

Theology and University:
Friedrich Schleiermacher, Karl Hagenbach, and the Project of
Theological Encyclopaedia in Nineteenth-Century Germany

By
Zachary Purvis
Regent's Park College
University of Oxford

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Theology and Religion
University of Oxford
For the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Trinity Term 2014

Short Abstract

This study examines the rise, development, and crisis of theological encyclopaedia in nineteenth-century Germany. As introductory textbooks for theological study in the university, works of theological encyclopaedia addressed the pressing questions facing theology as a ‘science’ (*Wissenschaft*), a rigorous, critical discipline deserving of a seat in the modern university. The project of theological encyclopaedia, I argue, functioned as the place where theological reflection and the requirements of the institutional setting in which that reflection occurred—here the German university—converged. I explore its roots as a pioneering idealist model for organizing knowledge in the German university system in the late eighteenth century. I focus especially on Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), the father of modern Protestantism and principal intellectual architect of the University of Berlin (1810). Schleiermacher’s programme transformed the scholarly theological enterprise into one defined in terms of science. That transformation laid the groundwork for the later historicization of theology, which I investigate in the two predominant ‘schools’ of German university theology in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Hegelian ‘speculative’ school and ‘mediating theology’ (*Vermittlungstheologie*). Among the latter, I emphasize the remarkable international influence of the Swiss-German Karl Hagenbach (1801–74), whose theological encyclopaedia was among the most widely read theological books in German-speaking Europe from the 1830s through World War I. Finally, I analyze the project’s downfall in the context of Wilhelmine Germany and the Weimar Republic, beset by radical disciplinary specialization, a crisis of historicism, and the attacks of dialectical theology. Throughout, I contend that theological encyclopaedia represented the institutionalization of the idea of theology as science, which furnishes an explanatory grid for understanding the relationship between theology and the university. The project resulted in a powerful synthesis that fundamentally shaped the reigning theological paradigms in nineteenth-century Germany and beyond.

Long Abstract

This thesis examines the origin, development, and crisis of theological encyclopaedia in nineteenth-century Germany. As introductory textbooks for theological study in the university, works of theological encyclopaedia addressed the most pressing questions facing theology as a ‘science’ (*Wissenschaft*), a rigorous, critical discipline deserving of a seat in the modern university: To what extent do the four traditional subdivisions of theology—exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical—form a single discipline? What unites them to one another, and how do they relate to other subjects in the university like philosophy, history, linguistics, or even the natural sciences? The vast pedagogical literature richly illustrates the complex internal dynamics of university theology. I analyze the rise and fall of the genre—a fate not assumed from the outset—as a unique means of defining theology. Furthermore, I explore how its purposes and priorities variously fit in, collided with, or adapted to an age of intellectual and disciplinary fragmentation, professionalization, and the ‘scientization’ (*Verwissenschaftlichung*) of academic life in the aftermath of the revolutionary, Napoleonic upheavals.

The model of theological encyclopaedia, I argue, functioned as the place where theological reflection and the requirements of the institutional setting in which that reflection occurred—here the German university—converged. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), the father of modern Protestantism and the principal intellectual architect of the University of Berlin (founded in 1810), together with his contemporaries, sought out ways to justify and interrelate the modern dispersion of theology into a multiplicity of disciplines. In doing so, he transformed the scholarly theological enterprise into one defined firmly in terms of ‘science’ (*Wissenschaft*). One of the main results of that transformation was the dominance of historical studies over the other branches of theology, leading to the historicization of theology in the later nineteenth century.

The broader model of encyclopaedia became one of the juggernaut forces in German academic life during the long nineteenth century, responsible for much of the structural changes across the ‘higher’ faculties of theology, law, and medicine and the ‘lower’ faculty of philosophy. It arose in the German university system in the eighteenth century as a response to the explosion of knowledge in the early modern world. It promised a more functional and philosophically-astute means of ordering knowledge than older, seemingly inelegant approaches like the ‘topical’ discussion in the venerable tradition of *loci communes*, which—so the Enlightenment critique ran—ostensibly arranged bits of learning like books in a library. Bold and sweeping in appeal, the new model recast not only theology but all of the major disciplines in the university through its ideological conception of knowledge in terms of unity, system, and organic wholeness, summed up by the recurring German idealist expression ‘totality of science’ (*Ganzheit der Wissenschaft*).

While previous studies have investigated the notion of theology as science or its institutionalization, the profound overlap between the two has never as yet been pursued in depth. Still, a number of connected, interdisciplinary concerns are attracting increasing attention. One is the continued relevance of theology, even after it lost its pre-modern status as ‘queen of the sciences’, for intellectual history and the history of the modern university—in and beyond Germany. Another concern relates

to the sociology of knowledge. The introductory theological literature contributed to the social mechanism by which ideas, mentalities, and prejudices entered the vocabulary of learned society. Introductory courses and textbooks became vehicles for the socialization, as it were, of generations of young theologians, who took their newfound expertise into manifold arenas. Attending to theological encyclopaedia as both a genre and a method for investigating the ‘orders of knowledge’ (*Wissensordnungen*) also accentuates the problem of relating form and content. With that in mind, I consider how the theological textbooks of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries depicted this reciprocal relationship on a grand scale—frequently with added moral imperatives.

Though I concentrate mostly on Protestant theology, rather than Catholic, I reflect on the fact that Protestants routinely pitched their works against their Catholic peers, implicitly and explicitly. The Reformation lingered just below the surface of discourse. In addition to the Protestant-Catholic confessional divide, intra-Protestant disputes regularly animated the field, such that the theological textbooks became ventures of polemical self-identification over against competing ‘schools’. For these reasons, I suggest that the field of theological encyclopaedia—revealing what theological faculties actually taught and the rationale behind that teaching—can inform recent debates about the nineteenth century as a ‘second confessional era’.

With important exceptions, the majority of these developments occurred within the ‘bridge period’ (*Sattelzeit*), the age of accelerated political, social, cultural, and economic change from the 1750s to the late nineteenth century. For the rapidly developing German university system and the remaking of university theology, the period between the 1790s and the 1840s, in particular, acquired special significance. The narrative unfolds in three major parts.

In chapters 2–4, I examine the origins of the genre and how it came to be an integral component of the theological curriculum in German universities in the second half of the eighteenth century. An intellectual and pedagogical discourse of *longue durée*, incorporating early modern Protestant theological compendia, pre-modern reference works, and older patterns of thought, led to its emergence. Scholastics and other thinkers often conceived of their works as exercises in *scientia*, science understood along traditional Aristotelian lines, and of theological reflection in the language of *sapientia*, or divine wisdom. From the late eighteenth century and particularly in post-revolutionary Prussia, however, a growing chorus of scholars and champions of *Wissenschaft*—comprehended as a progressive, dynamic, and even sometimes putatively secular form of scholarship—cast a dubious eye on the pre-Enlightenment theological traditions. The universities of Halle (founded in 1694) and Göttingen (founded in 1737) factor prominently in this account. State ministerial intervention at Göttingen resulted in the first introductory courses on the encyclopaedia and methodology of each discipline, which I explore with reference to lecture catalogues, guidebooks, and government reports. These chapters also elucidate the concept of encyclopaedia as a means of ordering and unifying diverse branches of knowledge, relating the theological literature to other more familiar projects of the Enlightenment.

Chapters 5–7 focus on Schleiermacher and his marriage of theology and science. While studies of Schleiermacher have canvassed a sizeable array of his many contributions to theology, education, and intellectual history generally, his own classic work of theological encyclopaedia, the *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1811; 2nd edn, 1830), has received cursory treatment, leaving it for the most part isolated from the intellectual, cultural, and institutional context to which it belonged. My account places Schleiermacher in the thick of his specific historical context, establishing the significance of his first academic post in Halle alongside his

familiar career in Berlin; the overlooked importance to him of Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775–1854); and the value of long neglected and unexamined texts and manuscripts, faculty manuals, lecture notes, correspondence, and publishing records, among other sources, for understanding his thoughtful complexity and extensive influence. I trace out that influence both through the dramatic spread of the ‘Prussian model’ of higher education, patterned after the University of Berlin, and through a series of prominent individuals and groups, including August Twisten (1789–1876), successor to Schleiermacher’s chair in Berlin, the ‘Catholic Tübingen School’, the Oxford Movement, Albrecht Ritschl (1822–89), Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), Ernst Troeltsch (1865–1923), and Karl Barth (1886–1968), among others.

Chapters 8–9 then examine the crossroads at which theological encyclopaedia stood after Schleiermacher, striking additional fresh ground in the study of nineteenth-century thought. The 1830s witnessed the formation of divergent paths in German university theology, each of profound consequence for modern Protestantism. The first I call the ‘speculative trajectory’, resulting from a group of broadly Hegelian theologians who privileged rational philosophical speculation above other forms of theological reasoning—among them Carl Daub (1765–1836), Philipp Marheineke (1780–1846), Karl Rosenkranz (1805–79), and David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74). The other has come to be known as ‘mediating theology’ (*Vermittlungstheologie*), whose advocates desired to strike a balance between forms of credal, ecclesiastical Christianity and modern historical and scientific consciousness. Among the latter, I make special reference to the Swiss-German church historian Karl Rudolf Hagenbach (1801–74). Those identifying with the mediating ‘school’ dominated German university theology over the middle-third of the nineteenth century. Seeing such developments through the lens of theological encyclopaedia clears up ambiguities and occluded transformations in the making of these major nineteenth-century systems and schools of thought.

Hagenbach’s contributions, in particular, represented the pinnacle of theological encyclopaedia and exhibit its prodigious changes. His introduction to the study of theology, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (1833; 12th edn, 1889), enjoyed unmatched international and transatlantic success and was translated into multiple languages. As the standard introductory textbook for students of theology for nearly a century, it became one of the most widely read theological books in nineteenth-century German-speaking Europe. Readers encountered a strong emphasis on historical reasoning in theology that was still attentive to piety and pedagogical training, enhancing Schleiermacher’s earlier treatment.

The project of theological encyclopaedia appeared to die a slow death with the last gasps of Wilhelmine Germany and the intoxicating first spells of the Weimar Republic—a time marked by radical, avant-garde developments in the study of theology and religion, generational conflicts, and intense church, political, and educational disputes. In the conclusion, I discuss the factors responsible for that downfall. These included a general crisis of historicism at the twilight of the nineteenth century, radical disciplinary specialization and the fragmentation of knowledge, which undercut the idealist belief in the unity of human learning, and the rise of dialectical theology. Dialectical critics like Barth attacked the entire project for attempting to legitimize theology by acquiescing to scientific methodology, surrendering Christianity’s ‘other-worldly’ apologetic and ecclesial claims. These forces resulted in the disintegration of the project’s idealist superstructure. If, at last, the centre did not hold, the project of theological encyclopaedia nevertheless resulted in a powerful synthesis that fundamentally transformed the reigning theological

paradigms in nineteenth-century Germany and beyond. The project represented modern university theology *par excellence*.

Throughout, I contend that theological encyclopaedia supplies the coordinates for examining nineteenth-century German theology as comprised both of theological ideas and institutional challenges, furnishing an incisive explanatory grid for understanding the university and theology in the university. In seeking to reframe debates about the study of modern theology, and concomitant disagreements over the relationship between Christian learning and higher education, I note that this thesis is primarily a work of intellectual history. Lingered doubts over the legitimacy of theology and religion in higher education and the ability of today's university to foster virtue and moral formation are in no short supply. Yet, attempts to discern answers to contemporary quandaries could reflect with profit on the deep historical roots of the recent fervour over the presence and characteristics of theology among the humanistic disciplines and the commitments of the modern university ideal. Knots of that ilk cannot be fully united without efforts to understand their past. The historical arguments presented here may perhaps help make sense of the complexities, contingencies, and ironies of academic theology in the modern age.

Acknowledgements

As an American writing an Oxford D.Phil. thesis on German university theology, I have had the great pleasure of working in a number of locations, universities, and institutions, stretching across the US and from there across the Atlantic to the UK, across the Channel to the Continent, and across western and central Europe. This has helped foster a comparative perspective on academic life. Even more, it has brought me into contact with a rich diversity of people, places, and ideas, for which I am deeply grateful.

At Oxford, I have enjoyed some of the most constructive and insightful conversation partners one could ask for. I would like to single out Johannes Zachhuber for his suggestions, advice, and encouragement. Grants from Regent's Park College and Oxford's Faculty of Theology and Religion enabled me to pursue my research in Berlin in the spring of 2012. During that time, I benefited from the assistance of Kurt-Victor Selge, Andreas Arndt, and Simon Gerber of Humboldt-Universität and the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. A US Fulbright Fellowship and Swiss Federal Scholar grant allowed me to spend a wonderful year in Basel, Switzerland. The debts I incurred there are too many to count, but let me thank especially Martin Wallraff, Georg Pfeleiderer, and Christian Kaufmann and Annemarie Kaufmann-Merriman for displaying such hospitality, friendship, and encouragement, making my stay not simply academically rewarding, but, in all respects, personally enriching, too. The 'Theologie als Wissenschaft' Graduiertenkolleg and the Forschungskolleg Humanwissenschaften, both connected with Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, invited me to spend time with their groups in the spring of 2013. I am grateful to Claus Arnold and Markus Wriedt for their support and assistance then and on various occasions since. A research grant from the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (DAAD) allowed me to spend half a year working in Munich. I would like to thank Professors Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Jan Rohls at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität for their generous support. Christian Danz and Patrick Leistner of Vienna and the Schelling-Kommission of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften provided helpful feedback on a few aspects of the project. So too did participants in the annual Oxford-Bonn joint seminar. I remain abidingly thankful for Westminster Seminary California. The Leibniz-Institut für Europäische Geschichte (IEG) in Mainz, Germany, supported the project at various stages, and allowed me to bring it to completion in 2014.

Mark Chapman and Thomas Albert Howard provided helpful suggestions and commentary. A number of friends and colleagues have also offered welcome criticism, conversation, and company along the way. Let me thank in particular Travis Baker, Dan Borvan, Casey Carmichael, Scott Clark, Joshua Forrest, Ryan Glomsrud, and Michael Horton, among many others.

Throughout, the archivists and librarians at a number of excellent institutions have provided invaluable and convivial assistance. These include Oxford's Bodleian Libraries and various college libraries, the Andover-Harvard Theological Library, the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, the Archiv der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, the Universitätsbibliothek at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, the Bibliothek der Bayerische Akademie der

Wissenschaften, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, the Fachbibliothek Theologie und Philosophie and Fachbibliothek Historicum at Munich's Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Basel's Frey-Grynaeisches Institut, the Karl-Barth-Archiv Basel, the Staatsarchiv Basel-Stadt, the Universitätsbibliothek Basel, Halle's Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig, the Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, and the Württembergische Landesbibliothek. I am grateful to the scholars and staff at each of these institutions.

Finally, I am most grateful to my family. Without their constant support—and reminders of those things of everlasting significance—I could not have written this thesis. No companion could ever compare with my wife Jessica. This thesis is dedicated to my grandfather, Norman, and my late grandmother, Beverley, whose demonstration of kindness, perseverance, wisdom, and wit has meant more to me than I could hope to convey.

Contents

<i>Short Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Long Abstract</i>	iii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. Organizing Knowledge: Humanists, Methods, and the <i>Longue Durée</i>	17
Encyclopaedic Ambitions	20
Sacred Science and the Search for a Genealogy	25
Mapping New Worlds	42
Conclusion	47
3. Institutions and Reforms	48
Criticism and Erudition	51
Progress in Halle and Göttingen	60
State Ministers and University Transformations	69
The ‘Special Encyclopaedia’ of Theology	77
Conclusion	81
4. Enlightenment, History, and New Ideals	83
An Embattled Order: Johann August Nösselt, Philosophy, and Theology	86
Ruptures and Revolutions: The Case of Gottlieb Jakob Planck	91
The Ethos of <i>Wissenschaft</i>	98
Conclusion	108
5. Theology, Encyclopaedia, and <i>Wissenschaft</i> in the ‘Quiet War’	110
Schelling, the Faculties, and Theology’s Dual Interests	114
Theology between Science and State	131
Conclusion	140
6. Schleiermacher from Halle to Berlin	142
The Promise of a New Professor	144
A Perplexing Guidebook and the Precarious Future of the Curriculum	149
The Idea and the Model of the University of Berlin	158
Conclusion	178
7. Renewing Protestantism? Schleiermacher and University Theology	181
A Scholar and A Manifesto	183
Publishing a University Text	186
Philosophical, Historical, and Practical Theology	191
A ‘Scientific’ and ‘Historicist’ Legacy	201
Conclusion	209

8.	The Speculative Trajectory	212
	Between Schelling and Hegel: Carl Daub	214
	System-Building after Hegel: Rosenkranz and Marheineke	218
	Strauss, History, and Exegesis	231
	Conclusion	243
9.	The Preceptor of Modern Theology: Hagenbach and the Mediating School	246
	A Theology Truly Scientific?	249
	The Lively Spirit of Mediating Theology	255
	Historical Conditions and the Fourfold Pattern	260
	International Influence	272
	Conclusion	277
10.	Conclusion	281
	<i>Bibliography</i>	296
	<i>Primary Sources</i>	296
	<i>Secondary Sources</i>	317

Abbreviations

Reference Works and Collected Editions

<i>ADB</i>	<i>Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie</i>
<i>ASL</i>	Friedrich Schleiermacher, <i>Aus Schleiermacher's Leben: In Briefen</i> , ed. Ludwig Jonas and Wilhelm Dilthey, 4 vols
<i>BBKL</i>	<i>Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon</i>
<i>EP</i>	<i>The Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i>
<i>GGB</i>	<i>Geschichte Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland</i>
<i>HUE</i>	Walter Rüegg (ed.), <i>A History of the University in Europe</i> , 4 vols
<i>HWP</i>	<i>Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie</i>
<i>KGA</i>	Friedrich Schleiermacher, <i>Kritische Gesamtausgabe</i> , ed. Hermann Fischer et al.
<i>NDB</i>	<i>Neue Deutsche Biographie</i>
<i>NSH</i>	<i>The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 4th edn
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>

Journals

<i>ABG</i>	<i>Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte</i>
<i>AHR</i>	<i>American Historical Review</i>
<i>AJT</i>	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ARG</i>	<i>Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte</i>
<i>ATR</i>	<i>American Theological Review</i>
<i>BJB</i>	<i>Basler Jahrbuch</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>CEH</i>	<i>Central European History</i>
<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Christliche Welt</i>
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>EKZ</i>	<i>Evangelische Kirchenzeitung</i>
<i>FBPG</i>	<i>Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte</i>
<i>GG</i>	<i>Geschichte und Gesellschaft</i>
<i>GH</i>	<i>German History</i>
<i>HEI</i>	<i>History of European Ideas</i>
<i>HEQ</i>	<i>Higher Education Quarterly</i>
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
<i>HJB</i>	<i>Historische Jahrbuch</i>
<i>HT</i>	<i>History and Theory</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>

<i>HU</i>	<i>History of Universities</i>
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JALZ</i>	<i>Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung</i>
<i>JBBK</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Berlin-Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>JHI</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Ideas</i>
<i>JHMTTh/ZNThG</i>	<i>Journal for the History of Modern Theology / Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte</i>
<i>JMH</i>	<i>Journal of Modern History</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JWCI</i>	<i>Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes</i>
<i>JWK</i>	<i>Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik</i>
<i>MIH</i>	<i>Modern Intellectual History</i>
<i>PJ</i>	<i>Preussische Jahrbücher</i>
<i>PN</i>	<i>Pietismus und Neuzeit</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ThV</i>	<i>Theologische Versuche</i>
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TSK</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZBK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZGNK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZRG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>ZWT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

Libraries and Archives

<i>AHTL</i>	Andover-Harvard Theological Library
<i>BBAW</i>	Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Archiv
<i>FG</i>	Bibliothek des Frey-Grynaeisches Institut, Basel
<i>HABW</i>	Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel
<i>HUB</i>	Humboldt Universitätsbibliothek
<i>KBAB</i>	Karl Barth-Archiv Basel
<i>NStUBG</i>	Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen
<i>PHL</i>	Pusey House Library and Archives, Oxford
<i>SBB-PK</i>	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Handschriftenabteilung
<i>StaBS</i>	Staatsarchiv Basel-Stadt
<i>UAG</i>	Universitätsarchiv Göttingen
<i>UBB</i>	Universitätsbibliothek Basel
<i>UBL</i>	Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig
<i>UBT</i>	Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Handschriftenabteilung
<i>ULBB</i>	Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Bonn, Handschriftenabteilung
<i>ULBSA</i>	Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle
<i>WLB</i>	Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, Handschriftenabteilung

Chapter 1

Introduction

What are theological or philosophical systems? We tear them out of the history through and in which they have grown, so that they are shrivelled plants, and not even that.

