a notion on the part of any sensible, industrious, and well behaved Mohammedan, for whom you feel the most unfeigned respect, go to convince you that you must be wrong in thinking madmen mad, and that there must be inspiration after all in what you always thought and still think the dialect of Bedlam? On the same ground that decides this question, we may venture to believe and say, that the peculiar philosophy of Germany is a γυνῶσις ψευδώνυμος, without receding in the least from what has been advanced already with respect to the pre-eminence of her historians and historical explorers.

It can scarcely be necessary to observe, that the emphatic terms of praise, which we apply to the historical researches of the Germans, are not intended to imply a sweeping approbation of the inferences drawn from their discoveries; for this would be to grant the truth of contradictory propositions. The use to which the Germans have applied the result of their researches is entirely distinct from the result itself, and there is nothing more surprising in the best works of this class than their objective character and strict discrimination between ascertained facts and theories invented to explain them. That many instances occur in which the facts themselves have, wilfully or otherwise, been warped and wrested by the writer's prepossessions, it would be folly to deny. But it were worse than folly, that is, gross injustice, to withhold from these laborious and successful miners the distinguished praise of having brought up larger quantities of pure ore, in proportion to the usual alloy, than any other body of historians whatever. The courageous equity, with which they state and prove facts utterly adverse to

their own notorious preconceptions, might put to shame many a more orthodox historian, who instead of following the testimony leads it, and attempts, as it were, to speak his own words through the lips of ancient witnesses. For abstinence from such devices, no less than for learning and original research, the best modern historiographers of Germany may well be said to stand unrivalled.

Of the labours thus commended, only a part could be included in the widest definition of Church History. The modern German historiography is not more distinguished for its depth than for its vast extent of surface, and for the impartial uniformity with which it has extended its researches in all possible directions. The antiquities of Greece and Rome, the long hidden records of the middle ages, the history of ancient and modern art, the progress of civilized society in Europe, these and other fields which might be named have been assiduously tilled anew and forced to yield surprising harvests. It is therefore only as one part of a great systematic movement that the recent and actual progress of Church History ought to be regarded. It affords, however, one of the most interesting samples of the general process, and the one with which we are at present specially concerned. Confining our attention for the present to this part of the great field, it is important to observe, that when we speak of vast researches and of rich results, the reference is not merely to general works upon Church History or to systematic treatises on any of its branches. However high the writings of Neander and of Gieseler may deserve to stand, for very different reasons, among work of this kind, they disclose a very small part of that great fermentation which has wrought so much for history. A very large proportion of the labour has been spent upon a multitude of monographs or special treatises on certain subjects of Church History, the most important classes being that of ecclesiastical biography and that of the history of particular doctrines from the apostolic age until the present time. This extreme division of labour, with the thorough microscopic scrutiny which it occasions, the intense concentration of so many minds on so many detached points, and the stimulus afforded both to personal and public curiosity, is admirably suited to secure the maximum of information now attainable and to present it in the most effective form. The German catalogues are



crowded with the names of such performances, to cite which would be only to confound our readers with a host of unknown titles. It will serve a better purpose for the present, if we indicate the true relation of these numerous and valuable monographs to those extensive works of which they furnish the materials, and with whose names we are naturally more familiar. This we cannot do better than by borrowing the language, or at least the ideas, of a highly gifted German writer, to whom we shall direct the attention of our readers more particularly afterwards. The greater number of historical text-books, he observes, some of which are of great value, and the more extensive histories of Neander and Gieseler, have at bottom only two important merits, that of going before the monographs, and pointing out the chasms which are yet to be filled, and that of coming after them and giving the result of their researches and discoveries a place in the living organism of History. This brief suggestion, and especially the admirable image which it raises, will do more to give the reader an idea of the vastness of the work in progress than the most elaborate description or declamatory panegyric, whether German or American.