August Twesten, 1815

In 1806, under the heat of the August sun, the Holy Roman Empire at last withered and died. In the tumult of Napoleon's expanding reach, many of Europe's famous universities likewise 'hovered between life and death', chief among them Prussia's flagship institution, the University of Halle.¹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, the father of modern Protestantism and Halle's theologian since 1804, rued: 'Should the crown of German universities . . . [and] an important nursery for the mind . . . just be broken apart? I cannot believe it!'² But he had little choice in the matter. Amid 'cannonade', 'clouds of flying dust', and 'shots whistling through the air', invading French troops, fresh from humiliating their German foes on the battlefield of Jena and Auerstädt, plundered his shared living quarters, taking watches, shirts, and ransacking his possessions to such an extent that even 'all the silver spoons, with the exception of two, they carried off'.³ Napoleon himself soon arrived, barring and shuttering the university days later. Only weeks after losing the family silver,

¹ Conrad Bornhak, *Geschichte der preussischen Universitätsverwaltung bis 1810* (Berlin: Reimer, 1900), 190. Cf. Walter Rüegg, 'Themes', in *HUE* iii. 3–31; L. W. Brockliss, 'The European University in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850', in M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vi/1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 77–133; and R. R. Palmer, *The Improvement of Humanity: Education and the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

² Schleiermacher to Joachim Christian Gaß, 26 November 1806, in *KGA* v/9. 218–19.

³ Henrich Steffens, *Was ich erlebte: Aus der Erinnerung niedergeschrieben* (Breslau: Josef Max, 1840–4), v. 191–7; Schleiermacher to Georg Reimer, 4 November 1806, in *KGA* v/9. 180–1.

Schleiermacher claimed to accept with equanimity the distress he had faced—only a ‘poor joke’, he said—but confessed disquiet over unsettled ‘intermediate matters’.⁴

Halle’s fate in Napoleon’s hands entailed more for Schleiermacher than wartime apprehension over his nascent academic career. He was concerned with the same nexus of problems facing European scholars in earnest especially since the early years of Enlightenment: the nature of the university, the organization of knowledge, and the unity of theology’s various parts. The dawn of the nineteenth century found theology’s inclusion among the other traditional faculties of the university—and the continued existence of universities themselves—cast into doubt across Europe, putting an exclamation mark on the final displacement of theology as ‘queen of the sciences’. Halle’s hanging in the balance illustrated, Schleiermacher held, those vexing questions, ‘such as the manner in which each individual may be able to influence the whole, and the organization of all scientific and ecclesiastical institutions . . . the latter especially, for Napoleon hates Protestantism as much as he hates speculative philosophy’.⁵

In the German tradition, these problems bear the collective name of theological encyclopaedia (*theologische Enzyklopädie*). Like the German university system, which survived the revolutionary, Napoleonic crisis and flourished in its wake, theological encyclopaedia experienced a meteoric rise in the nineteenth century. In conjunction with introductory courses in the university, the vast pedagogical literature of theological encyclopaedia defined the scope of theology, schematized the interrelations of its various subfields, and gave birth to competing ecclesiastical and academic schools of thought. Works in the new genre functioned as textbooks and critical bibliographical resources for students, covering the most pressing questions facing theology and theological study: To what extent do the four

⁴ Schleiermacher to Ehrenfried von Willich, 1 December 1806, in *ASL* ii. 77–8.

⁵ Schleiermacher to Willich, 1 December 1806, in *ASL* ii. 77.

traditional subdivisions of theology—exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical—form a harmonious ensemble? What unites them to one another, and how do they relate to other subjects in the university like philosophy, history, linguistics, or even the natural sciences? Such queries preoccupied not only Schleiermacher, but also an impressive list of provocateurs, iconoclasts, and guardians of the ‘old faith’, all richly illustrating the internal dynamics of university theology and its structural changes across the modern age.

Discussion of theology’s proper methods and parameters remained closely linked with the impassioned nineteenth-century debates over the status of theology as science or *Wissenschaft*—a rigorous, critical discipline deserving of a place in the modern university. Theology’s institutionalization in the modern university and the need to classify it in an overall system of scientific knowledge, in fact, opened up the very quandaries that dominated the horizons of the new field. As one prominent textbook noted, ‘The question is, above all, what is the nature of theology?’⁶ Theological encyclopaedia, stated another, has become ‘absolutely indispensable’ for the ‘scientific equipment of the student of theology’, and finds regular employment in the universities, the ‘workshops and forges of the intellectual life of [Germany’s] people’.⁷

Ecclesiastical life also met with new challenges. Theology bears no responsibility ‘to manufacture piety’, wrote Georg Heinrici in his encyclopaedia of 1893, but only ‘to research what Christianity is and how [it] . . . operates’. Alluding to the first question from the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), Heinrici stated emphatically: the question, “‘What is your only comfort in life and death?’” is not

⁶ J. Ch. K. von Hofmann, *Encyclopädie der Theologie*, ed. H. J. Bestmann (Nördlingen: Beck, 1879), 2.

⁷ John MacPherson, preface to J. F. Rübiger, *Encyclopaedia of Theology*, trans. John MacPherson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1884–5), i. 7; Friedrich Paulsen, *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universitätsstudium* (Berlin: Asher, 1902), 205. Cf. R. König, *Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität* (Berlin: Runde, 1935), 78–86.

answered by *Wissenschaft*.⁸ The encyclopaedic ‘movement’, as Edward Farley has provocatively put it, ‘constitutes a virtual cataclysm in the history of theological schools. It is not an exaggeration to say that it (or the mode of thinking behind it) is the most important event and the most radical departure from tradition in the history of the education of clergy’, whose aftershocks have jolted theology and theological education ever since.⁹

This thesis examines the emergence, evolution, and classical expressions of theological encyclopaedia in Protestant academic theology in modern Germany. The model of theological encyclopaedia, I argue, is the place where theological reflection and the requirements of the institutional setting in which that reflection occurs—here the German university—meet. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and his contemporaries sought out ways to justify and interrelate the modern dispersion of theology into a multiplicity of disciplines. In doing so, they transformed the scholarly theological enterprise into one defined firmly in terms of ‘science’ (*Wissenschaft*). That move reveals the convergence of these two spheres. Put differently, Schleiermacher could well have composed his famous speeches on religion in 1799 if he did not serve as chaplain to the Charité Hospital in Berlin. But if he were never a professor of theology, principal intellectual architect behind the founding of the University of Berlin (1810), or dean of Berlin’s first theological faculty, he would never have written his groundbreaking work of theological encyclopaedia, the *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1811; 2nd edn, 1830). Over the past two centuries, few texts have continued to set the agenda for theological enquiry like it has.

⁸ C. F. Georg Heinrici, *Theologische Encyklopädie* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1893), 9–10.

⁹ Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 31, 49.

While previous studies have investigated the notion of theology as science or its institutional framework, the profound overlap between the two has never as yet been pursued in depth.¹⁰ As I shall contend, theological encyclopaedia supplies the coordinates for examining theology as comprised of both theological ideas and institutional challenges, furnishing an incisive explanatory grid for understanding the university and theology *in* the university. In seeking to reframe the study of modern theology, and concomitant debates about the relationship between Christian learning and higher education, my account is not meant to be exhaustive. What I present is less the storyline of the mutual development of German universities and their theological faculties entwined with matters of the state.¹¹ Rather, I focus on the critical role played by theological encyclopaedia in holding together the increasingly diverse interests, methods, and commitments of academic theology. How does theology as a discipline integrate the conceptually and methodologically distinct fields of biblical, historical, systematic, and practical theology, let alone the many and sundry newcomers like religious studies? Scrutinizing this problem, I analyze the rise and fall of the genre—a pivotal if ultimately partial exit and a fate not assumed from the outset—and interpret its span of success as a unique means of defining theology. Throughout, I explore how its purposes and priorities variously fit in, collided with, or adapted to an age of intellectual and disciplinary fragmentation, professionalization, and the ‘scientization’ (*Verwissenschaftlichung*) of academic life.¹²

Schleiermacher’s idea of theology as science (*Theologie als Wissenschaft*), which would serve the interests of the church by fostering close ties with other branches of

¹⁰ See, e.g., Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Johannes Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas: Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

¹¹ On this, see Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

¹² See Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 3–130.

knowledge, had considerable ramifications for the future of theology and university alike. His proposals bore significant responsibility for the powerful ‘singular burst’ of theological scholarship in nineteenth-century Germany.¹³ Their reception ushered in paradigms of Protestant and Catholic thought which animated European religion well into the twentieth century. One of the main results of the transformation inaugurated by Schleiermacher was the upending of theology’s ‘internal’ and ‘external’ dispositions, by which I mean the relation of theology’s branches to one another and toward the university as a whole. This effectively laid the groundwork for the later dominance of historical studies over the other branches of theology, resulting in theology’s ‘historicization’, the recognition that Christianity’s values and ideas are historically conditioned and subject to change.¹⁴ In the twilight of Europe’s revolutionary century, that outcome would precipitate a crisis for many convinced that theology could no longer plausibly advance ahistorical, eternal verities.¹⁵ It would be difficult, in short, to overstate Schleiermacher’s influence on modern Christianity.

The broader model of encyclopaedia became one of the juggernaut forces in the academy during the long nineteenth century, responsible for much of the structural transformations across the ‘higher’ faculties of theology, law, and medicine and the ‘lower’ faculty of philosophy.¹⁶ This particular idea of an encyclopaedia arose in the German university system in the second half of the eighteenth century, prompted by the institutional demands placed on theology, but also as a response to the explosion of knowledge in the early modern world. It promised a more functional and philosophically-astute means of ordering knowledge than older,

¹³ Claude Welch, ‘The Problem of a History of Nineteenth-Century Theology’, *JR* 52/1 (1972), 9.

¹⁴ Cf. Georg Iggers, ‘Historicism: History and Meaning of the Term’, *JHI* 56/1 (1995), 129–52.

¹⁵ Ernst Troeltsch, ‘Die Krisis des Historismus’, *Die neue Rundschau* 33 (1922), 572–90.

¹⁶ Cf. Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, “‘Encyklopädie, Methodologie und Literatur’: Pädagogisches Wissen zwischen Amt und Wissenschaft”, in Jürgen Oelkers, Fritz Osterwalder, and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (eds.), *Das verdrängte Erbe: Pädagogik im Kontext von Religion und Theologie* (Weinham: Betz, 2003), 123–46.

seemingly inelegant approaches like the ‘topical’ discussion in the venerable tradition of *loci communes*, which—so the Enlightenment argument ran—ostensibly arranged bits of learning like books in a library. It was also a remarkably broad and dynamic phenomenon. Bold and sweeping in appeal, the new model recast not only theology but all of the major disciplines in the university through its ideological conception of knowledge in terms of unity, system, and organic wholeness, summed up by the recurring idealist expression ‘totality of science’ (*Ganzheit der Wissenschaft*).

If the precise subject matter has not received full treatment previously, a number of connected, interdisciplinary concerns are, nonetheless, attracting increasing attention.¹⁷ Reflecting strong trends in recent scholarship, Jürgen Osterhammel has proposed that religion ‘occupy center stage in a global history of the nineteenth century’.¹⁸ German university theology certainly represents a leading character to be cast in that story. The ‘twin birth’ of the modern university and the modern faculty of theology occurred arguably with the stirring founding of the University of Berlin in 1810, which would go on to become, as Nicholas Boyle put it, the ‘global standard’ of higher education.¹⁹ Despite gainsayers and overzealous secularization theorists, Jonathan Sheehan reflected, ‘religion has never been left behind, either personally or institutionally. Instead it has been continually remade and given new forms and meanings over time.’²⁰ As Thomas Nipperdey observed, ‘modern thought in Germany did not coexist or conflict with theology, but dwelled

¹⁷ Cf. Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 303–23; and Farley, *Theologia*, 29 ff. On the early modern Catholic side, see Leonhard Hell, *Entstehung und Entfaltung der theologischen Enzyklopädie* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999).

¹⁸ Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 873.

¹⁹ Nicholas Boyle, “‘Art’, Literature, Theology: Learning from Germany”, in Robert E. Sullivan (ed.), *Higher Learning and Catholic Traditions* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 89. Cf. Rüdiger vom Bruch and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden*, i (Berlin: Akademie, 2012).

²⁰ Jonathan Sheehan, ‘Enlightenment, Religion, and the Enigma of Secularization: A Review Essay’, *AHR* 108/4 (2003), 1072.

in the long shadows cast by the problems it had set, by the “totality” it had laid claim to’.²¹

Another concern relates to the sociology of knowledge. To modify D. F. McKenzie’s phrase, the ‘sociology of textbooks’ cuts a wide interdisciplinary swathe.²² The theological literature contributed to the social mechanism by which ideas, mentalities, and prejudices entered the vocabulary of learned society, what Charles Taylor has called the ‘social imaginary’.²³ Introductory courses and textbooks became vehicles for the socialization, as it were, of generations of young theologians, who took their newfound expertise into manifold arenas. Writings in this family ‘offer models of correct comportment and practice’ that ‘not only inform [students], but . . . form them, at one and the same time’.²⁴ Attention to theological encyclopaedia as both a genre and a method for investigating the ‘orders of knowledge’ (*Wissensordnungen*) also accentuates the problem of relating form and content. Academic norms and organizational practices shape and reflect perspectives on the past.²⁵ With that in mind, I consider how the theological textbooks of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries depicted this reciprocal relationship on a grand scale—frequently with added moral imperatives.

Though I concentrate mostly on Protestant theology, rather than Catholic, one should not lose sight of the fact that Protestants routinely pitched their works against their Catholic peers, implicitly and explicitly.²⁶ The Reformation lingered

²¹ Thomas Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 1800–1866*, trans. Daniel Nollan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 466. Cf. Thomas Nipperdey, *Religion im Umbruch: Deutschland 1870–1918* (Munich: Beck, 1988), 7.

²² D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). On textbooks as objects of study, see Emidio Campi et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe* (Geneva: Droz, 2008).

²³ Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 146, 171–6, 200–1.

²⁴ Anthony Grafton, ‘Textbooks and the Disciplines’, in Campi et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge*, 23.

²⁵ Cf. Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

²⁶ On nineteenth-century Catholic theology in Germany, see Heinrich Fries and Georg Schwaiger (eds.), *Katholische Theologen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols (Munich: Kösel, 1975).

‘never far below the surface of educated discourse’, an indication of the ‘invisible boundary’ dividing confessional groups.²⁷ Tendencies among Catholic theologians to reject German classical culture as ‘pagan’ bolstered Protestantism’s identification with ‘modern’ culture and science.²⁸ These polemics marked the nineteenth century, in the eyes of Olaf Blaschke, as a ‘second confessional era’.²⁹

In 1905, the Berlin theologian Adolf von Harnack spoke famously of the ‘big business of science’ that had ascended to unknown heights by the end of the nineteenth century, spurred on by the ever-increasing specialization of knowledge.³⁰ Confessional theologians and pietists and those who lauded the modernizing, ‘scientizing’ religious climate did not always make for contented bedfellows. ‘Our theology students do not have it easy’, said one notable pastor in 1829, ‘because science (*Wissenschaft*) and faith (*Glaube*) are so far apart from one another. It must eventually lead to an internal contradiction, which can endanger their spiritual lives.’³¹ Berlin’s E. W. Hengstenberg (1802–69), whom conservatives looked upon as ‘brave as a lion . . . like one of the prophets of the Old Testament’, excoriated modern critical science in Germany as idolatrous, ‘a surrogate for religion’.³² The Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard, who had studied at the University of Berlin,

²⁷ David Blackbourn, *History of Germany 1780–1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (2nd edn, Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 221. Cf. Etienne François, *Die unsichtbare Grenze: Protestanten und Katholiken in Augsburg, 1648–1806*, trans. Angelika Steiner-Wendt (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1991).

²⁸ Jeffrey Zalar, ‘The Process of Confessional Inculturation: Catholic Reading in the “Long Nineteenth Century”’, in Helmut Walser Smith (ed.), *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany, 1800–1914* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), 126.

²⁹ Olaf Blaschke, ‘Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?’, *GG* 26/1 (2000), 38–75. Cf. Anthony Steinhoff, ‘Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter? Nachdenken über die Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert’, *GG* 30/4 (2004), 549–70. An intra-Protestant ‘culture war’ (*Kulturkampf*) also fed confessional conflict. See Gangolf Hübinger, *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik: Zum Verhältnis von Liberalismus und Protestantismus im wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 16, 291–302. On Germany’s multi-confessional history, see Smith (ed.), *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany*; and Todd H. Weir, *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1–28.

³⁰ Adolf von Harnack, ‘Vom Großbetrieb der Wissenschaft’, *PJ* 119 (1905), 193–201.

³¹ Jakob Burckhardt, Sr, to J. J. Frei, 13 March 1829, in Peter Dietz, (ed.), ‘Briefe des Antistes Jakob Burckhardt (1785–1858) an seinen Freund Johann Jakob Frei (1789–1852)’, *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 53 (1954), 125.

³² Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, ‘Der Kunst- und Wissenschafts-Enthusiasmus in Deutschland als Surrogat für die Religion’, *EKZ* 69–70 (27–8 August 1828), 545–9, 553–6. Hengstenberg’s description comes from the American Presbyterian H. B. Smith (1815–77), in Elizabeth L. Smith, *Henry Boynton Smith: His Life and Work* (New York: Armstrong, 1880), 67–9.

mourned in the middle of the century that ‘Christianity has completely merged with [modern] science—that is, Christianity no longer exists’.³³

In a related vein, the modern university posits a ‘false premise’, Alasdair MacIntyre has argued recently. Once ‘freed from constraints and most notably the constraints imposed by religious and moral tests’ as it discarded older confessional and apologetic loyalties, the premise asserts, the modern university might then ‘produce not only progress in enquiry but also agreement among all rational persons as to what the rationally justified conclusions of such enquiry are’—a formulation equally befitting the institutions of Germany, Great Britain, and America.³⁴ Pursuit of progress aptly characterizes the near ubiquitous literature of theological encyclopaedia.

That is not to say, however, that the epithet ‘scientific’ perforce called to mind apostasy, an absolute clash between powers of ‘faith’ and ‘reason’, or automatic secularization.³⁵ Nor did it necessarily function as an invective, a body blow landed by the theological pugilist against an opponent. Past scholarship has sometimes tended to present religion as successively—and inexorably—accommodating, resisting, and finally succumbing to the unforgiving forces of modernity, but that perspective obscures as much as it reveals. Theological encyclopaedia is not simply coextensive with ‘rationalism and the historical method, leading to a hermeneutics of destruction, a de-supranaturalizing of canon, authority, and Scripture’.³⁶ For Schleiermacher and many others—not only those inclined toward liberal guises of Protestantism—*Wissenschaft* did not pose an inevitable threat to the truth claims of

³³ Søren Kierkegaard, *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*, iv, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 463.

³⁴ Alasdair MacIntyre, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 225.

³⁵ Cf. Sheehan, ‘Enlightenment, Religion, and the Enigma of Secularization’, 1061–80; Steve Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); and Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

³⁶ Farley, *Theologia*, 65.

the Christian faith, but seemingly held out promise for breathing new life into an ancient pursuit.

A glance at the University of Erlangen clarifies the changing, uneven embrace of *Wissenschaft*—which did not remain static itself as a scholarly ideal. From the 1830s, Erlangen’s theological faculty boasted a conservative Lutheran school intent on employing the methods of *Wissenschaft* in the service of the ecumenical creeds and Reformation confessions as they envisioned them, a position staked out by G. C. Adolph von Harleß’s encyclopaedia, subtitled, ‘From the Standpoint of the Protestant Church’.³⁷ Harleß’s successor, Johannes von Hofmann, also a committed confessionalist, retained greater sympathy for Schleiermacher yet remained deeply suspicious on the finer points of modern biblical criticism (*Kritik*). The theologian ‘cannot cast aside his Christianity in order to become an exegete. Such alleged presuppositionlessness (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*) would instead constitute a surrender of the essential condition by which Scripture can be understood’, he claimed.³⁸ Downbeat toward the growing confidence in historical ways of understanding reality, he asserted: ‘[T]he essential understanding of a thing does not result from the historical path’.³⁹ Still, Hofmann purported to construct a scientific system of theology, curiously without recourse to either the expertise of other scholarly disciplines or the governance of external authorities, including the institutional church.⁴⁰

With important exceptions, the majority of these developments occurred within the ‘bridge period’ (*Sattelzeit*), the era of accelerated political, social, cultural,

³⁷ G. C. Adolph von Harleß, *Theologische Encyclopädie und Methodologie vom Standpunkte der protestantischen Kirche* (Nuremberg: Schrag, 1837), xi–xii.

³⁸ Hofmann, *Encyclopädie der Theologie*, 143.

³⁹ Hofmann, *Encyclopädie der Theologie*, 26.

⁴⁰ On ‘Erlangen Theology’, see Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, *Die Erlanger Theologie: Grundlinien ihrer Entwicklung im Rahmen der Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät, 1743–1877* (Munich: Evangelische Presseverband, 1960); and Matthew L. Becker, *The Self-Giving God and Salvation History: The Trinitarian Theology of Johannes von Hofmann* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

and economic change from the 1750s to the late nineteenth century.⁴¹ For the rapidly developing German university system and the remaking of university theology, the period between the 1790s and the 1840s, in particular, has duly earned its description as ‘the heroic age of organized learning’, a ‘seed-time of the modern world’.⁴² The narrative here unfolds in three major parts.

In chapters 2–4, I investigate the origins of the genre and how it came to be an integral component of the theological curriculum in German universities in the second half of the eighteenth century. Through a series of twists and turns, an intellectual and pedagogical discourse stretching back in time to early modern Protestant theological compendia, pre-modern reference works, and older patterns of thought led to its emergence. Scholastics and other thinkers often conceived of their works as exercises in *scientia*, science understood along traditional Aristotelian lines, and of theological reflection in the language of *sapientia*, or divine wisdom.⁴³ From the late eighteenth century and particularly in post-revolutionary Prussia, however, a growing chorus of scholars and champions of *Wissenschaft*—comprehended as a progressive, dynamic, and even sometimes putatively secular form of scholarship—cast a dubious eye on the pre-Enlightenment theological traditions. The universities of Halle (founded in 1694) and, especially, Göttingen (founded in 1737), factor prominently in this account. State ministerial intervention at Göttingen resulted in the first introductory courses on the encyclopaedia and methodology of each discipline, which I explore with reference to ‘little tools of knowledge’ like lecture catalogues, guidebooks, and government reports.⁴⁴ These chapters also elucidate the

⁴¹ Reinhart Koselleck, ‘Einleitung’, in *GGB* i. xiii–xxvii.

⁴² R. Steven Turner, ‘The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative, 1806 to 1848’, Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1973), 1–2; David Blackbourn, ‘Germany and the Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1820’, *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 51 (2012), 10.

⁴³ On the shifting meanings of Aristotelian science, see Peter Peterson, *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im protestantischen Deutschlands* (Leipzig: Meiner, 1921).

⁴⁴ Cf. Peter Becker and William Clark (eds.), *Little Tools of Knowledge: Historical Essays in Academic and Bureaucratic Practices* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001).

concept of encyclopaedia as a means of ordering and unifying diverse branches of knowledge, relating the theological literature to other more familiar projects of the Enlightenment.

Chapters 5–7 focus on Schleiermacher and his marriage of theology and science. While studies of Schleiermacher have canvassed a sizeable array of his many contributions to theology and religious education, his *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* has received cursory treatment, leaving it for most part isolated from the intellectual, cultural, and institutional context to which it belonged.⁴⁵ Others, deeply cognizant of his activities as a Prussian academic bureaucrat, have helped shed light on his political milieu and theological methods.⁴⁶ My account places him in the thick of his specific historical context, establishing the significance of his first academic post in Halle alongside his familiar career in Berlin; the overlooked importance to him of figures like Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775–1854); and the value of long neglected and unexamined texts, faculty manuals, manuscripts, lecture notes, correspondence, and publishing records, among other relevant sources, for understanding his thoughtful complexity and extensive influence.⁴⁷ As Wilhelm Dilthey wrote, Schleiermacher ‘embraced all the greatest impulses of his time’.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Farley, *Theologia*, 73–124; Brian Gerrish, *Continuing the Reformation: Essays on Modern Religious Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 147–77, 249–74; Hans Frei, *Types of Christian Theology*, ed. George Hunsinger and William Placher (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); and Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

⁴⁶ Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 130–211; Richard Crouter, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Between Enlightenment and Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 140–8, 207–25.

⁴⁷ On his place in contemporary German discussions, see Georg Pfleiderer, “‘Theologie als Wissenschaft’: Recent German Debates and What They (Could) Learn from Schleiermacher’, in Brent W. Sockness and Wilhelm Gräb (eds.), *Schleiermacher, The Study of Religion, and the Future of Theology: A Transatlantic Dialogue* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 81–96. Cf. Stefanie Rotermaun, *Wozu (noch) Theologie an Universitäten?* (Münster: LIT, 2001); Matthias Krieg and Martin Rose (eds.), *Universitas in theologia, theologia in universitate* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1997); Martin Heckel, *Die theologischen Fakultäten im weltlichen Verfassungsstaat* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986); and Ernst-Lüder Solte, *Theologie an der Universität: Staats- und kirchenrechtlichen Probleme der theologischen Fakultäten* (Munich: Claudius, 1971).

⁴⁸ Wilhelm Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers* (Berlin: Reimer, 1870), x.

Chapters 8–9 then examine the crossroads at which theological encyclopaedia stood after Schleiermacher, striking additional fresh ground in the study of nineteenth-century thought. The 1830s witnessed the formation of divergent paths in German university theology, each of profound consequence for modern Protestantism. The first I call the ‘speculative trajectory’, resulting from a group of broadly Hegelian theologians who privileged rational philosophical speculation above other forms of theological reasoning—among them Carl Daub, Karl Rosenkranz, Philipp Marheineke, and David Friedrich Strauss. The other has come to be known as ‘mediating theology’ (*Vermittlungstheologie*), whose advocates desired to strike a balance between forms of credal, ecclesiastical Christianity and modern historical and scientific consciousness, and thereby ‘satisfy simultaneously the claims of *Wissenschaft* and the church’.⁴⁹ Among the latter, I make special reference to the Swiss-German church historian Karl Rudolf Hagenbach. In letters, periodicals, political and institutional memoranda, rectorial addresses, and other treatises, these figures laboured to establish their respective scholarly communities. One should also note the significance of a ‘third’ group: a relatively more tradition-minded, neo-confessional cluster from the 1830s onward, particularly as represented by the ‘Erlangen School’ of theologians like Harleß and Hofmann. Though falling outside of the scope of the present thesis, members of the Erlangen School—along with so-called ‘Repristination’ or ‘Restoration’ theologians like Hengstenberg—sounded another loud voice in German university theology and commanded considerable attention.⁵⁰ Seeing each of these developments through the lens of encyclopaedia

⁴⁹ Frederick Gregory, *Nature Lost? Natural Science and the German Theological Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 50.

⁵⁰ Cf. Martin Hein, *Lutherisches Bekenntnis und Erlanger Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984). On ‘Restoration’ thinkers in the Lutheran and Reformed Protestant traditions, respectively, see, e.g., Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “‘Restaurationstheologie’ oder neulutherische Modernisierung des Protestantismus? Erste Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des neulutherischen Konfessionalismus”, in Wolf-Dieter Hauschild (ed.), *Das deutsche Luthertum und die Unionsproblematik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1991), 64–109; and Lowell H. Zuck, ‘Heinrich Heppe: A Melancthonian Liberal in the Nineteenth-Century German Reformed Church’, *CH* 51/4 (1982), 419–33.

helps clear up ambiguities and occluded transformations in the making of the major nineteenth-century systems and schools of thought.

Hagenbach's contributions, in particular, represented the pinnacle of theological encyclopaedia and exhibit its prodigious changes. His introduction to the study of theology, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (1833; 12th edn, 1889), enjoyed unmatched international and transatlantic success throughout the nineteenth century and was translated into multiple languages. It was among the most widely read theological books in nineteenth-century German-speaking Europe, and has earned a comparison, in terms of pedagogical success, to Peter Lombard's *Liber sententiarum* or *Sentences*, the definitive scholastic textbook of the high Middle Ages.⁵¹ The parallel, if slightly embellished, is certainly fitting. Where Lombard's book 'did more than any other text to shape the discipline of medieval scholastic theology', Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* remained the standard textbook in the university education of theology students for nearly a century.⁵² Readers encountered a strong emphasis on historical reasoning in theology that was still attentive to piety and pedagogical training, enhancing Schleiermacher's earlier treatment.

Finally, I note that the present study is primarily one of intellectual history. I am persuaded, however, that it remains relevant not only for the history but also for the future of theology as an academic discipline.⁵³ Lingering aporiae over the legitimacy of Christian learning in higher education and the ability of today's university (a kind of 'information factory') to foster virtue and moral formation are,

⁵¹ Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, 17, 250; Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 311.

⁵² Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), i. 2; Josef Pieper, *Scholasticism: Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Pantheon, 1960), 97.

⁵³ In theoretical terms, this follows the notion of 'dialectical objectivity', in which the subject's interests can offer insight into the object of study. See Allan Megill, 'Four Senses of Objectivity', in Megill (ed.), *Rethinking Objectivity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 1–20.

of course, in no short supply.⁵⁴ In one provocative and ultimately pessimistic interpretation, Michael Legaspi has argued that ‘academic criticism in its contemporary form cannot offer a coherent, intellectually compelling account of what this information is actually *for*.’⁵⁵ Attempts to discern theological answers to recent challenges could reflect with profit on the deep historical roots of the contemporary fervour over the presence of theology and religion among the humanistic disciplines and the commitments of the modern university ideal. Knots of that ilk cannot be fully untied without efforts to understand their past. The historical arguments here, in other words, may perhaps help make sense of the complexities, contingencies, and ironies of academic theology in the modern age.

⁵⁴ See, e.g., Mike Higton, *A Theology of Higher Education* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, *No Longer Invisible: Religion in University Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Stanley Hauerwas, *The State of the University: Academic Knowledge and the Knowledge of God* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007); Andrea Sterk (ed.), *Religion, Scholarship, and Higher Education: Perspectives, Models, and Future Prospects* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002); Jon H. Roberts and James M. Turner (eds.), *The Sacred and the Secular University* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); D. G. Hart, *The University Gets Religion: Religious Studies in American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996); George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Mark Schwehn, *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); David Kelsey, *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); and Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). See also Walter E. Wyman, Jr, ‘The Historical Consciousness and the Study of Theology’, in Barbara G. Wheeler and Edward Farley (eds.), *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 91–117.

⁵⁵ Michael C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 169.

Chapter 2

Organizing Knowledge: Humanists, Methods, and the *Longue Durée*

Where could one find a feeling for the seriousness of research called to explore the fathomless depths of knowledge? How seldom is there any forbearance toward bold efforts that were unsuccessful, or patience for slow developments!

Goethe, 1810

The project of theological encyclopaedia in the nineteenth century did not emerge entirely from new, whole cloth, but grew out of an older, complicated history. While many other factors entered the picture, the modern career of that project remained forcefully rooted in humanistic traditions that reached back to the early modern and Renaissance periods, and, at least in part, to Aristotle and the ancient world. All too often, treatments of modern theology and theological education in Germany begin with or after the watershed of the German Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) and move headlong across the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the present day. Modern developments, however, arose from and at key junctures broke with the medieval and early modern legacy. Staying aloof from the assumptions and practices of the earlier ages only inhibits a contextually rich understanding of theology's modern development. With a view to that earlier history, I argue that an intellectual and pedagogical discourse of *longue durée* led to the blossoming of theological encyclopaedia as a distinct line of enquiry.¹ In multiple ways, the 'encyclopaedic'

¹ On the long-range focus, see David Armitage, 'What's the Big Idea? European History and the *Longue Durée*', *HEI* 38/4 (2012), 493–507.

output of the late Baroque age prepared the way for the ‘scientific’ (*wissenschaftlich*) character of the discipline in the revolutionary era.

The University of Breslau’s Julius Ferdinand Rübiger (1811–91) conveyed the perceived power of this lineage among his contemporaries in two publications, *Theologik, oder Encyklopädie der Theologie* (1880), and a shorter historiographical survey, *Zur theologischen Encyklopädie* (1882).² As a student at Leipzig and Breslau, Rübiger concentrated on the Old and New Testaments and the Semitic languages, but from the time he earned the right to give university lectures (*venia legendi*) in 1838 until his death—a fifty-three-year career—that field of vision broadened and culminated in these two volumes.³ ‘The theological encyclopaedia of the present must attach itself to the history of the present’, he wrote, ‘and from the course of that history it must seek to win the right points of view, both for the general conception and for the systematic arrangement of theology.’ The ‘significance of the history of theological encyclopaedia, as well as its right to a place in the encyclopaedia itself, can be vindicated and made good only when the history has been accurately conceived as the foundation upon which theological encyclopaedia shall be reared’.⁴

Totalizing ‘modern views’ of theology and science had rendered theology’s claim of uniqueness unintelligible, Rübiger held, calling out for one ‘to vindicate theology’s scientific autonomy (*wissenschaftliche Selbständigkeit*) and authority among the other sciences’. This, coupled with the opportunity to put into practice his anti-Catholic polemic, motivated him. Because Catholicism ‘conducts itself with an ever-increasing recklessness, as though Protestantism no longer existed’, he said, ‘there must be a reawakening of the Protestant spirit and Protestant consciousness, the

² J. F. Rübiger, *Theologik, oder Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1880); Rübiger, *Zur theologischen Encyklopädie: Kritische Betrachtungen* (Leipzig: Morgenstern, 1882). Both received a wide audience in English, in Rübiger, *Encyclopaedia of Theology*, trans. James MacPherson, 2 vols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1884–5).

³ Cf. ‘Ansprache zur Promotion von Julius Ferdinand Rübiger, Breslau, 18.11.1836’, in ULBB, Autogr.

⁴ Rübiger, *Theologik*, 2.

winning again of the German people's love for their Reformation churches, and the leading of the German youth, by a deep impulse of the heart . . . to the study of theology and the service of the church'.⁵ Theological encyclopaedia's history and constructive proposals for its future, he held, must serve those ends.

Räbiger also added a third reason for engagement. The historical character of the discipline required special attention. Notably in his scheme, a recovered sense of the historically-conditioned nature of all theological work—and an adoption of 'historicist' methods—would be able in some sense to answer critics who asserted that Christianity's origins rested not on empirical accounts but mythical projections. 'As in all scientific departments, the historical method has in our time won general acceptance [and] can be departed from least of all in theology', he judged. Without reducing all branches of theology to a niche field of history, a historically-conscious theology would uphold the 'objectivity' of Christian belief. 'No science is so much exposed as theology to the danger of falling under the sway of subjectivity. The various theological systems have yielded more or less to subjective influences. Only when led by the inexorable declarations of history is theology able to avoid the cliffs of subjectivity and reach those of objectivity, after which every science has striven.'⁶ Though a relatively minor figure, Räbiger gave voice to widespread ideas on the history of theological study and the importance of history itself within the theological curriculum.⁷

This chapter sets the stage in broad outline for that account. Several background considerations require attention in order to place the developments of the long nineteenth century in a wider and deeper historical context. I offer, here, a

⁵ Räbiger, *Theologik*, iv.

⁶ Räbiger, *Theologik*, v.

⁷ Cf. Abraham Kuyper, *Encyclopaedie der heilige Godgeleerdheit*, i (Amsterdam, 1894; 2nd edn, Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1908–9). An abridged version of the first volume from Kuyper (1837–1920), a notable Dutch theologian and statesman, appeared in English as *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles*, trans. J. Hendrik De Vries (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898).

brief survey of the intellectual traditions at work in the eras leading up to the latter half of the eighteenth century. To understand that history and its force for Rübiger and his peers, this chapter treats the complex roots of theological encyclopaedia in humanist ideas on scholarly method, early modern Protestant guidebooks to the study of theology (including *loci communes* or theological commonplaces), and related bibliographic surveys. First, I elucidate the nature of ‘encyclopaedia’ as both a concept and a method according to its various expressions in the past. Second, I offer a sort of pre-history or ‘ideal-typical’ overview of the primary components more or less common to the nineteenth-century pursuits for a suitable theological genealogy, grounded in a series of concrete examples. This history is only partially recounted here, culminating in the era of German pietism and concluding, briefly, with a discussion of the seminal thinker J. G. Herder. The next chapter, in turn, traverses much of the same timespan in the second half of the eighteenth century but focuses in particular on the institutional contexts and actors through which theological encyclopaedia found its place in the curriculums of German university faculties of theology. Third, I summarize a facet of early modern bibliographies, namely, *historia literaria*. These components together make up the foundations of the classical theological encyclopaedia project.

ENCYCLOPAEDIC AMBITIONS

In his *Journal meiner Reise im Jahr 1769*, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) commented on what might be called an Enlightenment fascination with encyclopaedic texts. ‘Now encyclopaedias are being made, even Diderot and d’Alembert have lowered themselves to this. And that book that is a triumph for the French is for us the first sign of their decline. They have nothing to write, and thus

produce summaries (*abregés*), dictionaries, vocabularies . . . encyclopaedias—the original works fall away’.⁸ In truth, mountainous compilations could pack an intellectual punch as much as the leanest octavo. The *Preliminary Discourse to the Encyclopédie of Diderot* (1751) laid out the plan for ‘that book’ disrelished by Herder. As a dictionary, it would present the ‘general principles that form the basis of each science and each art, liberal or mechanical, and the most essential facts that make up the body and substance of each’. As an encyclopaedia, it avowed to ‘set forth as well as possible the order and connection of the parts of human knowledge’.⁹ Based on Ephraim Chambers’s *Cyclopaedia* (1728), the output of Denis Diderot, Jean Le Rond d’Alembert, and their many collaborators amounted to seventeen folio volumes of text and eleven volumes of plates, published in instalment, containing a remarkably diverse 71,818 articles. It was an accomplishment of massive proportions, a philosophical ‘trimming of the tree of knowledge’, and an exemplar after Francis Bacon of the impulse to sort, to classify, to diagram, and to order.¹⁰ Behind the French campaign lay an intent to carry through a sweeping reformation of the Republic of Letters, and thereby inaugurate a new era.¹¹

The *Encyclopédie*’s fame triggered an outbreak of encyclopaedias throughout Europe.¹² First appearing in three quarto volumes in Scotland, *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1768–71) became a distinguished brand of reference book in its own right.