But in order to give adequate enlargement to our views of this extensive exploration, it must not be overlooked that, in addition to the general Church Histories, these monographs are furnishing materials to another class of writings, which we have before described as almost peculiar to the German language, and which, even in it, are of recent origin, and yet so numerous already as to form a little library. We mean the works on *Dogmengeschichte* or the History of Doctrine. We are not aware that there is any original work whatever in the English language on this interesting subject, and the only one with which we are acquainted even in an English version, is the oldest on the German list, or at least the production of the oldest professed writer on the subject. This is William Münscher, formerly Professor in the University of Marburg, the first two volumes of whose Manual (*Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*) appeared in 1797, the third in 1802, the fourth in 1809, bringing the history down to Gregory the Great. The only previous attempt, of which we are aware, at a history in this form, is Lange's *Geschichte der Dogmen*, the first and only volume of which appeared in 1796. Semler's Introduction to

Baumgarten's Theology (1767) and his Commentaries upon Ancient Christianity (1771) are supposed to have prepared the way for later writers, but are not in systematic form, while all the older contributions are contained in works more or less extensive on Church History in general. The work of Münscher may be, therefore, regarded as the first formal Dogmengeschichte which has still maintained a place in public estimation. In this work Münscher, after stating the advantages and disadvantages both of a purely chronological method and of one purely topical, combines the two, dividing his whole subject into seven periods, under each of which he undertakes to give, first a general statement of the changes in theology, and then a history of the doctrines seriatim, according to a systematic order of his own. The work on this scale never reached beyond the times of Gregory the Great, and even this part was eventually superseded by a smaller but complete work of the same author, known as his Text Book (*Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*) originally published in 1811. In this work he simplifies his plan by reducing his seven periods to three, and thus dividing the whole history into three parts, Ancient (A. D. 1—600), Middle (600—1517), and Modern (1517—1811.)

In the interval between the first and last of these publications several others had appeared, called forth by the example and success of Münscher. The only one of these, with which we are acquainted, is Augusti's *Lehrbuch*, in a moderate octavo, published first in 1805, and thirty years later in a fourth edition. Augusti modifies the plan of Münscher by carrying the General History continuously through ten periods before giving that of the particular doctrines.

A new edition of Münscher's smaller work, enlarged by the addition of original authorities and other matter, was begun by Von Cölln in 1832, and completed by Neudecker in 1838. The *Dogmengeschichte* of Ruperti (1831,) like most other learned works by Pastors not Professors, seems to be excluded from the catalogue of scientific treatises. That of Lentz (1834) might have escaped a like condemnation on account of his proposing, a new method, that of taking up the history of a doctrine where it first becomes important in Church History, with retrospective reference to its earlier development. His chronological division of the whole is into eight periods.

Earlier than the second of the works just mentioned, and of far more consequence than either in the judgment of the learned, was the *Lehrbuch* of Baumgarten-Crusius, which appeared in 1832, in two closely printed volumes. This work, notwithstanding its obscurity and heaviness, received great praise for erudition and profundity. It consists of a General and a Special History of Doctrines, the first being subdivided into external and internal. The number of periods assumed is twelve.

The first Roman Catholic attempt of this kind is, so far as we know, that of Klee, whose first volume appeared in 1837 and the second two years later. He repudiates the distinction between General and Particular Dogmengeschichte, and also the division into periods, choosing rather to describe each doctrine at its first appearance, and then trace its development from age to age.

The work of Engelhardt (1839) divides the history of Christian Doctrine from the time of the Apostles to the Reformation into two great periods, the turning point of the division being Scotus Erigena. Under each of these divisions the subject is distributed according to a mixed chronological and topical arrangement.

Meier's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (1840) exhibits, in a thin octavo volume, an exceedingly condensed and yet perspicuous compendium of the history, in a form peculiarly adapted to the wants of those who wish to make a first acquaintance with the subject. His chronological division of the whole is into six periods, grouped in three ages, differing from those of MÜNCHER'S second method only in the greater length assigned to ancient times, which Meier understands as reaching into if not through the eighth century.

The latest work which we have seen in this department is the beautifully printed and laboriously written work of Hagenbach in two octavo volumes. Though the author's text is less perspicuous than Meier's, his details are fuller, his citations more abundant, and the statements of his second volume founded upon later materials. A valuable contribution to this branch of learning had been previously made by the same author in his *Tabular Synopsis of the History of Doctrines from the times of the Apostles to the Reformation* (1828.) In his last work he returns

to the old method of General and Special History, which he handles under seven periods.

No attempt whatever has been here made to estimate the absolute or relative value of these works, upon the score of orthodoxy or of scientific merit. The sole design of the enumeration is to show the recent origin and rapid growth of this new discipline, as well as to determine certain points, both dates and names, for reference hereafter. Our readers will also bear in mind that, while these systematic works have been successively appearing, the process of historical monography, to which they are indebted for materials, has continued without any interruption or decrease.

In addition to the systematic writers upon Dogmengeschichte, some of whom have now been mentioned, there is one whose influence can scarcely fail to be enduring and extensive in determining the character and form of future works upon this subject, if indeed it has not been already felt by more than one of the most recent. This is Kliefoth, whose Introduction to the History of Doctrine\* was published at the chief town of the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg in 1839. We have no hesitation in pronouncing this one of the most striking and attractive books that we have ever read. It is not only highly original itself but constantly suggestive of new thoughts besides those which are formally expressed. Another characteristic feature is the largeness of the author's views without the customary drawback of indefiniteness and abstruseness. It is also distinguished among German writings by the rare combination of simplicity and clearness with extraordinary novelty and boldness of conception. If this be the newest type of German speculation, we sincerely hail it as an omen of most salutary change, and shall rejoice to find that our own ignorance has taken for an individual peculiarity what is really common to the younger race of theologians. We allude to speculation in connexion with this work because it is not really a history nor a bibliographical introduction to the study, but a truly philosophical analysis of the development of Christian doctrine, and a masterly delineation of the way in which its history should be recorded. No book was ever more devoid of pedantry. The only evidence of erudition is afforded

\* Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte von Dr. Th. Kliefoth. 8vo.

by occasional illustrations which evince a thorough knowledge of the literature of the subject, and show clearly that the author's most refined speculations are the gases evolved by a laborious process, not the fogs spontaneously engendered by the exhalations of a stagnant pool. In short, if we were called upon to say in what particular this work of Kliefoth differs from the mass of German writings of the more ideal class, we should reply that it is full of novelties, at least to us, and yet of novelties which even we can understand. This testimony must of course be taken with all due allowance for our want of information and the obvious possibility that what seems new to us in Kliefoth may be merely the reflection of some greater light not yet apparent above our horizon. We are only giving the impressions actually left some time since by a cursory perusal without any aid, before or after, from contemporary criticism.

It would be easy to concoct an entertaining and instructive article by simply giving a synopsis of the theories propounded in this interesting book. But it is not at present in our hands, and such an undertaking would divert us from another object which we have in view. The only other point to which we shall refer, before proceeding with our task, is Kliefoth's striking exhibition of the characteristic difference between the four great periods of the History of Doctrine, a difference arising from the several problems which the church has been called successively to solve. During the first period, the Greek theologians were employed upon the doctrines of Theology in the restricted sense, including all that relates to the being and attributes of God, and to the mode of the divine existence, the divinity of Christ, his natures and his person, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit. When these had been discussed and settled by authority, the second period began, during which the Latin Church was engaged in a like work with respect to Anthropology, the nature and fall of man, original sin, free will, &c. In the third or Reformation period, the great subject of dispute and adjudication was Soteriology, the method of salvation, atonement, justification, regeneration, &c. According to Kliefoth, if our memory serves us, we are now at the commencement of a fourth great period, and the only portion of the Christian system which remains to be developed is Ecclesiology, the doctrine of the Church, to which all controversies and investigations are now tending, and

the settlement of which will be the harbinger of general union, purity, and peace. We do not know with whom this fine conception is original; but it seems to be the key-note of all Kliefoth's compositions, the favourite thought with which he begins and ends, and by which the character and tone of all his speculations are determined.