⁸ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Journal meiner Reise im Jahr 1769*, in Herder, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin: Weidmann, 1877–1913), iv. 412.

⁹ Jean Le Rond d’Alembert, *Preliminary Discourse to the Encyclopédie of Diderot*, trans. Richard N. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 4.

¹⁰ Robert Darnton, *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie, 1775–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979), 7; Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), 191–213. Cf. Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopaedia, or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, 2 vols (London, 1728).

¹¹ Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 27–8; Robert Darnton, ‘The *Encyclopédie* Wars of Prerevolutionary France’, *AHR* 78/5 (1973), 1331–52.

¹² Béatrice Didier, *Alphabet et raison: Le paradoxe des dictionnaires au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1996). Cf. Joanna Stalnaker, *The Unfinished Enlightenment: Description in the Age of the Encyclopedia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010); Richard Yeo, *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and Frank A. Kafker (ed.), *Notable Encyclopedias of the Late Eighteenth Century: Eleven Successors of the Encyclopédie* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1994).

The largest reference book of the eighteenth century, Johann Heinrich Zedler's *Universal-Lexicon* (1732–50), ran to sixty-four volumes. On an even more palatial scale stood the truly staggering 242-volume *Oeconomische Encyclopädie* (1753–1858) begun by the Frankfurt physician Johann Georg Krünitz, whose colleagues looked on with bewilderment at the magnitude of his endeavour. He hoped to arrange a 'general system of land, domestic, and state economy' in alphabetic form, and managed to finish the first seventy-two volumes during his lifetime. The preface to the posthumous seventy-third volume carried the morbidly fascinating announcement that Krünitz had died just after finalizing the entry on the topic 'corpse' (*Leiche*, in German). So Krünitz managed to slog his way through nearly half of the alphabet before his death in 1796: to use Matthew Arnold's words, 'still nursing the unconquerable hope'.¹³ With these intrigues in mind, one writer observed already in 1762 that the German term 'Enzyklopädie', nearly unknown ten years earlier, had exploded in popularity.¹⁴

These works, not to mention the *Dictionnaires* from Pierre Bayle (1694) and Voltaire (1764–70), all arranged their topics on a lexical or alphabetic basis, but this was not the only model. Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–79), a popular philosopher in Zurich, produced a non-lexical encyclopaedia, the *Kurze Begriff aller Wissenschaften und anderer Theile Gelehrsamkeit* (1745; 2nd edn, 1759), which introduced general readers to emerging sciences, disciplines, and otherwise useful pieces of information. Sulzer comprehended eight 'main subjects of all human learning'. He proposed a didactic model, loosely organized by various topics in philology, history, the arts, mathematics, physics, philosophy, law, and theology, without engaging in a systematic overview of any field in isolation or combined with others. Numerous

¹³ See Annette Fröhner, *Technologie und Enzyklopädismus in Übergang vom 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Johann Georg Krünitz (1728–1796) und seine Oeconomisch-technologische Encyclopädie* (Mannheim: Palatium, 1994), 53. Cf. Matthew Arnold, 'The Scholar-Gipsy', *Poems* (London: Longman, 1853).

¹⁴ Friedrich Molter, 'Vorrede', *Kurze Encyclopädie oder allgemeiner Begriff der Wissenschaften* (Karlsruhe, 1762), n.p.

related texts from the same period bear witness to the fashionable nature of Sulzer's approach. One popular volume approximating the didactic model, for instance, promised to promote 'the understanding of all the different classes of arts and sciences that the human mind can grasp' (*fassen*).¹⁵ Because knowledge increases 'as long as enquiry continues', Sulzer held, 'the material of learning (*Gelehrsamkeit*) is endless. In recent times it has grown to such an extent that it is difficult to ignore it'. What one needed was a 'map' (*Landcharte*), a 'survey' (*Abriß*), representing objects of knowledge as individual 'countries'. The reader could then learn 'the names, the location, and the general condition of the different provinces and cities'.¹⁶

Sulzer's reader-as-traveller in want of a cartographer's sketch modified one of the French *Encyclopédie*'s central metaphors. As d'Alembert had written, the *Encyclopédie* 'is a kind of world map which is to show the principal countries, their position and their mutual dependence, the road that leads directly from one to the other. This road is often cut by a thousand obstacles, which are known in each country only to the inhabitants or to travellers, and which cannot be represented except in individual, highly detailed maps. These individual maps will be the different articles of the *Encyclopédie* and the Tree or Systematic Chart will be its world map.'¹⁷ Diderot and d'Alembert used the map metaphor to suggest relationships, orders, and cross-referenced connections among fields of learning. Sulzer's usage, by contrast, resisted any systematic orientation. The image of the map, either as a kind of schematic 'tree of knowledge' diagramming the branches of human learning, or a kind of 'mental map' depicting philosophical order, was also a recurring one across the theological literature. As late as 1893 and with reference to d'Alembert, the Swiss-German Philip Schaff (1819–93) framed his *Theological Propaedeutic: A General*

¹⁵ Molter, 'Vorrede', n.p.

¹⁶ J. G. Sulzer, *Kurze Begriff aller Wissenschaften und anderer Theile Gelehrsamkeit* (Leipzig, 1745; 2nd edn, 1759), 6.

¹⁷ D'Alembert, *Preliminary Discourse*, 47–8 (trans. modified).

Introduction to the Study of Theology as a fulfilment of ‘the purposes of a map for orientation’.¹⁸ One could readily marshal a plethora of similar theological texts imbued with the map idea in both rhetoric and organization. These encyclopaedic visions addressed the seemingly ‘timeless structure of the human mind, which underpins the state of knowledge at a particular time’.¹⁹

Notwithstanding their differences, both lexical and didactic models represented two sides of the same coin. As the German Romantic August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767–1845) suggested in his own lectures on the ‘encyclopaedia of science’ (1803), such efforts boiled down to an ‘aggregate’ or mass as opposed to a ‘living organization’ of knowledge.²⁰ This critique reverberated throughout the nineteenth century. Among Schlegel’s contemporaries, adoptions of the ‘living organization’ of encyclopaedia resulted in a deep-seated transformation in the nature, purpose, and study of university theology in Germany. The remainder of this chapter seeks to refine our understanding of the complex and entangled roots of that transformation.

It is necessary, then, to understand the relationship between theological encyclopaedia in its typical forms and other encyclopaedic undertakings, which for the most part came into their own in the eighteenth century. General lexical and didactic approaches encompassed a plurality of disciplines. Single-subject encyclopaedias (*Fachenzyklopädie*), by contrast, restricted their purview to (near) discrete disciplines. Textbooks of the encyclopaedia of a given academic discipline produced from the second half of the eighteenth century onward, moreover, did not function, strictly speaking, as reference volumes, as scholars have come to understand the reference genre today, but rather introduced the main ideas of the

¹⁸ Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical, including Encyclopaedia, Methodology, and Bibliography; A Manual for Students* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1893), iii.

¹⁹ Genevieve Lloyd, *Enlightenment Shadows* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 112.

²⁰ August Wilhelm Schlegel, ‘Vorlesungen über Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaft’, in Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, iii, ed. Ernst Behler and Frank Jolles (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006), 4.

discipline, connections among its varying branches, and the corresponding methods and tools of each branch—a ‘special’ rather than ‘general’ approach. Without recounting the extensive history of ‘encyclopaedia’ as a general concept, I concentrate on the way in which ‘encyclopaedic’ scholarly practices inside and outside of theology converged, particularly after the 1750s, thus establishing the conditions for theological encyclopaedia to take root as a fundamental feature of the modern university.²¹

SACRED SCIENCE AND THE SEARCH FOR A GENEALOGY

The encyclopaedia devoted to an individual subject or academic discipline has an ancestry partly in common with large-scale lexical and didactic reference works. Storing, sorting, selecting, and summarizing information—what Ann Blair has called ‘the four S’s of text management’ devised in early modern European reference books (florilegia, *sententiae*, dictionaries, commonplaces, and bibliographies)—underwrote the efforts of early modern humanists to manage colossal accumulations of human knowledge.²² Though a single, uniform definition of ‘encyclopaedia’ remains elusive, works referring to ‘encyclopaedia’ in the early modern age tended to signify that they would take their readers through the thicket of human learning, with the word designating a philosophical ideal of the interconnection of all branches of knowledge.²³ As a term, ‘encyclopaedia’ was actually coined in the sixteenth century from a misrepresentation of a Greek expression believed to mean the ‘circle’ (*kyklos*)

²¹ For an overview of ‘encyclopaedia’ as a concept, see Ulrich Dierse, *Enzyklopädie: Zur Geschichte eines philosophischen und Wissenschaftstheoretischen Begriffs* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1977); and William Gerber, ‘Philosophical Dictionaries and Encyclopedias’, *EP* vi. 170–99. Cf. Gert Hummel, ‘Enzyklopädie, theologische’, in *TRE* xix. 719–42; and Georg Heinrich, ‘Encyclopedia, Theological’, in *NSH* iv. 125–8.

²² Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 3.

²³ Dierse, *Enzyklopädie*, 9–15. Cf. Ulrich G. Leinsle, ‘Wissenschaftstheorie oder Metaphysik als Grundlage der Enzyklopädie?’, in Franz M. Eybl et al. (eds.), *Enzyklopädie der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995), 98–119.

of learning. As various commentators have observed, however, the Greek expression was really *enkyklios paideia*, which referred to ‘common knowledge’, or loosely, ‘general education’.²⁴ The term ‘cyclopaedia’, a version of ‘encyclopaedia’, first appeared in a 1583 edition of the *Margarita philosophica* (1503) by the Carthusian monk Gregor Reisch, subtitled, ‘Most Perfect Cyclopaedia of All the Disciplines’. As a compendium of each of the liberal arts plus natural and moral philosophy, the *Margarita* emphasized the content, rather than the theory, of the disciplines in view.²⁵

The theological encyclopaedists regularly reflected over the meaning of *enkyklios paideia* or ‘circle of learning’, which they traced from *Naturalis Historiae* by Pliny the Elder and *Institutio Oratoria* by Quintilian in the first century. Quintilian, the Roman master of language, described grammar, rhetoric, music, and astronomy as the ‘round of learning’ (*orbis doctrinae*).²⁶ The idea was a complete course of instruction in all parts of knowledge—in what would become known as the *trivium* (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, or ‘three words’) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy, or ‘four numbers’), and eventually, ‘the arts’ and ‘the sciences’—which one would undertake before entering public society or proceeding to specialized studies. In Hagenbach’s characteristic discussion: ‘The encyclopaedia of a science (*Wissenschaft*) as a whole can only come into being as the [science] has been rounded into a *kuklos*; and theological encyclopaedia, accordingly, could not originate before theology had been an organism of various departments. The beginnings of this were apparent in the church, however, at quite an early period,

²⁴ See Robert Fowler, ‘Encyclopaedias: Definitions and Theoretical Problems’, in Peter Binkley (ed.), *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 3–29; Jean Céard, ‘Encyclopédie et Encyclopédisme à la Renaissance’, in Annie Becq (ed.), *L’Encyclopédisme: Actes du Colloque de Caen* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1991), 57–67; Jürgen Henningsen, ‘“Enzyklopädie”: Zur Sprach- und Bedeutungsgeschichte eines pädagogischen Begriffs’, *ABG* 10 (1966), 271–362; and L. M. de Rijk, ‘“Enkyklios paideia”: A Study of Its Original Meaning’, *Vivarium* 3 (1965), 24–93.

²⁵ Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 169. Cf. Gregor Reisch, *Margarita philosophica* (Basel, 1583).

²⁶ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. H. E. Butler (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920–2), I.10.1. Cf. Harold Fuchs, ‘Enkyklios paideia’, in *RAC* v. 366–98; and Aude Doody, ‘Pliny’s Natural History: *Enkyklios Paideia* and the Ancient Encyclopedia’, *JHI* 70/1 (2009), 1–21.

though rather in connection with other branches of theological study than as a distinct subject of enquiry.’²⁷

Authors in the theological genre regularly included historical prefaces to their books, asserting a more or less continuous intellectual tradition extending at least as far back as Augustine’s *De doctrina christiana* (426). The synopsis by A. F. L. Pelt (1799–1861), who taught theology at the universities of Kiel and Griefswald, in his principal work, *Theologische Encyklopädie als System* (1843), is typical.²⁸ Medieval and Renaissance volumes received brief notice, such as the twelfth-century Hugh of St Victor’s *Didascalicon de studio legendi*, composed in Paris sometime in the 1120s for students at the newly founded Abbey of St Victor. The *Didascalion* distinguished philosophical knowledge into theoretical, practical, mechanical, and logical realms, with theology functioning as a component of theoretical knowledge. The Renaissance scholar Nicholas of Clémanges’s *De studio theologico* (c.1410) continued in this tradition.²⁹

Only with the rise of universities during the thirteenth century did theology emerge as an academic discipline. Though Christian reflection had nearly from its beginnings a tradition of ‘theology’ as a knowledge of God and divine things, the institutional developments in the thirteenth century added to this the sense of ‘theology’ as a self-conscious, scholarly enterprise. Before this, in fact, scholars used terms like *sacra pagina*, *sacra doctrina*, *sacrum studiorum*, and *sacra eruditio* to describe Christian learning, with *theologia* only coming into normal usage around the time of

²⁷ K. R. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (9th edn, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1874), 95.

²⁸ Anton Friedrich Ludwig Pelt, *Theologische Encyklopädie als System, im Zusammenhange mit der Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften und ihrer einzelnen Zweige* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1843), 7–15. Cf. Kuiper, *Encyclopaedia*, i.

²⁹ Cf. G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), 57–136; Paul Rorem, *Hugh of Saint Victor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 21–34; J. A. Weisheipl, ‘Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought’, *Mediaeval Studies* 27 (1965), 54–90; and Leonhard Hell, *Entstehung und Entfaltung der theologischen Enzyklopädie* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), 11–15.

Thomas Aquinas.³⁰ Through the practices of Boethius and Peter Abelard, but especially through the spread of universities and the first faculties of theology in the thirteenth century, *theologia* gained terminological precision as a discrete academic field. In Bernhard Geyer's summary, 'the word *theologia* first became established in general use in association with the university term *facultas theologica*'.³¹ While these occurrences informed the views of theologians like Pelt, the earlier, pre-university texts still occupied important positions. For a handful like Rübiger, establishing a kind of continuity with the medieval world—and thus the ancient church—lent additional grist to the mill of anti-Catholic polemics.³²

The Reformation brought renewed scrutiny to the grounds of theology and its methods of study. Protestant encyclopaedists, accordingly, allocated considerable space in their histories to the sixteenth-century developments in humanism and theological reflection, with Erasmus serving as the point of departure.³³ Erasmus's *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam* (1518), published on its own and included in the front matter to his second edition of the Greek New Testament (1519), outlined an irenic approach to theology that fostered piety, devotion, wisdom, and intellectual modesty in the life of the student.³⁴ Mastery of the biblical languages loomed large in the proposal from the learned humanist, so

³⁰ Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 29–30; J. Rivière, 'Theologia', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 16 (1936), 47–57.

³¹ Bernhard Geyer, 'Facultas theologica: Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *ZKG* 75 (1964), 137. Cf. Ulrich Köpf, *Die Anfänge der theologischen Wissenschaftstheorie im 13. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1974); Ferdinand Kattenbusch, 'Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie', *ZTK* 11 (1930), 161–205; and M. D. Chenu, 'La Théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle', *Archiv d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 2 (1927), 31–71. See also Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford: Clarendon, 1936), ii. 211–316; Anders Piltz, *The World of Medieval Learning*, trans. David Jones (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981); and James H. Overfield, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

³² Rübiger, *Theologik*, iv–v.

³³ J. T. L. Danz, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Weimar: Hoffmann, 1832), 128.

³⁴ Erasmus, *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam* (Basel, 1519); repr. in Erasmus, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Werner Welzig (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), iii. 117–495. See also Peter Walter, *Theologie aus dem Geist der Rhetorik: Zur Schriftauslegung des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1991); and Gerhard Ritter, *Via antiqua und via moderna auf den deutschen Universitäten des XV. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1922).

that students would not have to depend on the Latin Vulgate. He opposed the philosophy of scholasticism with the ‘philosophy of Christ’ (*philosophia Christi*), the latter of which abided in devotional study and faithful living rather than in logical syllogisms.³⁵ ‘The chief aim of theologians is to explain wisely the sacred writings’ (*divinas litteras*), he held.³⁶

Though offered various university professorships, Erasmus kept his distance from the ‘school men’ he regularly rebuffed. ‘The methods that our scholastics follow only render more subtle the subtlest of subtleties’, he said in *Moriae encomium*, or the *Praise of Folly* (1511). ‘For you will no more easily escape from a labyrinth than from the snares of Realists, Nominalists, Thomists, Albertists, Occamists, and Scotists.’³⁷ Nevertheless, he also sketched the outlines of a programme for the academic study of dogmatic or systematic theology that would foster the philosophy of Christ in one’s heart and life. ‘My feeling in this matter is that our young beginner should be offered teachings (*dogmata*) which have been brought together into a summary or compendium’, he wrote, ‘and that this compendium be drawn primarily from the Gospel fountains and from the letters of the Apostles, so that the beginner might have definite objectives to which he correlates those things that he reads.’³⁸

Even more than Erasmus, Martin Luther (1483–1546), Philip Melancthon (1497–1560), and their orthodox successors held rank. As a number of writers have pointed out, Luther’s tripartite formula for ‘the correct way of studying theology’—*oratio*, *meditatio*, and *tentatio* (prayer, meditation, and temptation or spiritual testing)—from the preface to the 1539 edition of his German works, had a

³⁵ Erasmus, *Ratio seu methodus perveniendi ad veram theologiam*, 297. On the context for his rhetoric, see Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

³⁶ Erasmus, *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam*, 193.

³⁷ Erasmus, *Moriae encomium*, in Erasmus, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ii. 132–5. Cf. John P. Dolan (ed. and trans.), *The Essential Erasmus* (New York: New American Library, 1964), 144. See also Terrence Heath, ‘Logical Grammar, Grammatical Logic, and Humanism in Three German Universities’, *Studies in the Renaissance* 18 (1971), 9–64.

³⁸ Erasmus, *Ratio seu methodus perveniendi ad veram theologiam*, 170.

considerable influence on Lutheran university theological education.³⁹ Melanchthon, regarded fondly as *Praeceptor Germaniae* (the teacher of Germany), received nearly as much attention for his propaedeutic essay, *Brevis discendae theologiae ratio* (1530), as for his foundational work, *Loci communes* (1st edn, 1521), which was arguably the first Protestant systematic theology.⁴⁰ In his original dedicatory letter to the *Loci communes*, Melanchthon stated his desire to adumbrate ‘what one must chiefly look for in Scripture’ while also exposing the corrupt ‘theological hallucinations of those who have offered us the subtleties of Aristotle instead of the teachings of Christ’.⁴¹

Those ‘chief’ biblical passages, taken together, formed the essentials, topics, or commonplaces (*loci*) which comprised the substance of biblical doctrine. The *Loci communes* thus treated such ‘topics’ or *loci* as the Trinity, creation, the fall, law, gospel, and other historic Christian doctrines with references to appropriate biblical texts and patristic authors. This ‘commonplace method’, indebted in part to classical sources like Quintilian and Cicero as well as the humanist Rudolf Agricola’s textbook of logic, *De inventione dialectica* (1515), became a much imitated model for organizing the doctrines of theology.⁴² Countless writers, such as Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75) of Zurich and Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563) of Strasbourg, Augsburg, and Bern, exhibited Melanchthon’s model in their own works on theological learning.⁴³ The student of theology needed to understand the appropriate horizons of

³⁹ Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Schriften* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009), i. 657–61. See also Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 1997).