The only other specimen of Kliefoth's composition which has come into our hands is a series of articles in several successive numbers of the *Allgemeines Repertorium*, a monthly journal of theological literature and ecclesiastical statistics, formerly edited by Rheinwald, now by Reuter of Berlin. The articles which we have mentioned all appeared during the first half of the year 1845. They are on the modern historiography of the German Protestant Church,\* the merits and defects of which are compared with those of the older writers, and the actual state and prospects of the science exhibited. Although we have not found these articles so striking and impressive as the book before described, in which the writer may have laid out his whole stock of original ideas, they are nevertheless eminently interesting and instructive, and have made us more desirous of ascertaining something in relation to the author, over and above the fact that he is Superintendent in Schwerin, and that he was a member of the late ecclesiastical convention at Berlin, the report of whose proceedings is now anxiously expected. We did hope to obtain some information from the work of Dr. Schaf, who mentions many of the latest German writers; but if Kliefoth's name occurs in his pages, it has inadvertently escaped our notice. This is the more remarkable because of the congeniality between the men, and the singular coincidence of thought and language in their two productions now before us. Some of the qualities which we have ascribed to Dr. Kliefoth are undoubtedly possessed by Dr. Schaf, and would have made the same impression if it had not been forestalled by a previous perusal of the other, so that what was last read seemed but a second emanation from the same school, however they might differ in particular opinions. Dr. Schaf, moreover, has the disadvantage of appearing under the disguise of a translation, not by any means remarkable for purity of English, ease of manner, or correctness of

\* Die neuere Kirchengeschichtschreibung in der deutsch-evangelischen Kirche.

expression. In his native tongue, so far as we may dare to judge, he is distinguished by a liveliness, simplicity and clearness, near akin to that which charms us in the works of Kliefoth.

The strong affinity between the transatlantic and the cisatlantic writer may be gathered even from an outline of the plan of Dr. Kliefoth's articles compared with the contents of Dr. Schaf's discourse. The former, setting out from the remarkable and interesting facts, that every living German theologian of celebrity has made some contribution to the science of Church History, and that within the last thirty years ten times more has been published on that subject than on systematic or dogmatical theology, directs attention to the disproportionate amount of labour which has been expended upon certain periods and on certain points connected with those periods, the periods and the topics thus distinguished being those which have contributed most to the formation of the church and of her doctrinal system. He then proceeds to a description of the different methods of historiography which have successively prevailed in Protestant Germany since the Reformation. First, the old orthodox method, which assumed the whole established system as not only founded but explicitly revealed in Scripture, and regarded all departure from its formulas, in ancient and in modern time, as heresy. Then comes the opposite extreme which has its starting point in Godfrey Arnold and his forced attempt to prove the heretics always in the right, if not in point of doctrine, yet in character and spirit. He then describes in order the pragmatistical school of which Mosheim was a representative, and the successive changes wrought by Semler and Herder in the theory and practice of church history. He next takes up the two antagonistic schools of Hegel and Schleiermacher, in reference not so much to what they did themselves as to what was done by their disciples and under the influence of their peculiar systems. Out of these he represents as springing the two later schools of Neander and Baur, while a mediating influence between all these extremes is beginning now to be excited by the two eclectic *Richtungen*, which are represented by Guerike and Rudelbach on one hand, and by such men as Ullmann, Dorner, Hundeshagen, and Ranke on the other.

The main design of Dr. Schaf's tract is an admirable one, in which we wish him all success. It is to foster a spirit of histori-

cal inquiry, with respect to the church and to theology, in opposition to the adverse tendency so evident and strong among ourselves at present. In urging this, he only asks us to keep up with the general progress of improvement, instead of lapsing into barbarous stagnation. In all the fields of human knowledge, history has now become essential, both as an object and a means of cultivation. It is no longer possible to learn or teach any branch of science thoroughly without due regard to the historical element which it involves, or at least to the historical phase in which it may be viewed. The effect of this is something more than the awakening of a livelier interest in subjects which might otherwise seem barren and repulsive. It also tends to bring the various parts of knowledge into harmony and counteract the hurtful segregation of the sciences. Experience has shown that the most effective means to this end is afforded, not by abstract ideas but by concrete realities, that the principle of unity is to be sought not in metaphysics but in history. Each part of learning or of science has a history of its own, and this, as we have said, has come to be regarded as essential to its perfect exhibition. At the same time, the whole subject takes its proper place in the general series of historical succession. Thus history, in one sense, comprehends all sciences, and in another, forms a part of each. Like the atmosphere, it presses both within and without, and while it fills up every nook and cranny in the parts, embraces and encompasses the whole.

< Our national tendency, so far as we have any, is to slight the past and overrate the present. This unhistorical peculiarity is constantly betraying itself in various forms, but it is nowhere more conspicuous and more injurious than in our theology. Hence the perpetual resuscitation of absurdities a thousand times exploded, the perpetual renewal of attempts which have a thousand times been proved abortive. Hence the false position which religion has been forced to assume in reference to various inferior yet important interests, to science, literature, art, and civil government. Hence, too, the barrenness and hardness by which much of our religious literature is distinguished, because cut off from the inexhaustible resources which can only be supplied by history. The influence of this defect upon our preaching is perhaps incalculable. But instead of going on to reckon up the consequences of the evil now in question, let us rather draw at-



tention to the fact that it is not of such a nature as to be corrected by the lapse of time, but must increase with the increase of ignorance and lazy pride, especially when fostered by a paltry national conceit, and flattered by those oracles of human progress who declare that history is only fit for monks.

To counteract this tendency, we need some influence *ab extra*, some infusion of strange blood into our veins. On this ground we are much disposed to look for good effects from Dr. Schaf's appearance, and even from the faults which have been charged upon his writings. The grotesque English which occasionally marks his style is not only palliated by the intimation on the title page—"translated from the German"—but may serve, like the jargon of his favourite Carlyle, to make the reader think by making him first stare and laugh. Even the positive dogmatical authoritative tone, which sometimes verges upon flippancy, may serve, by rendering the composition more *piquant*, to make it more effective. Whether any good is likely to result, among intelligent and cultivated readers, from the author's habit of pronouncing just as confidently where he is imperfectly informed as where he understands his subject, from his supercilious representations of English and American Theology as wholly unproductive, or from the compassionate disdain with which he looks down upon all who are not of the High Dutch breed and breeding—is a question which we leave to be decided by himself. If even these peculiarities, however, which ought long since to have dropped off as the exuviae of the *status pupillaris*, should, by rousing attention to the valuable truths embodied in his writings, give additional effect to his undoubted talents, eloquence, and learning, the price paid for the benefit is one of which the purchasers at least will have no reason to complain.

The valuable truths of which we speak have, in the present case, no necessary connexion with the author's doctrine as to our participation in the human nature of our Lord, nor even with his doctrine of "organic development." In some directions we are not prepared to take a step with him; in others we can go as far as he can, for example in maintaining the importance of Historical Theology, as well for its conservative as its progressive influence. We hold, as thoroughly as he can, the necessity of knowing what has been before us, in order to fulfil our own vocation. If he chooses to express this same idea by the figure

of organic growth, like that of plants and animals, with all the cognate images of twigs and sap, or food and blood, we do not make the least objection to his pleasing his own taste in the selection of a figurative vehicle for his ideas. But so far is this theory, or rather this poetical conception, of an animal or vegetable growth, from aiding the effect of what it represents upon ourselves, that we would rather look at the plain truth divested of the tropical costume in which the author's eloquence has dressed it up. In this we have been influenced, no doubt, to some extent, by our long familiarity with all kinds of "development," as regular cant phrases in our newspaper vocabulary. The changes rung upon this term and its correlatives have been so endless, that they seem to have lost all their power *ad captandum vulgus*. This would be a very insufficient reason for rejecting any new discovery which happened to have been baptized by this familiar name; but when we come to look more narrowly at Dr. Schaf's principles, apart from the accompanying metaphors, they strike us very much like old acquaintances in masquerade, or we may even say like English and American travellers, fresh from the hands of a German tailor.