⁴⁰ Philip Melanchthon, *Loci communes rerum theologicarum seu hypotyposes theologicae* (1521), and Melanchthon, *Brevis discendae theologiae ratio* (1530), in Karl Bretschneider and Heinrich Bindseil (eds.), *Corpus Reformatorum, Philippi Melancthonii Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Halle: Schwetschke, 1834–60), xxi. and ii. 455–62, respectively.

⁴¹ Melanchthon, *Loci communes*, in Bretschneider and Bindseil (eds.), *Corpus Reformatorum*, xxi. 81–2.

⁴² See Robert Kolb, ‘Teaching the Text: The Commonplace Method in Sixteenth-Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary’, *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987), 571–85; Quirinius Breen, ‘The Terms “Loci” and “Loci Communes” in Melanchthon’, *CH* 16 (1947), 197–209; and Paul Joachimsen, ‘Loci Communes: Eine Untersuchung zu Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation’, *Luther-Jahrbuch* 9 (1926), 27–97.

⁴³ Heinrich Bullinger, *Ratio studiorum de institutione, qui studia literarum sequuntur, libellus aureus* (Zurich, 1594); and Wolfgang Musculus, *Loci communes in usus sacrae theologiae candidatorum parati* (Basel, 1560).

the biblical texts and to apply the proper method of relating the *loci* to one another.

‘Whoever wishes profitably to teach himself or intelligently to instruct others must first comprehend from beginning to end the principal pieces in a thing, and carefully note how each piece follows the one preceding [it]’, Melanchthon wrote.⁴⁴

Melanchthon’s twofold concern to recover theology’s proper *scopus* and develop a right theological method prompted Ernst Troeltsch to characterize him as preoccupied with a ‘theology of definitions’ that animated Lutheran and Reformed thought for centuries.⁴⁵ As Richard Rothe said in an 1860 speech at the University of Heidelberg, on the occasion of the 300-year-anniversary of Melanchthon’s death, ‘It is not too much to say that the university in all its departments, throughout Protestant Germany, is his creation’.⁴⁶ Equally concerned with deep learning, elegant simplicity, and clear biblical teaching—something of which was captured in the humanist and Reformation slogans of *ad fontes* and *sola Scriptura*—Melanchthon assigned all of ‘the newly acquired knowledge to its allotted place in the most systematic order’.⁴⁷

Even if Aristotle received opprobrium in the first edition of the *Loci communes*, Melanchthon’s relation to ‘The Philosopher’ was in reality nuanced and modulated according to circumstance.⁴⁸ Luther had attacked Aristotle in the spring of 1518 at the Heidelberg Disputation. But when Melanchthon arrived in Wittenberg at the end of the year to begin his new position as a professor of Greek—on the

⁴⁴ Clyde L. Manschreck (ed. and trans.), *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), xlvi.

⁴⁵ Ernst Troeltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Johann Gerhand und Melanchthon* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891), 58.

⁴⁶ Richard Rothe, ‘Rothe’s Address on Philip Melanchthon’, trans. Erskine N. White, *ATR* 3 (1861), 277. On Melanchthon as an educational reformer, see Irene Dingel et al. (eds.), *Philip Melanchthon: Theologian in Classroom, Confession, and Controversy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011); Karin Maag (ed.), *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999); Joon-Chul Park, ‘Philip Melanchthon’s Reform of German Universities and its Significance: A Study on the Relationship between Renaissance Humanism and the Reformation’, Ph.D. diss. (Ohio State University, 1995); and Karl Hartfelder, *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Berlin: Hofmann, 1889).

⁴⁷ Rothe, ‘Rothe’s Address on Philip Melanchthon’, 271.

⁴⁸ Nicole Kuropka, ‘Philip Melanchthon and Aristotle’, *Lutheran Quarterly* 25 (2011), 16–27.

recommendation of his great uncle, the humanist and noted Hebraist Johann Reuchlin—he used his inaugural address, ‘De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis’, to plead for a new understanding of Aristotle and a return to the original sources (*ad fontes*) of piety and learning, stressing the general usefulness of a thorough education in the ‘humane disciplines’ (*humanis disciplinis*).⁴⁹ And though Luther’s speech brimmed with anti-scholastic sayings, he, too, did not eradicate all use of Aristotelian philosophical categories in his thought.⁵⁰

In addition to Melanchthon, other theologians, like Calvin’s successor in Geneva, Theodore Beza (1519–1605), took pains to foster the *studia humanitatis* alongside explicit theological training and received recognition from the nineteenth-century encyclopaedists. A noted humanist in his own right, Beza drew to the Genevan academy several of Europe’s highest ranking philologists, including Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon, attempting to unite classical philology, poetry, and other fields with theological studies and imbue the entire enterprise with a deep sense of devotion and religious formation.⁵¹

Intimately bound up with these sources was the establishment or reform of universities, schools, and monasteries in the Reformation’s wake throughout Europe. Steven Ozment’s remark depicts aptly the state of affairs: ‘As a theological movement, Protestantism continued the scholastic enterprise of defining true doctrine. It was peculiar in that it streamlined this undertaking with the *studia humanitatis*.’⁵² The sixteenth-century reforms were transformative in nature. In the words of Lewis Spitz, ‘The magisterial Reformation was born in the university . . .

⁴⁹ Philip Melanchthon, *De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis* (1519), in Robert Stupperich (ed.), *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*, iii (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1961), 29–42.

⁵⁰ David V. N. Bagchi, ‘Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism’, in Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark (eds.), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 3–15.

⁵¹ Scott Manetsch, ‘Psalms before Sonnets: Theodore Beza and the Studia Humanitatis’, in Robert J. Bast and Andrew C. Gow (eds.), *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 400–16. Cf. David C. Steinmetz, ‘The Scholastic Calvin’, in Trueman and Clark (eds.), *Protestant Scholasticism*, 16–30.

⁵² Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform, 1250–1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 316.

[and] triumphed with the help of universities'.⁵³ In his classic history of medieval education, Hastings Rashdall put it similarly, writing, 'It is hardly too much to say that the existence of universities . . . made the Reformation possible.'⁵⁴ Luther's *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation* (1520) signalled that ecclesiastical and theological reform could not be isolated from educational reform. 'The universities need a sound and thorough reformation. I must say so no matter who takes offence. . . . For Christian youth and those of our upper classes, with whom abides the future of Christianity, will be taught and trained in the universities. In my view, no work more worthy of the pope and emperor could be carried out than a true reformation of the universities. On the other hand, nothing could be more wicked, or serve the devil better, than unreformed universities. . . . I greatly fear that the universities are but wide-open gates leading to hell.'⁵⁵ Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Protestant schools established or renewed in places like Wittenberg, Geneva, and Heidelberg, among numerous others, bear out this emphasis.⁵⁶

Melanchthon's efforts buttressed the broad array of post-Reformation treatises of theological prolegomena, or introductory theological texts—often penned with a view toward theological study in the setting of German Lutheran or Reformed universities from the mid-sixteenth until the eighteenth century.⁵⁷ The select literature of Protestant scholasticism treated here sheds light on the features of

⁵³ Lewis Spitz, 'The Importance of the Reformation for Universities: Culture and Confession in the Critical Years', in James M. Kittelson and Pamela J. Transue (eds.), *Rebirth, Reform, and Resilience: Universities in Transition, 1300–1700* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984), 42.

⁵⁴ Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ii. 233.

⁵⁵ Martin Luther, 'An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung' (1520), in *Luthers Werke*, vi. 457–8.

⁵⁶ On the Reformed side, see Karin Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995).

⁵⁷ For overviews of the Protestant scholastic literature, see Robert D. Preuss, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 2 vols (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970–2); and Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 4 vols (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003). See also Rudolf Mau, 'Programme und Praxis des Theologiestudiums im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *ThV* 11 (1979), 71–91; and Chi-Won Kang, *Frömmigkeit und Gelehrsamkeit: Die Reform des Theologiestudiums im lutheranischen Pietismus des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Basel: Brunnen, 2001).

theological study on the verge of the German Enlightenment. In addition, these works constitute notable predecessors to the genre of theological encyclopaedia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Two of the more important Lutheran sources for the nineteenth-century thinkers warrant particular mention: Andreas Hyperius (1511–64) and Johann Gerhard (1582–1637).

Hyperius, Marburg University's leading theologian, was a Flemish refugee who had lived in England for a time in the 1530s. He acquired a reputation for his vernacular devotional works and for his activities in combating poverty.⁵⁸ His academic manual on the practice of preaching, subsequently translated from Latin into English, secured his image in the nineteenth century as the 'father of practical theology'.⁵⁹

Ten years after Luther's death, Hyperius produced a formative textbook, *De recte formando theologiae studio* (1556), which represented 'the most extended Protestant essay on the basic study of theology written in the sixteenth century'.⁶⁰ Hyperius divided the theological curriculum into three general areas: Scripture and its interpretation,⁶¹ *loci communes* or the study of doctrinal topics,⁶² and practical theology, which included the history of the church, preaching, liturgy, and church polity.⁶³ These subdisciplines constituted the main course of study for students of theology, who were to meet each subject with piety and receive guidance by the

⁵⁸ Robert Jütte, 'Andreas Hyperius und die Reform des frühneutzeitlichen Armenwesens', *ARG* 75 (1984), 113–38; and Helmut Zedelmaier, 'Lesetechniken: Die Praktiken der Lektüre in der Neuzeit', in Helmut Zedelmaier and Martin Muslow (eds.), *Die Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001), 11–30.

⁵⁹ Ernst Christian Aechlis, 'Die Entstehung der "Praktischen Theologie"', *TSK* 65 (1892), 7–43. Cf. Andreas Hyperius, *De formandis concionibus sacris* (Marburg, 1553); trans. John Ludham as *The Practise of Preaching, Otherwise Called the Pathway to the Pulpit*, trans. John Ludham (London, 1557). More generally, see Johannes Wischmeyer, 'Protestant Katechetik—Institutionelle Kontexte und wissenschaftliche Profile im langen 19. Jahrhundert', in Bernd Schröder (ed.), *Institutionalisierung und Profil der Religionspädagogik: Historisch-systematische Studien zu ihrer Genese als Wissenschaft* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 53–88.

⁶⁰ Andreas Hyperius, *De recte formando theologiae studio* (1556); 2nd edn, as *De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, libri IIII* (Basel, 1559). Cf. Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 108.

⁶¹ Hyperius, *De theologo*, ii. 1–38, 80–425.

⁶² Hyperius, *De theologo*, iii. 1–8, 425–562.

⁶³ Hyperius, *De theologo*, iv. 1–10, 562–756.

sapiential writings of Scripture. The Apostle Paul, Hyperius insisted, citing 1 Cor. 1, defined theology as ‘a wisdom not of this world’.⁶⁴ For Hyperius, true theological study knit together a proficiency in academic material and a profound formation in spiritual matters.⁶⁵ Nearly all of the major textbooks of theological encyclopaedia pointed toward Hyperius’s work as the first to anticipate the fourfold division of theology into biblical exegesis, systematic or dogmatic theology, church history, and practical theology, a division that would become dominant in the nineteenth century through the work of Hagenbach. The increasing acknowledgment of a historical component in the theological curriculum, ‘something largely foreign to medieval scholasticism, helped establish an “institutional space” for the further historicization of Protestant theology in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century’.⁶⁶

Gerhard, among the most illustrious Protestant thinkers of the seventeenth century, became widely known for his Herculean *Loci theologici* (1609–22) and his treatise on theological method, *Methodus studii theologici* (1620).⁶⁷ From the medieval town of Quedlinburg, Gerhard studied in Wittenberg and then Jena, where he eventually took an academic post. During his lifetime he was regularly considered the greatest living Lutheran theologian.⁶⁸

Rehearsing the question of whether theology is more properly a science (in the Aristotelian sense of *scientia*) or an aptitude (*habitus*), a common query and subject of perennial debate throughout scholastic literature in the Middle Ages and the early modern period, Gerhard declared: ‘Theology is the God-given *habitus* conferred on man by the Holy Spirit through the Word. By this *habitus*, man is not

⁶⁴ Hyperius, *De theologo*, i. 40.

⁶⁵ Hyperius, *De theologo*, i. 36. Cf. Muller, *After Calvin*, 108.

⁶⁶ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 76.

⁶⁷ Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, 9 vols (Jena, 1610–25); rev. edn, ed. Eduard Preuss (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–85), and Gerhard, *Methodus studii theologiae* (Jena, 1620).

⁶⁸ See Johannes Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961), 5–84.

only instructed in an understanding of the divine mysteries through the illumination of his mind . . . but it also makes him fit and ready concerning those divine mysteries. . . . [I]t makes him a path for informing others of salvation, a path for setting heavenly truth free from the corrupting influence of gainsayers, so that human beings, glowing with faith and good works, may be drawn to the kingdom of heaven.’⁶⁹ Gerhard’s accent soon became customary in Lutheran as well as Reformed theological prolegomena. Abraham Calov (1612–86), for instance, repeated Gerhard’s contention in his *Isagoges theologicae* (1652), summing up the era.⁷⁰

These Protestant works reflected the post-Reformation process involved in the codification, confessionalization, and systematization of new theological doctrines. Teaching a system of doctrines to young students in an academic setting recalled some of the pedagogical practices of the late-medieval ‘school men’, but did not necessarily foretell an abandonment of early-Reformation truths.⁷¹ A union of humanistic and scholastic elements was characteristic of the epoch. ‘Understood as method’, Richard Muller has argued forcefully, ‘scholasticism evidences an institutionalization of Protestant thought in its academies and universities, not the rise of a specific doctrinal perspective.’⁷²

Though post-Reformation Europe witnessed a sustained push toward the consolidation of theological developments, as new doctrinal systems received systematic treatment in the context of the university, historians sometimes depict it as an age remarkable precisely for its unoriginality in religious thinking.

‘[S]cholastics—the strangest sort of men who ever lived’, wrote F. C. Baur, reciting

⁶⁹ Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, i. §31; Eng. trans. from Gerhard, *Theological Commonplaces*, i: *On the Nature of Theology and of Scripture*, ed. Benjamin T. G. Mayes, trans. Richard J. Dinda (St. Louis: Concordia, 2006), 312. See also Wallmann, *Theologiebegriff*, 62–75.

⁷⁰ Abraham Calov, *Isagoges theologicae, liber II, paedia theologica, de methodo studii theologici* (Wittenberg, 1652). Cf. Preuss, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, ii. 217.

⁷¹ On the late-medieval context, see Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (London: Lutterworth, 1967); and Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (2nd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 11–98.

⁷² Muller, *After Calvin*, 4.

the conclusion of another prominent nineteenth-century church historian.⁷³ This viewpoint became cemented into popular and scholarly mentalities in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. Isaak Dorner's prominent history of Protestantism, penned at the behest of the Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities in 1867, registered seventeenth-century scholasticism as little more than an exercise in 'wall building', where near-Byzantine spectacles of nuance and precision fashioned German Protestantism into an 'impregnable citadel'.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, the early modern period gave birth to an abundance of creative schemes for the methods of theology and organization of theological knowledge, including such influential works as David Chytraeus's *De studio theologiae* (1562); Bartholomaeus Keckermann's *Operum omnium quae extant* (1614); Johann Heinrich Alsted's *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta* (1630); Gisbertus Voetius's *Execitia et bibliotheca* (1664); and Johannes Buddeus's *Isagoge historico-theologica ad theologiam universam* (1727); all of which received a wide readership across 'Germandom', broadly conceived, as well as France, Switzerland, and the Low Countries.⁷⁵ Together, they corroborated the view of one Catholic church historian on early modern Lutheranism, specifically, who opined in 1861: "Dead orthodoxy" (*die todte Orthodoxie*) is currently one of the most popular catchphrases. . .

⁷³ F. C. Baur, *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1852), 183; Eng. trans. from Peter C. Hodgson (ed. and trans.), *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 192. Cf. G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie von der Konkordienformel an bis in die Mitte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1831).

⁷⁴ Isaak Dorner, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland* (Munich: Cotta, 1867), 520. Cf. Zachary Purvis, 'The New Ethicist and the Old Bookkeeper: Isaak Dorner, Johann Quenstedt, and Modern Appropriations of Classical Protestantism', *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 19/1 (2012), 14–33.

⁷⁵ Cf. Wallmann, *Theologiebegriff*; Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications, 1543–1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); and Arnold Stolzenburg, *Die Theologie des Jo. Franc. Buddeus und des Chr. Matth. Pfaff: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aufklärung in Deutschland* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1926).

. But there is a great mistake in saying this. Lutheran orthodoxy was not dead in Germany—on the contrary, as long as it existed it was extremely lively.’⁷⁶

Alsted’s *Encyclopaedia* included citations of numerous treatises generated in the German universities, many of which were devoted to a single discipline but collectively formed a kind of encyclopaedic project, like Keckermann’s writings.⁷⁷

Based at the Calvinist Herborn academy, Alsted first outlined his approach in a little treatise in 1610, *Panacea philosophica*, which he described as ‘an easy, new, and carefully devised method of teaching and learning the whole encyclopaedia’.

Questions of order and logic hung over the proposal. ‘I call it a panacea, that is a universal medicine’, Alsted wrote, ‘not alchemical but philosophical, by which the disorders that the mind suffers in thinking about things, words, and quantities can be removed. This panacea, in a word, is method’.⁷⁸ He continued: ‘I shall endeavour, with God’s blessing, to furnish the individual arts with this very method’.⁷⁹

(Incidentally, his great-uncle was Hyperius.) Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716) spoke of systematically cataloguing all human learning in ‘a precise inventory of all the available but dispersed and ill-ordered pieces of knowledge’.⁸⁰ In short, these figures contributed to the ‘proliferation of humanist discourses and disciplines’, noted Ian Hunter, ‘not just metaphysical philosophy and theology, but politics, jurisprudence, medicine, natural philosophy and “encyclopaedism” taking place during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries’ in Protestant university curricula.⁸¹

⁷⁶ J. J. Ignaz von Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat: Historisch-politische Betrachtungen* (Munich: Cotta, 1861), 376.

⁷⁷ Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta*, 2 vols (Herborn, 1630). On Alsted, see Howard Hotson, *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

⁷⁸ Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Panacea philosophici* (Herborn, 1610), 12. Cf. Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, 170.

⁷⁹ Alsted, *Panacea philosophici*, 6–7.

⁸⁰ Quoted in Mogens Laerke, ‘Leibniz, the Encyclopedia, and the Natural Order of Thinking’, *JHI* 75/2 (2014), 238.

⁸¹ Ian Hunter, *The Secularisation of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 38. Cf. Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, ‘Einleitung:

Discussion of more recent forerunners commenced with Philipp Jakob Spener's (1635–1705) *Pia desideria*, a founding pietist document from 1675,⁸² and moved from there to the prodigious works of the pietists J. J. Breithaupt (1658–1732),⁸³ August Hermann Francke (1663–1727),⁸⁴ and Joachim Lange (1670–1744).⁸⁵ At the Enlightenment University of Halle, Francke transposed the theological task identified by Gerhard into one grounded more clearly in pious practice. If the theologian 'does not use the Word of God to become a true Christian', he said, 'then even if he becomes . . . a master of Scripture, it will be of no use to him'.⁸⁶ The directive to read and study the text, Jonathan Sheehan observes, was always accompanied by the parallel command to read and study the heart.⁸⁷ Francke's *Idea studiosi theologiae* (1712; 2nd edn, 1717) began with the claim that the student of theology must 'seek first and above all to see that his heart is righteous before God'. 'No one who knows the real nature (*Beschaffenheit*) of true Christianity puts his Christianity in knowledge, opining and babbling, or in lofty speculations' and 'subtle and hidden truths'. Francke admonished students to shun 'theological studies in which one seeks to become more learned and not really better or more pious'.⁸⁸

In his valuable history of seventeenth-century university life and Lutheran theology, F. A. G. Tholuck (1799–1877) observed: 'Only sporadically was a course on the methods of theological study offered'.⁸⁹ In Tholuck's lectures on theological

Die Schulphilosophie in den reformierten Territorien', in Helmut Hozhey and Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann (eds.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, iv/1 (Basel: Schwabe, 2001), 392–7.