Another circumstance which has contributed to break the magic spell of this word is its having been so recently adopted by Newman and applied to the corruptions of the Church of Rome. Of Newman's Essay (on the Development of Christian Doctrine) Dr. Schaf speaks slightly, and yet seems to regard it as beyond the reach of native American criticism, because "too many of our critics, in their immense Protestant self-complacency, to which all is clear and settled long ago as regards the whole subject, are utterly disqualified for every task of this kind." Dr. Schaf knows best, but we should certainly have thought the "self-complacency" of looking upon every thing as "clear and settled long ago" less "immense" than that of looking upon every thing as waiting to be rendered clear and settled by ourselves. But in defiance of the prohibition thus laid, like a chancery injunction, on the non-german critics, we shall venture to express a few ideas which the reading of that Essay has suggested to ourselves, the rather as we overlooked it at its first appearance, and its subject is essentially identical with Dr. Schaf's.

Even a cursory perusal is sufficient to disclose the *genesis* of

this strange essay. It is clearly the effort of a highly cultivated and ingenious mind to reconcile its new position with its old associations. It betrays a fixed determination to lay hold of every practicable means to justify the foregone conclusion of the writer, not so much before the public as before himself. It is really difficult to see why as much might not be said for Buddhism and a great deal more for Islam. The principle tacitly assumed is that whatever now stands connected, in the Romish system, with the teachings of the scriptures, must be right, however foreign from those teachings, nay, however uncongenial or even inconsistent with them it may seem, because the same reproach which these additions now incur has been lavished on the Church from the beginning, and because the adventitious matter, although utterly dissimilar to primitive Christianity, may have been included in it as a germ implanted with a view to subsequent development. In this way Fetishism might be represented as a legitimate development of Deism. Let it be once conceded that the greatest actual difference is no bar to the supposition of original identity, and little ingenuity will be required to bring the case within the scope of Mr. Newman's definitions and distinctions between genuine development, corruption, and decay. If it can be alleged of all the actual peculiarities of Popery, that they carry out the original idea and proceed upon an unchanged principle, that they are nothing more than conservative additions and unitive assimilations, then may any one thing be proved to have been developed out of any other.

Closely connected with the origin and primary design of the Essay, and indeed a striking proof of it, is the tentative form of its contents. It is not the record of the author's ultimate conclusions, but of his confused attempts to reach them. He is groping all through in the dark, determined to attain a certain object, he knows not, we had almost said, he cares not how. Like a traveller in a forest or a pathless waste, he first strikes out in this direction, then in that, resolved to find a way or make one. At each successive failure he renews the effort, coming back, as near as may be, to his former starting point. This, we have no doubt, is the secret history of many passages, in which there is the greatest show of scientific forms and systematic order, as for instance in the long enumeration of the various species of development, and in that of the tests by which corrup-

tions and developments may be distinguished. These classifications are evidently not the result of the author's speculations but their basis, the provisional assumptions upon which he builds his theory, with the intent and in the hope of proving them as he proceeds, and when he fails in this, the unsupported postulates are suffered to remain, as if self-evident. This mode of reasoning and composition seems to be a favourite with some distinguished living writers of the Church of England, not excepting those who have derived most assistance from the Germans. Every attentive reader must be struck with it in Bishop Thirlwall's *History of Greece*, which, able and learned as it is, exhibits, in its earlier chapters, not so much the writer's view of the subject after he had mastered it, as the first painful process of investigation, so that often, at the opening of a paragraph, he does not seem to know on which side of the question he will be at its conclusion. This description, however, admits only of a partial application to the case of Newman, whose uncertainty extends to the ways and means of proof, but by no means to the proposition which he wills to prove, and which was evidently fixed before he took his pen in hand. From the extraordinary nature of the doctrine thus assumed—to wit, the doctrine of development applied to the corruptions of the Papacy—and from the singularly unconvincing nature of the proofs employed, we do not wonder that the crafty representatives of Rome in England courteously declined to read the book before its publication, and preferred to leave the whole responsibility of its contents upon the venerable neophyte who brought it to their altars as the first fruits of his blessed renovation. That it should ever have the least effect in working the conversion of others, even among Newman's former friends and associates, but much more among Protestants of other schools, seems almost inconceivable.