⁸² Philip Spener, *Pia desideria*, trans. T. G. Tapert (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964). See also Spener, *Theologische Bedenken* (Halle, 1700–2); and Spener, *De impedimentis studii theologici* (Halle, 1707). Cf. Pelt, *Theologische Encyklopädie*, 55.

⁸³ J. J. Breithaupt, *Exercitatio inauguralis, de studio theologico* (Halle, 1702).

⁸⁴ August Hermann Francke, *Definitio studii theologici* (Halle, 1708); Francke, *Idea studiosi theologiae, oder, Abbildung eines der Theologie beflissenen* (Halle, 1712); and Francke, *Methodus studii theologici* (Halle, 1723).

⁸⁵ Joachim Lange, *De genuina studii theologici, praecipue thetici, indole ac methodo* (Halle, 1712).

⁸⁶ August Hermann Francke, *Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Erhard Peschke (Berlin: Luther-Verlag, 1969), 174.

⁸⁷ Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 60.

⁸⁸ Francke, *Werke in Auswahl*, 172–3, 179.

⁸⁹ F. A. G. Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Beziehung auf die protestantisch-theologischen Fakultäten Deutschlands* (Halle: Anton, 1853–4), i. 100.

encyclopaedia at the University of Halle from 1842–3, he bypassed virtually the entire seventeenth-century scholastic tradition—jumping from Erasmus and Melancthon to Spener—on account of its having ‘entirely forgotten [the] practical earnestness of the Christian religion’.⁹⁰

Another figure forming a piece of the lineage was Herder. As General Superintendent at Weimar, Herder oversaw the schools and clergy in the duchy and left his mark on the shape of instruction at the *Gymnasium* and on the training of theological candidates, or those not yet appointed to a church.⁹¹ His four-part *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend* (1780–1), in which he advised young students to read the Bible ‘humanely’, as a historical book, found its way into the historical prefaces in the literature of theological encyclopaedia. The first two volumes of the *Briefe* contained a running commentary on the Old Testament and the gospels of the New Testament, as well as instructions on how to read and study each to maximum profit. The latter half of the letters discussed certain dogmatic constructions. Though Herder upheld the orthodox view that the best study of divinity was the Bible itself, volume one of the *Briefe* opened with the pronouncement: ‘The Bible is . . . as it were the most human of all books, for it is for the most part and fundamentally also the oldest.’⁹² His *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (1784–91) spoke of the Old Testament as humanity’s oldest trustworthy document, in some contrast to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, his senior by fifteen years, who said it had all the limited qualities of a ‘primer’ for humanity.⁹³ Herder composed the *Briefe* in the wake of Lessing’s publication of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragmente* from Hermann Reimarus

⁹⁰ F. A. G. Tholuck, ‘Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology, Translated from the Unpublished Lectures of Prof. Tholuck, by Edwards A. Park’, *BSac* 1 (1844), 184. See also Nicholas Hope, *German and Scandinavian Protestantism, 1700–1918* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 354–99.

⁹¹ W. H. Bruford, *Culture and Society in Classical Weimar 1775–1806* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 184–235, 308–17.

⁹² Johann Gottfried Herder, *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, in Herder, *Sämmtliche Werke*, x. 7.

⁹³ Toshimasa Yasukata, *Lessing’s Philosophy of Religion and the German Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 103.

(1694–1768). Though hardly sympathetic to Reimarus's 'piecemeal attacks' on the Bible, Herder hoped that his letters would present a rational discussion of faith and an introductory account of biblical teaching for aspiring clergy.⁹⁴ He stressed broad tolerance in theological matters, positing no insurmountable conflict between reason and faith. Theology remained for him *philosophia sacra*.⁹⁵

Privileging individuality and local, temporal developments in culture over universalized claims, the *Briefe* counselled a somewhat special sort of hermeneutics when reading the biblical books: 'You see, my friend, how holy these books are to me, and how much I (according to Voltaire's ridicule) am a Jew, when I read them: for should we not be Greeks and Romans, when we read Greeks and Romans? Every book must be read in its own spirit, and so too the book of books, the Bible. . . . [W]e cannot do anything more perverse than to read God's texts with the spirit of Satan, that is, to embellish the oldest wisdom by invoking the most recent stupidities, [or to explain] heavenly simplicity by means of today's roguish witticisms.'⁹⁶ Similarly, Herder's work on the 'folk poetry' of the ancient Israelites, *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie* (1782–3; 2nd edn, 1787), blended 'enlightened hermeneutics' with the 'ultimate desire to give God, history, and nature, rather than natural law and present-day interpreters, the upper hand'.⁹⁷

Herder's account differed from other works of theological pedagogy in that it neither arose within a university context nor imitated post-Reformation prolegomena. Herder had nearly obtained a professorship at Göttingen in 1775, but

⁹⁴ Robert Clark, *Herder: His Life and Thought* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955), 276.

⁹⁵ Herder, *Briefe*, 384. On his theological development, see Martin Keßler, *Johann Gottfried Herder: Der Theologe unter den Klassikern: Das Amt des Generalsuperintendenten von Sachsen-Weimar*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

⁹⁶ Herder, *Briefe*, 143–4.

⁹⁷ Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 47.

local opposition blocked the application.⁹⁸ To redeploy in positive terms Friedrich Nietzsche's headstrong line on Herder, the *Briefe* stood like 'an unquiet guest' among the scholarly encyclopaedic works, but was responsible for creatively inspiring scores of theologians and historians in Germany throughout the nineteenth century.⁹⁹ In his later years, W. M. L. de Wette (1780–1849) credited Herder's early influence with saving him from the 'arid wastelands of theological criticism and rationalism'.¹⁰⁰ Others similarly identified with Herder as a religious poet and hailed the *Briefe*, while not quite a theological encyclopaedia in the proper sense, as the crowning work of the eighteenth century's 'benchmark theologian'.¹⁰¹ On the other side of the Atlantic, in the first volume of *The Dial*, the mouthpiece for the New England Transcendentalists, George Ripley (1802–80) heartily recommended Herder's *Briefe* to his American audience, even if that meant learning German to read it.¹⁰² As Wilhelm Dilthey first observed, it would be difficult to overstate Herder's influence on modern German historicism.¹⁰³ Though perhaps not approaching the same heights, a similar judgement might be made concerning his influence on theological study toward the end of the eighteenth century.

MAPPING NEW WORLDS

Another torrent of literature known as *historia literaria* prepared the soil from which the modern Protestant encyclopaedists sprouted. This genre addressed three main

⁹⁸ UAG, Kur. 4 II b.

⁹⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches* (1876–8), in Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. Giorgi Colli and Mazzinno Mantarini (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), ii. 603.

¹⁰⁰ Ernst Staehelin (ed.), *Dewettiana: Forschungen und Text zu Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Leben und Werk* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1956), 183–4.

¹⁰¹ See K. R. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Weidmann, 1845), viii–ix.

¹⁰² George Ripley, 'Letter to a Theological Student', *The Dial* 1/2 (1840), 187.

¹⁰³ Wilhelm Dilthey, 'Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert und die geschichtliche Welt' (1901), in Dilthey, *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii (Stuttgart: Tuebner, 1942), 206–68. Cf. Frederick C. Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 98–166.

topics: literary history or the history of all knowledge (from whence its name); the knowledge of books (*notitia librorum*); and the third, a miscellany of information on recommended reading lists, book reviewing, and the ballooning practice of giving general and special study advice for students. ‘*Historia literaria* is both the history of the human spirit and the description of the origins of human knowledge’, declared one scholar in 1777.¹⁰⁴

Yet *historia literaria* represented much more than mere ‘bibliography’. As Martin Gierl has commented, the literature marked ‘the starting point for an eclectic alchemy of knowledge’. Compilers, collectors, and producers strove to ‘find some good even in the bad’ of their predecessors, ‘in order to drive knowledge towards a standard of continual perfection’.¹⁰⁵ Representative works include Christophorus Mylaeus’s *De scribenda universitatis rerum historia libri quinque* (1551); Daniel Georg Morhof’s *Polyhistor* (1688–92); and the *Allgemeine Geschichte der Cultur und Litteratur des neuen Europa* (1796) from Göttingen’s early Orientalist and Protestant Enlightenment theologian, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn. Before Eichhorn, Johann Andreas Fabricius, who had studied theology in Leipzig and Helmstedt and had close ties to Francke, published a widely used ‘general history of scholarship in outline’.¹⁰⁶ Anonymous and pseudonymous collections likewise facilitated the

¹⁰⁴ Michael C. Carhart, ‘*Historia Literaria* and Cultural History from Mylaeus to Eichhorn’, in Peter N. Miller (ed.), *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 186. Cf. Michael Denis, *Einleitung in der Bücherkunde* (Vienna, 1777–8), ii. 1. See also Martin Gierl, ‘Bestandsaufnahme im gelehrten Bereich: Zur Entwicklung der “*Historia literaria*” im 18. Jahrhundert’, in Martin Gierl et al. (eds.), *Denkhorizonte und Handlungsspielräume: Historische Studien für Rudolf Vierhaus zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1992), 53–80; and Frank Grunert and Friedrich Vollhardt, *Historia literaria: Neuordnungen des Wissens im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Akademie, 2007).

¹⁰⁵ Martin Gierl, ‘Compilation and the Production of Knowledge in the Early German Enlightenment’, in Hans Erich Bödeker, Peter Hanns Reill, and Jürgen Schlumbohm (eds.), *Wissenschaft als kulturelle Praxis, 1750–1900* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 77.

¹⁰⁶ Johann Andreas Fabricius, *Abriß einer allgemeinen Historie der Gelehrsamkeit*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1752–4).

transmission of both learned ‘encyclopaedic’ tomes and scandalous, clandestine works of the early Enlightenment’s literary underground.¹⁰⁷

Though moving in different orbits, these volumes all put ‘encyclopaedism’ to new purposes, attempting ‘to explain the progress of the arts and sciences, of the human spirit, and of European society as a whole’.¹⁰⁸ Early contributions to what today would go by the names of cultural history and the history of the book, they united philological erudition with expansive knowledge of learned texts, sometimes drawing from medieval and Renaissance authorities like Hugh of St Victor for assistance in their schemes of classification.

Lectures on *historia literaria* became a regular feature of university life toward the end of the seventeenth century. University of Jena librarians and sometime historians and philosophers, Burkhard Gotthelf Struve and Gottlieb Stolle, lectured on the topic in the early 1700s.¹⁰⁹ Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundlung did the same in Halle beginning in 1703.¹¹⁰ A dispatch from the University of Königsberg in 1713 reported with satisfaction that for some time *historia literaria* had been in good health at numerous universities across the German lands.¹¹¹ Professors used the field as a means of surveying, investigating, and plotting paths through the thickly-wooded forest of early modern scholarship. Morhof spoke of a vast ocean demanding careful navigation.¹¹² Once more, the map metaphor pervaded the discussion. ‘Synchronic classification schemes and diachronic organization’ attempted to give to the growing

¹⁰⁷ Martin Muslow, ‘Practices of Unmasking: Polyhistor, Correspondence, and the Birth of Dictionaries of Pseudonymity in Seventeenth-Century Germany’, *JHI* 67/2 (2006), 219–50.

¹⁰⁸ Carhart, ‘Historia Literaria and Cultural History’, 186.

¹⁰⁹ Gottlieb Stolle, ‘Leben des Verfassers’, *Anleitung zur Historie der juristischen Gelahrheit* (Jena, 1745), 55. Cf. Burkhard Gotthelf Struve, *Introductio in notitiam rei litterariae et usum bibliothecarum* (3rd edn, Jena, 1710). For the topic’s later history in Jena, see Jonas Maatsch, ‘Jenaer Vorlesungen zur Enzyklopädie und Wissenschaftskunde’, in Thomas Bach, Jonas Maatsch, and Ulrich Rasche (eds.) ‘*Gelehrte*’ *Wissenschaft: Das Vorlesungsprogramm der Universität Jena um 1800* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 125–40.

¹¹⁰ Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling, ‘Vorrede’, *Collegium ad Historiam Litterariam* (Halle, 1715), in NStUBG, 8 HLU I, 1536.

¹¹¹ Emil Clemens Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten: Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zu selbstständigen Disziplinen* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1927), 203.

¹¹² Daniel Georg Morhof, *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus* (4th edn, Lübeck, 1747), i. 9.

heap of literature ‘a coordinate system—a topography’, in which ‘individual authors and their works are assigned a place on the map of the learned world.’¹¹³ These ‘maps’ facilitated library book purchases and furnished mountainous reading lists for scholars.¹¹⁴

Out of this field came theological bibliographies, typified above all by the Halle theologian J. A. Nösselt’s *Anweisung zur Kenntniß der besten allgemeineren Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie*, first issued in 1779.¹¹⁵ Nösselt discussed how to use books properly and how keeping up with book fairs, catalogues from publishers, and new periodicals could benefit theologians, pastors, and students.¹¹⁶ Enlightenment review journals, both Protestant and Catholic, burgeoned in the late eighteenth century, lending help as well as confusion to scholars and lay readers keeping track of new literature across the disciplines. Friedrich Nicolai’s *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, founded in 1765, became one of the most important sources for book reviews and literary criticism for an emerging reading public—and a prominent broadcaster of Enlightenment ideas.¹¹⁷ Placidius Sprenger (1735–1806), a Benedictine monk in Franconia, founded an important journal to function as a ‘general library’ of Catholic Germany in response to ‘Protestant Germany, [which] is almost suffocated by the number of its leading journals and newspapers’.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ Martin Gierl, *Pietismus und Aufklärung: Theologische Polemik und die Kommunikationsreform der Wissenschaft am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 516.

¹¹⁴ See Helmut Zedelmaier, *Bibliotheca universalis und bibliotheca selecta: Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1992).

¹¹⁵ Johann August Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Kenntniß der besten allgemeineren Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie* (Leipzig, 1779; 4th edn, 1800). Similar examples include Carl August Gottlieb Keil, *Systematische Verzeichniß derjenigen theologischen Schriften und Bücher, deren Kenntniß allgemein nötig und nützlich ist* (2nd edn, Stendal, 1792); and Johann Otto Thieß, *Handbuch der neuern, besonders deutschen und protestantischen Literatur der Theologie*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1795–7).

¹¹⁶ Cf. Andreas Urs Sommer, ‘Neologische Geschichtsphilosophie: Johann Friedrich Jerusalem’s *Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der Religion*’, *JHMTh/ZNThG* 9/2 (2002), 172; and Albert Ward, *Book Production, Fiction, and the German Reading Public, 1740–1800* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974).

¹¹⁷ See Pamela Eve Selwyn, *Everyday Life in the German Book Trade: Friedrich Nicolai as Bookseller and Publisher in the Age of Enlightenment, 1750–1810* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000); and Horst Möller, *Aufklärung in Preussen: Der Verleger, Publizist und Geschichtsschreiber Friedrich Nicolai* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1974).

¹¹⁸ ‘Vorrede’, *Litteratur des katholischen Deutschlands* 1 (1775). On Sprenger’s journal, see Michael Printy, *Enlightenment and the Creation of German Catholicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009),

Friedrich Novalis (1772–1801) gave a vivid, prescient account of the ascendant literary economy in his *Dialogen* (1798). Noting an onslaught of specialized books on novel topics flooding the marketplace, he observed: ‘If things go on like this, in the end we will no longer be able to study a science in its entirety—the range of literature grows so monstrously.’ Of ‘the older philologists’ manner of filling works with quotations and commentaries—what was it but the child of poverty? Born of lack of books and abundance of literary spirit’, he said.¹¹⁹ New fields of learning and publishing ‘are like an unmeasured ocean on which one would not dare venture in a skiff’, reported another. ‘[T]hey are like an abyss into which one cannot look without amazement and terror.’¹²⁰ Frequently, bibliographical guides even referenced the Book of Ecclesiastes 12:12: ‘Of the making of books there is no end’.

In order to make sense of this rapidly shifting landscape, theological bibliographies like Nösselt’s prescribed titles according to the kinds of theological task in view: books on textual criticism of the Old and New Testaments, recommendations on commentaries, judgments on dogmatic theology in general and on specific dogmas, guides to catechesis and devotion, studies in church history, and manuals on preaching and liturgy. They served as companions to the prominent textbooks of theological encyclopaedia, or found their way into the corresponding sections of the textbooks themselves.

152–60. On German periodicals in general during this period, see Joachim Kirchner, *Das deutsche Zeitschriftenwesen: Seine Geschichte und seine Probleme*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962); and Sibylle Obenaus, ‘Die deutschen allgemeinen kritischen Zeitschriften in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts’, *Archiv für Buchwesens* 14 (1973), 1–122. Cf. Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, ‘Das Kommunikationsproblem theologischer Zeitschrift seit dem 17. Jahrhundert und die kirchlicher Presse in der heutigen “Öffentlichkeit”’, *ZRG* 35 (1983), 193–220.

¹¹⁹ Novalis, *Schriften: Die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs*, ed. Paul Kluckhorn and Richard Samuel (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960–1999), ii. 663.

¹²⁰ Molter, ‘Vorrede’, n.p.

CONCLUSION

The early theological encyclopaedists did not explicitly rehearse Goethe's interjection on the lack of patience in the quest 'to explore fathomless depths of knowledge'. They did, nevertheless, attempt to answer it in their own ways, whether prompted by institutional or ministerial reform (as the next chapter shows), or by reaching back into the past in order to understand the present. If 'one desires to master a particular discipline in its fullest extent, one must make it one's aim to sift and to supplement (*die Reinigung und Ergänzung*) what others have contributed to it', Friedrich Schleiermacher later declared. 'Without such an effort, no matter how complete one's information may be, one would be a mere carrier of tradition', which represented 'the lowest rank of all activities open to a person, and the least significant'.¹²¹ A complex 'sifting' and 'supplementing' of various traditions is precisely what comes to the fore when uncovering the deep roots of theological encyclopaedia in the early modern age.

¹²¹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (2nd edn, 1830), in *KGA* i/6. §19, 333.

Chapter 3

Institutions and Reforms

Theologians must make it their duty to acquire a proper, thorough learning that is fitting for these present times.