Dr. Schaf's plea for development is not more totally unlike Mr. Newman's in its purpose and conclusions than in its structure, plan, and manner. There is nothing dubious, provisional, or tentative, either in the matter or the form of his discourse, which, on the contrary, presents throughout the uniform appearance of a subject which the author has thought out, and on which his judgment [is already settled. From this very circumstance arises, in a great degree, that air of confidence and positiveness which has been already mentioned. The learning here exhibited

is of course rather superficially extensive than profound; but what the author knows he has digested and knows how to use. Even the thoughts of others have become his own before he reproduces them, by what his predecessor Mr. Newman might call unitive assimilation.

After all that we have said of our ingenious author's metaphors, it may be thought presumptuous if we attempt to give our own views of "development" in parabolic form. This is the rather to be apprehended as the illustration which we have in mind is open to the same severe censure here pronounced on Dr. Cheever's imagery borrowed from the solar system, namely, that it likens human progress to the changes of dead matter rather than the growth of an organic body. But this last comparison, though beautiful and in some respects perfectly appropriate, nevertheless strikes us as involving a confusion of things really distinct, viz. the growth of Christian doctrine or revealed truth and the growth of Christian knowledge or theology. The first kind of development is repudiated not by us alone, but by the author, when he grants, or rather strongly affirms, the completeness of the original revelation and the real presence of all Christian doctrines in the books of the New Testament. This necessarily implies the co-existence, even in the most perfect human systems, of two elements, one variable, the other constant, to denote which combination the figure of animal or vegetable growth is by no means so well suited as that of a precious and invariable substance, subjected to an infinite variety of processes and modes of treatment. Upon this presumption rests the following illustration.

The whole body of religious truth and theological opinion, as it now exists, may, without absurdity, if not with strict propriety in all points, be compared to an extensive mine, which has been known and wrought for ages, and on which mining companies and individual miners are still busily employed. Among these miners there is a great diversity of practice, arising from a corresponding difference of theory, as well in relation to the value of the ore as to the method of procuring it. All are agreed that gold is to be found there, and that it there exists in combination with other metals or with certain earths. But one of the oldest and most active companies proceeds upon the principle, that these adjuncts must not be separated from the gold, having been

*This  
more illustration*

formed in combination with it, and being for that reason equally precious. Another company, or rather a solitary member of the first, departs so far from the opinion of his fellows as to hold that the adjuncts are of later date, having by some mysterious process been evolved from the gold, in which they were originally latent, and of which they consequently still form part. A third set or company assume an opposite position, namely, that the gold has been formed, or at least brought to perfection, by the successive combinations into which it has entered as a constant element, and that the adscititious substances with which it is now mixed, have had a share in this creative process, although worthless in themselves and now superfluous. A fourth class admits the latter part of this opinion but rejects the first, alleging that the adjuncts are and always have been worthless, and insisting on their total separation from the precious ore, by precisely the same methods and the use of the same implements employed by their own predecessors centuries ago. Any change in the hereditary processes of mining and metallurgy is looked upon by these as a depravation of the gold itself. By way of contrast to this strange idea, a fifth set steadily maintain that no regard whatever should be paid to any former practice or contrivance, but that every miner should begin *de novo*, manufacture his own tools and invent his own methods, as if no experiment had yet been made and no result accomplished. While each of these laborious companies is wedded to its own peculiar theory and practice and regardless of the rest, there is a sixth which differs from them all, and yet in some degree agrees with each, by carefully distinguishing the gold from the alloy, and laboriously separating one from the other, in the use of the best methods which their own experience or that of their forerunners has brought to light and proved to be effectual.

The application of this parable, so far as it requires or admits an application, is as follows. The first class or company of miners represents the vulgar Popish doctrine, which puts Scripture and Tradition on a level, and requires the monstrous after-growth of ages to be treated with the same consideration as the primitive doctrines and institutions, out of whose corruption it has sprung.

The second theory is Newman's doctrine of Development, in which a series of gradual additions to the primitive simplicity is

granted, but alleged to be the necessary evolution of a germ or principle implicitly contained in the original revelation, and designed from the beginning to be thus evolved.

Over against this stands the doctrine of Development, maintained by many German writers, and which recognises all the absurdities and heresies of past times, either as modifications of the truth, or as processes without which it would never have attained its present value, so that the truth is actually more true than it would have been but for the many falsehoods which have heretofore usurped its place, obscured its light, and marred its beauty.

The miners who persist in the exclusive use of the ancestral implements and methods are those orthodox traditionists who, not content with holding fast to the original doctrines of the Reformation, attach equal sanctity and value to the ancient forms of definition and elucidation, making no distinction between one who teaches a new doctrine and one who propounds an old one in new language. These theologians would as soon go to the stake for the scholastic formula in which the truth is set forth by some human teacher, as they would for the truth itself or the authoritative form in which the word of God exhibits it.

A worthy counterpart to this school is the one which rushes to the opposite extreme of foolishly ignoring all the past, and making self the starting point of all development and human progress. These are the miners who are so afraid of being hampered by adherence to the implements and methods of their predecessors, that they obstinately sink new shafts instead of going down the old ones, and waste no little time in the creation of original spades and grubbing hoes.

Lastly, the really enlightened miners, among whom we of course aspire to hold an humble place along with Dr. Schaf, while they maintain the immutability of the truth itself and the completeness of its revelation in the word of God, believe themselves at liberty, or rather under the most solemn obligations, to employ the best means of discovery, exposition, illustration, and diffusion, and as a necessary means to this end, seek to know the methods of their predecessors and the fruits of their exertions, abjuring neither the experience of their fathers nor the use of their own judgment, but applying both with freedom and discretion, as alike essential to complete success. These miners nei-

ther bind themselves to use the rude and awkward apparatus of the first explorers, nor engage to fabricate a new one for themselves. They only promise to employ the best, an undertaking which implies a due regard to previous improvements no less than to fresh researches, as it still holds good of the religious teacher, whether from the chair, the pulpit, or the press, that "every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."

---

### SHORT NOTICES.

ART. VII.—*A Universal and Critical Dictionary of the English Language. To which is added Walker's Key to the Pronunciation of Classical and Scripture Proper Names, much enlarged and improved; and a pronouncing vocabulary of modern geographical names.* By Joseph E. Worcester. Boston: Wilkins, Carter, & Company. Svo. pp. 956.

THE design of this dictionary is to give a complete glossary to all English books that are now read. It therefore contains besides the ordinary vocabulary, first, a large class of technical and scientific terms, not usually found in English dictionaries; secondly, many obsolete words; and thirdly, "many which are low and unworthy of being countenanced." The authority on which any word is included in the vocabulary, is given in all cases where it would not be entirely superfluous. Whenever also a new sense is assigned to a word, the authority for it is stated. The vocabulary has thus been enlarged by the addition of twenty-seven thousand words to those found in Todd's edition of Johnson's Dictionary.

The work just mentioned, Mr. Worcester has made the basis of his own, which we regard as a proof of good judgment. The whole list of words however found in Todd and Walker, "has been carefully revised in relation to their orthography, pronunciation, etymology, definition, &c., a great part of them, especially