Johann Salomo Semler, 1757

In 1784, Immanuel Kant famously defined ‘Enlightenment’ as emerging from one’s ‘self-incurred immaturity’ by throwing off external guidance and having the courage to think for oneself.¹ At the same time, a growing number of German scholars and literati, often outside of university contexts, became deeply involved in mocking those whom they thought had failed to exercise individual judgement, clinging instead to old and deficient intellectual paradigms. Among the targets, university professors featured prominently.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, a vociferous wave of criticism broke against Germany’s traditional universities and schools and the scholars (*Gelehrte*) who inhabited them. In his widely read six-volume satirical novel *Carl von Carlsberg oder über das menschliche Elend*, Christian Gotthilf Salzmann criticized the ‘medieval’ character of the universities—recalling an age when theology still reigned as ‘queen of the sciences’—for spreading pedantic dogmatism and squabbling over arcane minutiae. Salzmann had studied theology in Jena in the 1760s and for a time

¹ Immanuel Kant, ‘Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?’, in Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1902–97), viii. 35; Eng. trans. in Kant, ‘An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?’, in James Schmidt (ed.), *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 58–64. Cf. Steven Lestition, ‘Kant and the End of the Enlightenment in Prussia’, *JMH* 65/1 (1993), 57–112.

followed in his father's footsteps as a Lutheran pastor before fixing his attention on pedagogical reform. 'In our day', Salzmann said, 'the universities make as miserable a figure as a fortress that was created at the time of the Crusades, in a war in which one uses bombs and cannons'.² Universities had become 'dens of baseness and depravity' for students and professors alike.³ 'Whoever has not the talent to study, who is not able to earn his own understanding through contemplation, lets his teacher think for him, takes up his system as gospel, and learns it by heart. This system is his erudition (*Gelehrsamkeit*); he drags it around like a shoemaker dragging his last. Onto it he must fit all knowledge and judgements of other men, and what does not fit he rejects and mocks as error.'⁴ Though professors at forward-looking Halle and Göttingen gave lectures in the vernacular, the persistence of dead languages in other institutions affronted him. 'Is it not offensive to heaven that for so many centuries scholars had their own language? That they all write in Latin?'⁵ But curiously enough, in addition to languages and institutions, he also lampooned the popular Enlightenment genre of encyclopaedia. Gisbert, a main character, received the sardonic advice that he needed only one resource to instruct a young count: 'He gave to me an encyclopaedia and said, "You see, my dear Gisbert, here is the embodiment of all the sciences"' (*Inbegriff aller Wissenschaften*).⁶

This chapter explores the early relations of the encyclopaedic genre to the German university system. The idea of a scientific encyclopaedia—a creative combination of the Aristotelian tradition of philosophy as paradigmatic knowledge with new designs for systematizing and ordering that knowledge—became a concrete, fundamental feature of the modern university in the eighteenth century. In

² Christian Gotthilf Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg oder über das menschliche Elend* (Karlsruhe, 1783–7), i. 341.

³ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, i. 155–6.

⁴ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, i. 339.

⁵ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, iii. 78.

⁶ Salzmann, *Carl von Carlsberg*, iv. 357.

particular, the University of Göttingen pioneered in each faculty instruction in the ‘encyclopaedia and methodology’ of the academic disciplines. These new lecture courses treated the systematic unity and coherence of each subject in isolation and in connection to other fields. In fact, they sought to reflect the very nature of the university itself. When looking closely at the vocabulary used to define the educational institutions even from their earliest inception, the term *universitas*, even more than *studium generale*, rises to the top. An abstract word in classical Latin for ‘the totality’ or ‘the whole’, *universitas* became for medieval jurists the general term for describing communities and corporations (guilds, trades) of all stripes. When referring to teaching institutions, one would speak, for example, of ‘the university of masters and students’ (*universitas magistrorum et scholarium*).⁷ Universities, said Christoph Meiners in 1802, have formed ‘a manifestation of the powerful progress of the spirit’, in harmony with enlightened ideas about ‘the unceasing advance of human striving for knowledge’.⁸ University lectures on ‘encyclopaedia’ stitched together these features.

Theological encyclopaedia, accordingly, became not only an integral component of the theological curriculum in German universities, but the foundational, load-bearing one, resulting in the institutionalization of the different sources—humanist ideas on method, Protestant prolegomena, Enlightenment strategies of presentation, bibliographical tools—previously described. Academic guidebooks in all fields, and particularly in theology, morphed into encyclopaedic systems.

It is crucial to see the institutionalization of theological encyclopaedia in the context of late eighteenth-century pedagogical reform, especially in light of the

⁷ On the terminological history, see Jacques Verger, ‘Patterns’, in *HUE* i. 35–73.

⁸ Christoph Meiners, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen unseres Erdtheils* (Göttingen: Röwer, 1802–5), i. 7; Walter Rüegg, ‘Themes’, in *HUE* i. 9.

dynamics of German pietism and the efforts of various educational reformers at the universities of Göttingen and Halle. Past histories have tended to focus on settings other than this institutional context in the early history of the field.⁹ One of the primary concerns of this chapter, therefore, is to demonstrate how the rise of theological encyclopaedia as a system and a method must be understood at least in part as an institutionally generated and preserved extension of the European humanistic tradition, bound together with pedagogical reform. Here I investigate the complex web of university criticism, competing traditional and progressive scholarly ideals, and curricular changes in German faculties of theology in the second half of the eighteenth century. I do not intend to offer an extensive history of theological education at the Enlightenment reform institutions—Halle (founded in 1694), Göttingen (1737), and to a lesser extent, Erlangen (1734).¹⁰ Rather, I take a close look at key points of intersection between institutional factors and theological and philosophical ideas.

CRITICISM AND ERUDITION

In addition to being an age of the encyclopaedia, the eighteenth century may also lay claim to the title of ‘the pedagogical century’.¹¹ As Notker Hammerstein and Friedrich Paulsen observed, Renaissance humanism and Reformation theology

⁹ Leonhard Hell, *Entstehung und Entfaltung der theologischen Enzyklopädie* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), 167–86.

¹⁰ For detailed analyses of these institutions, see Wilhelm Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle*, 2 vols (Berlin: Dümmler, 1894), Götz von Selle, *Die Georg-August Universität zu Göttingen, 1737–1937* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937); and J. G. V. Engelhardt, *Die Universität Erlangen von 1743 bis 1843* (Erlangen: Universitätsbuchdruckerei, 1843). See also Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany 1700–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 27–98; and Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten: Vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart* (3rd edn, Leipzig: Veit, 1919–21), i. 511 ff., ii. 11 ff. On Göttingen’s faculties, see Luigi Marino, *Praeceptores Germaniae: Göttingen 1770–1820*, trans. Brigitte Szabó-Bechstein (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

¹¹ Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 131.

helped steer pedagogical reform in early modern Europe.¹² German pietism and especially the Enlightenment, moreover, found characteristic expression in a mass fervour for reform. Philipp Jakob Spener, Erhard Wiegel (1625–99), and Samuel Pufendorf (1632–94) were three of the most prominent sponsors of educational reform in Lutheran Germany after the Thirty Years' War. Their proposals influenced the directions taken by the universities of Leipzig and Jena, where many of Halle's first professors began their academic careers, including Francke and Christian Thomasius (1655–1728).¹³ Two of Francke's schools, the *Pädagogium* (founded in 1695), and the *Seminarium selectum praeceptorum* (1696), functioned as hubs of reform. The *Pädagogium* was an elite secondary school that prepared the sons of nobles and wealthy citizens (*Bürger*) for bureaucratic posts or university study. Candidates in the *Seminarium*, often poor theology students, received methodological training and moral instruction in order to teach in one of Francke's other schools or those like them cropping up with increasing frequency. Second-generation pietists like J. J. Hecker (1707–68) looked to Francke's schools in Halle when seeking to enact similar reforms in Berlin and elsewhere.¹⁴ Halle pietism and Friedrich Wilhelm I enjoyed a powerful 'collaboration' of sorts in the restructuring of the Prussian kingdom.¹⁵ Douglas Shantz has gone so far as saying that one finds in Lutheranism after the Thirty Years' War, 'for the first time, a concern for world improvement, social reform, and a sense of being God's chosen instrument to change the world through German churches and schools'.¹⁶

¹² Notker Hammerstein, *Bildung und Wissenschaft vom 15. bis 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003), 1–54; and Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, i. 276–326. Cf. R. J. W. Evans, 'German Universities after the Thirty Years' War', *HU* 1 (1981), 169–90.

¹³ See John Robert Holloran, 'Professors of Enlightenment at the University of Halle, 1690–1730', Ph.D. diss. (University of Virginia, 2000), 30–89.

¹⁴ James Van Horn Melton, *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 50–7.

¹⁵ Richard L. Gawthrop, *Pietism and the Making of Eighteenth-Century Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 11.

¹⁶ Douglas H. Shantz, *An Introduction to German Pietism: Protestant Renewal at the Dawn of Modern Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 46. Cf. Hartmut Lehmann, 'Lutheranism in the

Yet pietism did not represent the only path of renewal. By the third-quarter of the eighteenth century, several other educational theorists had emerged, such as Heinrich Pestalozzi and J. B. Basedow, all inspired in one way or another by Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Émile* (1762). Pestalozzi (1746–1827), for instance, set out to 'psychologize instruction', whereby teachers adapt to the uniqueness of each individual, helping students cultivate their own intellectual and creative gifts. Like his fellow educational pioneers, Pestalozzi's methods stressed individual character development (*Bildung*) rather than strictly the conveying of a body of knowledge; the free improvement of intellect and personality and moral cultivation of autonomous agency—learning from 'natural objects' and from 'play'—rather than overt instructional guidance. Such views harmonized with the emerging interests of neohumanism and the educated middle classes (*Bildungsbürgertum*).¹⁷

Though these movements principally targeted secondary schools—*Lateinschulen* or *Gymnasien*—they also confronted universities and the *Gelehrtenstand*, Germany's traditional 'learned estate'. At Halle, August Hermann Niemeyer (1754–1828) attempted to bridge the higher and lower educational levels. In 1796, he published the first edition of his popular *Grundsätze der Erziehung und des Unterrichts*, described by commentators as 'the first comprehensive, praxis-oriented, encyclopaedic handbook of pedagogy'.¹⁸ Niemeyer's work prompted no less an iconic educational theorist as a young Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841) to

Seventeenth Century', in R. Po-chia Hsia (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 71; and Carl Hinrichs, *Preußentum und Pietismus: Der Pietismus in Brandenburg-Preußen als religiös-soziale Reformbewegung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 8.

¹⁷ Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Wie Gertrude ihre Kinder lehrt* (1801), in Pestalozzi, *Sämtliche Werke*, xiii, ed. Herbert Schönebaum and Kurt Schreinert (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1932). On his reception, see Fritz-Peter Hager and Daniel Tröhler (eds.), *Studien zur Pestalozzi-Rezeption im Deutschland des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Bern: Haupt, 1995); and Renate Hinz, *Pestalozzi und Preussen: Zur Rezeption der Pestalozzischen Pädagogik in der preussischen Reformzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag & Herchen, 1991). See also Kate Silber, *Pestalozzi: The Man and His Work* (4th edn, London: Kegan Paul, 1976).

¹⁸ Ulrich Hermann, 'Der Begründer der modernen Universitätspädagogik: August Hermann Niemeyer (1754–1828): "denkender Christ"—"unpartheyischer Pädagoge"—"Retter und Wiederbegründer der Franckeschen Anstalten"—"hallescher Patriot"', *Neue Sammlung* 44 (2004), 363. Cf. August Hermann Niemeyer, *Grundsätze der Erziehung und des Unterrichts* (Halle, 1796).

remark—with traces of Luther’s spirit—that Niemeyer was ‘like a mighty fortress’, representing ‘the sum of today’s educational science’.¹⁹ One writer has called Niemeyer ‘the founder of modern university pedagogy’.²⁰ Discontent with pedantry (*Schulmeisterei*) and ‘mindless routine’ (*Schlendrian*) underwrote these pursuits.

As R. Steven Turner has pointed out, the learned ideal under attack in the works of Salzmann and others was *Gelehrsamkeit*. In the late seventeenth and well into the eighteenth century, a university professor, generally, was a scholar (*ein Gelehrter*) with an extensive and wide-ranging acquaintance with the literature of a given subject. Under the influence of this ideal, professors displayed an accomplished ‘baroque love of detail’,²¹ aspiring to circumnavigate every contour line on the topographical map of human (and sometimes even divine) knowledge. The scholar (*der Gelehrte*) was or desired to be a *Polyhistor*, that erudite intellectual of the Holy Roman Empire who, from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century, in Anthony Grafton’s description, ‘had to know the structure and relation of all disciplines, the titles and contents of all books, the character traits and oddities of all significant earlier scholars’. No domain would be left unconquered. Morhof’s pre-eminent *Polyhistor* (1688–92) summed up the quixotic mission when it celebrated an obscure, mythical scholar who, Grafton wrote, ‘knew all the arts and sciences, played—and built—all the musical instruments, and embroidered more deftly than any woman’.²² Eighteenth-century *Gelehrte* followed in this tradition.²³

¹⁹ J. F. Herbart, *Pädagogische Schriften*, ed. Otto Willmann and Theodor Fritzsche (Osterwieck: Zickfeldt, 1913), i. 118.

²⁰ Hermann, ‘Der Begründer der modernen Universitätspädagogik’, 359–82.

²¹ R. Steven Turner, ‘Historicism, *Kritik*, and the Prussian Professoriate, 1790 to 1840’, in Mayotte Bollack and Heinz Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 453.

²² Anthony Grafton, ‘The World of the Polyhistor: Humanism and Encyclopedism’, *CEH* 18/1 (1985), 37, 41. Cf. Daniel Georg Morhof, *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus* (4th edn, Lübeck, 1747), i. 2.

²³ For examples of their scholarly endeavours, see Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Leroy E. Loemker, *Struggle for Synthesis: The Seventeenth Century Background of Leibniz’s Synthesis of Order and Freedom* (Cambridge,

Salzmann was not alone in the second half of the eighteenth century when he criticized the viewpoint that mastering an encyclopaedia meant one had mastered all knowledge. One member of the intelligentsia satirized the fussy fastidiousness of his contemporaries by drawing up a mock-dissertation entirely in footnotes.²⁴ Lessing frequently derided the ideal of *Gelehrsamkeit*, which, Turner notes, ‘had come increasingly to connote pedantry, pretension, and encyclopaedic cram to an Enlightenment public’.²⁵ Lessing’s play, *Der junge Gelehrter* (1754), pilloried traditional scholarly existence as divorced from aesthetic judgment and common sense.²⁶ Goethe, though active in the reforms at the University of Jena, famously began part one of *Faust* (1806) with a monologue indicting traditional university practices:

I have studied philosophy,
the law as well as medicine—
and alas, theology too;
studied them well with ardent zeal,
yet here I am a wretched fool,
no wiser than I was before.
They call me Master, even Doctor,
and for some years now
I’ve led my students by the nose,
up and down, across, and in circles.²⁷

Gelehrsamkeit came in for reassessment, as did the sterility of the old curriculum—dubbed ‘old obscurantism’—and, generally, the purpose and nature of universities

Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 28–52; and Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

²⁴ G. W. Rabenar, ‘Hinkmar von Repkows Noten ohne Text’, *Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes* 2 (1754), 263–306. Cf. Wolfgang Martens, ‘Von Thomasius bis Lichtenberg: Zur Gelehrten satire der Aufklärung’, *Lessing Yearbook* 10 (1978), 7–34; and Alexander Košenina, *Der gelehrte Narr: Gelehrten satire seit der Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004), 297–405.

²⁵ Turner, ‘Historicism, Kritik, and the Prussian Professoriate’, 455.

²⁶ Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Der junge Gelehrter*, in Lessing, *Werke und Briefe zwölf Bänden*, i, ed. Wilfried Barner (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1989), 139–237.

²⁷ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust: Part One*, trans. David Luke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 15 (trans. modified).

themselves as fixtures of higher education. According to a common late eighteenth-century expression, universities remained ‘ossified in a guildlike mentality’.²⁸

Still, Lessing’s parodies offer evidence not of the obsolescence but of the relevance of encyclopaedic learning. German Romantics, too, harboured encyclopaedic ambitions. Two cases come from Novalis, who compiled the fragmentary *Allgemeine Brouillon: Materialien zur Enzyklopädistik* near the end of his life, and Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829), who planned an eccentric encyclopaedia that he termed his ‘Bible project’. In opposition to *Gelehrsamkeit*, Novalis stated that ‘the scientific scholar (*der Wissenschaftler*) deals only with knowledge as a whole—he has to do only with the sciences as such’. The ‘doctrine of the science of knowing’ (*Wissenschaftslehre*), he said, alluding to Fichte’s complex work of the same name from 1794, calls for a ‘true, autonomous, [and] independent encyclopaedia’.²⁹ Schlegel wrote that ‘poetry must and will now be reformed and centred through encyclopaedia and through religion. . . . The encyclopaedia becomes harmonious development in poetry’.³⁰ Others like Friedrich Schiller testified that such ventures, if they relied on the old view of *Gelehrsamkeit*, would supply ‘nothing more than the imprint of one’s occupation or specialized knowledge’.³¹ Scholars within and without the universities began to rethink *Gelehrsamkeit* as an academic ideology.

Critics, even from the inside, frequently pointed toward the theological faculties for perpetuating the lives of such out-dated and antiquated (*altmodisch*) ideas—a regressive ‘guild theology’ (*Zukunfttheologie*).³² Many sympathized with the French *philosophe* Baron d’Holbach, who sneered in 1772, the ‘science of theology . . .

²⁸ Daniel Fallon, *The German University: A Heroic Ideal in Conflict with the Modern World* (Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press, 1980), 6.

²⁹ Novalis, *Schriften: Die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs*, ed. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960–1999), iii. 249. Cf. Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *The Science of Knowing*, ed. and trans. Peter Heath and John Lachs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

³⁰ Friedrich Schlegel, *Literary Notebooks 1797–1801*, ed. Hans Eichner (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), 185.

³¹ Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, ed. and trans. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 35 (trans. modified).

³² Karl Schwarz, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing als Theologe* (Halle: Pfeffer, 1854), 63.

is a continual insult to human reason'.³³ In 1785, one of Germany's notorious rationalist theologians, Carl Friedrich Bahrdt (1741–92), published a plan in Berlin for reforming the theological faculties, *Ueber das theologische Studium auf Universitäten*.³⁴ Bahrdt dedicated the book to Karl Abraham Freiherr von Zedlitz, then Prussian Minister of Education and supporter of Bahrdt's throughout a tumultuous series of teaching posts marred by one theological or moral controversy after another at Leipzig, Erfurt, Erlangen, Giessen, and Halle.³⁵ Bahrdt proposed a radical three-year curriculum that cast aside the traditional study of Hebrew and Aramaic, Old Testament exegesis, dogmatics, and the entirety of church history, arguing that these subjects offered no practical benefit but only 'learned nonsense' (*gelehrter Kram*).³⁶ He spoke from the position of a former 'insider', as a pastor, a lecturer (*Privatdozent*) and then professor, but who now stood on the outside as a drifting *Privatdozent* with virtually no possibility of obtaining a regular academic appointment. The current system, he said, forced students to enrol in the standard 'bread-courses' (*Brotstudium*). In order for students to sit consistorial examinations, they needed to procure testimonials of attendance from their professors in these standard courses. It is not difficult observe Bahrdt's own interests behind his recommendation to eliminate the testimonial system and radically alter the examinations.³⁷ The goal, Anthony La Vopa relayed, was 'at last to break the hold of the "old gentlemen"—i.e., the tenured professors—who pocketed the fees that the monopoly guaranteed'.³⁸ In Bahrdt's proposal, 'many a *Privatdozent* (who now

³³ D'Holbach, *Le Bon Sens, ou Idées naturelles opposées aux idées surnaturelles* (London, 1772); new edn, ed. J. Deprun (Paris: Éditions Rationalistes, 1971), 9.

³⁴ Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Ueber das theologische Studium auf Universitäten* (Berlin, 1785). On Bahrdt, see Sten Flygt, *The Notorious Dr. Bahrdt* (Nashville: Vanderbilt, 1963).

³⁵ For Bahrdt's account of his 'troubles', see Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Geschichte seines Lebens, seiner Meinungen und Schicksale, von ihm selbst geschrieben* (Frankfurt am Main, 1790).

³⁶ Bahrdt, *Studium*, 34.

³⁷ Cf. John Stroup, *The Struggle for Identity in the Clerical Estate: Northwest German Protestant Opposition to Absolutist Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 99–105.

³⁸ Anthony La Vopa, *Grace, Talent, and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 343.

receives no requests at all for testimonials) would receive all the applause and many an old gentleman would remain a professor without an audience for his entire life'.³⁹

Joachim Heinrich Campe (1746–1818), educational advisor to the Duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, echoed Bahrtdt's complaints in a number of essays in the Hamburg journal devoted to pedagogical reform, *Allgemeine Revision der gesamten Schul- und Erziehungswesen* (1785–92). Campe had begun his career as a tutor to the brothers Wilhelm and Alexander von Humboldt, and worked with Basedow at his famous Philanthropinum school in Dessau, where, as with other reform schools, it was a point of pride for instructors to carry out their lessons in the common language of German and not in 'regressive' Latin or Greek.⁴⁰ 'Perhaps many think that the universities have educated great men, so that living and teaching at a university is the condition of becoming great', Campe stated. 'But how many great men lived outside universities! One thinks of Leibniz, Reimarus, Voltaire, Lessing, Moses Mendelssohn . . . sincere men who had and still have decisive influence on the culture of learning (*Wissenschaft*) and art and on the improvement of humanity. It is therefore not easy to see how the universities are to form such great teachers and models for humanity. Aids to the development of the mind (*Hilfsmittel zur Bildung des Geistes*) exist abundantly outside the universities; and contact with [university] scholars might well contribute little to this development.'⁴¹ Campe's hold on the *Allgemeine Revision der gesamten Schul- und Erziehungswesen*, a widely read periodical, granted him a conspicuous platform to circulate his and Bahrtdt's root-and-branch revisionist ideas for education and university theology. By 1802, the physician and

³⁹ Bahrtdt, *Studium*, 118–20.

⁴⁰ W. H. Bruford, *The German Tradition of Self-Cultivation: 'Bildung' from Humboldt to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 3.

⁴¹ J. H. Campe, 'Von den Universitäten', *Allgemeine Revision der gesamten Schul- und Erziehungswesen* 16 (1792), 218–19.

political philosopher J. B. Erhard disparaged theological faculties as entirely at odds with modern reason, arguing for their expulsion from the university.⁴²

The critiques of Bahrdt and Campe drew forth various defences of a more traditional theological curriculum. In 1790, the Göttingen theologian Gottfried Less (1736–97), educated at Halle and head of Göttingen’s theological faculty since 1784, aired widespread sentiments when he laid blame at the feet of beginning university students for the contempt with which Germany’s cultural luminaries held academic theology: ‘From the schools . . . there comes every semester a group of sluggish, ignorant students, . . . unfortunately most of them are flung straight into theology. Youths from the lowest estate, without capability and without education, devoid of culture, poor and inexperienced in thinking and in morals; they want to become—teachers of Christianity’.⁴³ He continued: ‘The ignorant and the half-baked, the puffed-up and the ranting, the base-thinking and the base-acting become ever more numerous among the preachers and the theologians!’⁴⁴ In response, Less suggested an even more rigorous curriculum that emphasized the ancient languages, rather than increased attention to the practical activities required of clergy.⁴⁵ G. J. Planck, another of Göttingen’s leading theologians, likewise struck against the ‘anti-scholastic’ rhetoric of academic theology’s critics under his own kind of anti-utilitarian banner. Planck’s own theological encyclopaedia strongly defended the necessity of historically-oriented ‘pedantic’ fields like classical philology even for clergymen concerned with the religious instruction of the uneducated.⁴⁶ The connection to philology, pedagogy, and the humanist tradition is noteworthy. J. A.

⁴² Johann Benjamin Erhard, *Ueber die Einrichtung und den Zweck der höhern Lehranstalten* (Berlin: Braun, 1802).

⁴³ Gottfried Less, *Ueber christliches Lehr-Amt dessen würdige Führung, und die schikliche Vorbereitung dazu, nebst einem Anhang von der Privat-Beichte* (Göttingen, 1790), vi–vii. On Less, see Stroup, *Struggle for Identity in the Clerical Estate*, 142–7.

⁴⁴ Less, *Lehr-Amt*, x–xi.

⁴⁵ Less, *Lehr-Amt*, 63–96.

⁴⁶ G. J. Planck, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1794–5), i. 53–6, 166. Cf. Bernd Moeller (ed.), *Theologie in Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987); and Johann Meyer, ‘Geschichte der Göttinger theologischen Fakultät’, *ZGNK* 42 (1937), 7–107.

Nösselt, who authored a popular theological encyclopaedia at Halle (considered with Planck's in Chapter 4), had seriously contemplated a career in classics, like many others.⁴⁷ Authors of theological encyclopaedic texts, including J. L. von Mosheim (1693–1755), L. F. Leutwein (1748–1821), Nösselt, and Niemeyer, moreover, featured prominently in important tomes dedicated to educational theories and theorists in the humanities, such as one standard reference work from 1790 that overviewed nearly 400 of the most demanding and impressive recent writers.⁴⁸ Major literary and theological periodicals, including Nicolai's *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, regularly surveyed their works.⁴⁹ Though the ideal of *Gelehrsamkeit* persisted to a degree in the outlooks of Less and Planck, it nevertheless began to mix with neohumanist language and pedagogical change. New practices and ideas at the forward-looking universities of Halle and Göttingen increased the scholarly potency of that mix.

PROGRESS IN HALLE AND GÖTTINGEN

The creation of the modern research university 'harnessed a fledgling social system for the formal creation of knowledge to the much more robust social systems for professional credentialing, elite education, and upward educational mobility, all within a single institution, the old university'.⁵⁰ Though it is a stretch to call Halle the first 'modern' university, its founding in 1694 marked a clear turning point in the

⁴⁷ La Vopa, *Grace, Talent, and Merit*, 344. Cf. Anthony Grafton, 'Polyhistor into Philolog: Notes on the Transformation of German Classical Scholarship, 1780–1850', *HU* 3 (1983), 159–92.

⁴⁸ Samuel Baur, *Charakteristik der Erziehungsschriftsteller Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1790), 236–38, 327–34. Cf. Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung, die Gottesgelahrtheit vernünftig zu erlernen, in academischen Vorlesungen vorgetragen*, ed. Christian Ernst von Windheim (Helmstedt, 1756; 2nd edn, 1763); and Lorenz Friedrich Leutwein, *Theologische Encyclopädie und Methodik* (Stuttgart, 1799).

⁴⁹ *Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* 54 (1800), 131–2. From 1793 the journal had appeared under the title *Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*.

⁵⁰ R. Steven Turner, 'Ideas, Institutions, and Wissenschaft: Accounting for the Research University', *MIH* 4/2 (2007), 367. Cf. Rudolf Stichweh, *Zur Entstehung des modernen Systems wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen: Physik in Deutschland, 1740–1890* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984), 7–93.

history of universities.⁵¹ As Prussia's outstanding university in the eighteenth century, Halle counted such brilliant professors and leading lights as Francke, Thomasius, Christian Wolff (1679–1754), N. H. Gundling (1671–1729), S. J. Baumgarten (1706–57), J. S. Semler (1725–91), Nösselt, and Niemeyer. The German Enlightenment, Peter Hanns Reill once suggested, can be defined in part as the attempt 'to resolve the contradictions [among] pietism, orthodoxy, and rationalism through the use of history supported by critical reflection and philosophical inquiry'.⁵² Halle's professors support that view.

Dubbed 'the jewel in the crown of German scholarship' by Voltaire, Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten had studied at Halle and began teaching theology there in 1730.⁵³ Intent on mediating between orthodox Lutheranism and pietism, on one hand, and the philosophical rationalism of Wolff, on the other hand, he earned the esteem of Hans Frei as the 'harbinger of a new day' in German academic theology.⁵⁴ Semler accepted an appointment to Halle in 1752, and after Baumgarten's death in 1757, became head of the theological faculty. An able church historian, Semler also penned his own guide for beginning theology students, *Versuch einer nähern Anleitung zu nützlichen Fleisse in der ganze Gottesgelehrsamkeit für angehende Studiosos Theologiae* (1757).

The *Anleitung* held the fundamental premise that the pursuit of theology as a discipline, centred on historical study, was 'separate from and independent of the dictates of personal piety'. Recollecting the circumstances that had led him to

⁵¹ On Halle's founding and early years, see Holloran, 'Professors of Enlightenment at the University of Halle'.

⁵² Peter Hanns Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975), 6.

⁵³ Johann Salomo Semler, *D. Johann Salomo Semlers Lebenbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst* (Halle, 1781–2), i. 108.

⁵⁴ Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 89–90. Cf. David Sorkin, 'Reclaiming Theology for the Enlightenment: The Case of Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten (1706–1757)', *CEH* 36/4 (2003), 503–30; and Martin Schloemann, *Sigmund Jacob Baumgarten: System und Geschichte der Theologie des Übergangs zum Neuprotestantismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

compose the text, Semler mused, impeaching the earlier works of both Gerhard and Francke: 'Learning (*Gelehrsamkeit*) in general [in those days] was regarded as a necessary evil, over which private practice and experience of godliness . . . always was to be preferred.'⁵⁵ As he described his own programme of theological study elsewhere, theological students and professors had to keep pace with the intellectual trends of the day. Thus, aspiring theologians must make it their duty to gain 'a thorough learning fitting for the present times'.⁵⁶

Semler emphasized historical sensitivity and the mastery of ancient languages in an academically rigorous manner above training in piety, which had emanated from his predecessors like Francke. His turn toward historical criticism came about as a means of both reforming the Lutheran confessional tradition and defending a version of biblical revelation against the attacks of freethinkers, deists, and 'enthusiastists' (*Schwärmerei*).⁵⁷ Though Semler's text did not, in a strict sense, resemble the later works of theological encyclopaedia proper, it nevertheless occupied an important transitional role like Herder's *Briefe*. For these reasons, Hagenbach said of him: at the beginning of 'the scientific era' (*der Wissenschaft Epoche*), Semler 'introduced a new element, the critical, and thereby changed [theological] encyclopaedia, which would otherwise easily have become a dead aggregate of bibliographical knowledge'.⁵⁸ Hagenbach's assessment matched the

⁵⁵ Semler, *Lebensbeschreibung*, ii. 380. Cf. Johann Salomo Semler, *Versuch einer nähern Anleitung zu nützlichen Fleisse in der ganze Gottesgelehrsamkeit für angehende Studiosos Theologiae* (Halle, 1757), 8–9. See also Leopold Zscharnack, *Lessing und Semler: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1905), 21.

⁵⁶ Johann Salomo Semler, 'Vorrede', in Johann von Ferreras, *Allgemeine Historie von Spanien*, viii, ed. Johann Salomo Semler (Halle, 1757), iv.

⁵⁷ See Erich Wilhelm Carlson, 'Johann Salomo Semler, The German Enlightenment, and Protestant Theology's Historical Turn', Ph.D. diss. (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2006). Cf. Dietrich Ritschl, 'Johann Salomo Semler: The Rise of the Historical-Critical Method in Eighteenth-Century Theology on the Continent', in Robert Mollenauer (ed.), *Introduction to Modernity: A Symposium on Eighteenth-Century Thought* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), 107–33; and Gottfried Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler: Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996).

⁵⁸ K. R. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (9th edn, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1874), 104.

opinions of a host of other liberal-leaning nineteenth- and twentieth-century theologians. W. M. L. de Wette saw Semler as ‘the instigator of a revolutionary movement in theology and the church which is still being carried forward’.⁵⁹ Another said that Semler should be granted ‘the glory for having been the reformer of Protestant theology’.⁶⁰ Ernst Troeltsch and Emanuel Hirsch wrote of him as ‘the father and pioneer of a Protestantism of critical ideas’, the pivotal figure in the Enlightenment shift from ‘Old Protestantism’ to ‘New Protestantism’.⁶¹

Before Baumgarten and Semler came Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling. The son of a pastor, Gundling studied theology sporadically at Jena, Leipzig, and Altdorf before serving as a preacher in Nuremberg. From there he moved to Halle in order to work as a schoolmaster before entering the local university, intent on a legal career. In 1703, Gundling completed his studies at Halle, and in 1705, received an appointment to the philosophy faculty. In 1707, he was promoted to a professorship in eloquence and antiquity, and in 1709, he began to focus on natural law. He achieved wide recognition for his popular lectures and contributions to natural law theory. In fact, Gundling’s lectures inspired the founding curator of the University of Göttingen, G. C. von Münchhausen, while the latter was a student at Halle.⁶²

Though an established legal scholar, Gundling’s reflections branched out to theology and the nature of the academic vocation. He advocated on more than one occasion for freedom of enquiry in the university. His address, as Halle’s rector, to the royal founder and patron of the university, the Elector of Brandenburg and Prussian King Friedrich I, on the occasion of Friedrich’s birthday, ably displayed his

⁵⁹ W. M. L. de Wette, *Über Religion und Theologie: Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815), 119.

⁶⁰ Wilhelm Dilthey, *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung: Lessing, Goethe, Novalis, Hölderlin* (16th edn, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 76.

⁶¹ Ernst Troeltsch, *Protestantism and Progress: The Significance of Protestantism for the Rise of the Modern World*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Williams & Norgate, 1912), 201; Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens* (5th edn, Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975), iv, 49.

⁶² Notker Hammerstein, *Jus und Historie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 205–65.

concern. Gundling's speech from 12 July 1711 bore the title, 'De libertate Fridericianae: die Friedrichsuniversität das atrium libertatis. Was ist die Aufgabe der Universität?'⁶³ It extolled the twin virtues of *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*—freedom from external interference in both research and teaching and in studying—and helped to secure Halle's reputation as an institution that fostered 'modern' academic freedom. In testimony to Gundling as an admired professor, students compiled many of his lecture notes for publication after his death, including his dense survey of theology, *Die Geschichte der übrigen Wissenschaften, führnehmlich der Gottesgelahrtheit* (1742).⁶⁴

In this work, Gundling made a significant distinction in the way in which one might organize the assorted components of theology into a discipline. The customary method, he reasoned, classified the various parts of theology according to the type of literature discussed. This traditional scheme functioned as a way to organize bibliography; in other words, it provided a list of differing clusters or fields of theological literature. Yet, he countered, one might instead classify the parts according to their respective method.⁶⁵ In the literary type, '*theologia patristica*, *theologia exegetica*, and so forth organized not "sciences" but authors and their works'. In the methodological type, Gundling went 'beyond the organizing of bibliography', nearly 'identifying the fields as sciences' (*Wissenschaften*).⁶⁶ This latter approach allowed implicitly for a splintering of theology as a unitary science into a multiplicity of individual—and more or less independent—theological sciences. Gundling also proposed a broad, twofold division of theology as a means of grouping individual sciences. The field of divinity (*Gottesgelahrtheit*), he held, comprised doctrines of faith

⁶³ Friedrich Paulsen, *The German Universities and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly and William E. Elwang (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 46–7; Fallon, *The German University*, 112.

⁶⁴ Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling, *Die Geschichte der übrigen Wissenschaften, führnehmlich der Gottesgelahrtheit* (Bremen, 1742).

⁶⁵ Gundling, *Geschichte der Gottesgelahrtheit*, 317–24.

⁶⁶ Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 75–6.

(*Glaubenslehren*) and rules for living (*Lebensregeln*).⁶⁷ These he described in turn as *theologica theoretica* and *theologiam practicam*.⁶⁸ Both found their place in Gundling's overall definition of theology: 'everything known, believed, and acted on in order to obtain blessedness' (*was man wissen, glauben, und tun muss, um selig zu werden*).⁶⁹

Only a few decades after Halle's founding, the new University of Göttingen came to rival the Prussian school as the most progressive and premiere university in central Europe. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen—or *Georgia Augusta*, named after its founder George II, Elector of Hanover and ruler of Great Britain—played a striking if unsung role in the development of the academic subject encyclopaedia and the development of Gundling's approach. In 1732, Privy Councillor J. D. Gruber proposed to the British king that establishing a new Hanoverian university would serve the interests of the state.⁷⁰ Gruber argued that Hanover's young (*Landeskinder*) regularly left their homeland to study at the one nearby university, Helmstedt, in neighbouring Brunswick-Lüneberg. Halle, the relatively new Prussian reform university, also drew away many of Hanover's students. This exodus of subjects—and indeed, their funds—Gruber calculated, could soon cost the monarchy up to 100,000 thaler per year.⁷¹ Furthermore, a new university would allow the king to challenge Halle's patrons, the Hohenzollerns—longstanding academic adversaries—and the king's cousin Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia.⁷² The university would prove itself worthy and capable of enticing the youth of the nobility away from the popular

⁶⁷ Gundling, *Geschichte der Gottesgelahrtheit*, 342.

⁶⁸ Gundling, *Geschichte der Gottesgelahrtheit*, 352.

⁶⁹ Gundling, *Geschichte der Gottesgelahrtheit*, 325.

⁷⁰ 'Erster Entwurf des Hofraths J. D. Gruber', in Emil Rössler (ed.), *Die Gründung der Universität Göttingen: Entwürfe, Berichte und Briefe der Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1855), 3–9.

⁷¹ 'Erster Entwurf des Hofraths J. D. Gruber', 3.

⁷² Selle, *Die Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, 9.

knightly academies (*Ritterakademien*).⁷³ Above all, an ‘Academia Georgina’ would pay a lasting tribute to its royal benefactor as a progressive, first-rate institution.⁷⁴

Duly persuaded, George II enlisted Minister Gerlach Adolph Freiherr von Münchhausen (1688–1770) to manage the affair. Born in Berlin, Münchhausen had studied law at Halle, Jena, and Utrecht. When George II had inherited the throne in 1727, he elected Münchhausen to Hanover’s Privy Council, where Münchhausen directed matters of education and religion.⁷⁵ In the fall of 1737, the new university held its first lectures. Participants in the inaugural celebration marking the opening of the university praised it as a ‘new Athens on the [River] Leine’ and a ‘sanctuary for the Muses’.⁷⁶ It would also become a laboratory for theological change.

In some respects, Göttingen’s Johann Lorenz von Mosheim carried on and pushed past Gundling’s arguments.⁷⁷ Though called the ‘Erasmus of the eighteenth century’, Mosheim’s greatest claim to fame rests on his reputation as the ‘father of modern church history’, which he acquired through his *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae* (1755).⁷⁸ Born in Lübeck, he studied at the University of Kiel before eventually accepting a call as *Professor Ordinarius* at the University of Helmstedt in 1723. Despite the fact that he did not join Göttingen’s faculty until 1747, when a special position of ‘chancellor’ was established solely for him, he exerted considerable influence on the university and the theological faculty from the time of

⁷³ McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 35–9, 56.

⁷⁴ ‘Erster Entwurf des Hofraths J. D. Gruber’, 4.

⁷⁵ Walter Buff, *Gerlach Adolph Freiherr von Münchhausen als Gründer der Universität Göttingen* (Göttingen: Kaestner, 1937), 3. On Münchhausen, see *ADB* xxii. 729–45.

⁷⁶ Wilhelm Ebel, *Memorabilia Göttingensia: Elf Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Universität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 24–35; and Hermann Wellenreuther, ‘Von der Manufakturstadt zum “Leine-Athen”. Göttingen, 1714–1837’, in Elmar Mittler (ed.), *‘Eine Welt allein ist nicht genug’: Großbritannien, Hannover und Göttingen 1714–1837* (Göttingen: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2005), 11–28.

⁷⁷ For Mosheim’s biography, see Inge Mager, ‘Zu Johann Lorenz von Mosheims theologischer Biographie’, in Martin Muslow et al. (eds.), *Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693–1755): Theologie im Spannungsfeld von Philosophie, Philologie und Geschichte* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), 277–96.

⁷⁸ Bernd Moeller, ‘Johann Lorenz von Mosheim und die Gründung der Göttinger Universität’, in Moeller (ed.), *Theologie in Göttingen*, 18. Cf. Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae et recentioris*, 4 vols (Helmstedt, 1755).

its founding as Münchhausen's trusted advisor.⁷⁹ 'In his thoughts, Mosheim sketched the city [i.e., the university] that Münchhausen later built'.⁸⁰

Mosheim's lectures on theological method and pedagogy appeared posthumously. Arranged by his son-in-law, Mosheim's *Kurze Anweisung, die Gottesgelahrtheit vernünftig zu erlernen* (1756; 2nd edn, 1763) drew a line between what he called 'theological method' and 'pastoral theology', or the tasks of 'theological scholars' (*theologischen Gelehrten*) in the university and the 'duties of teachers and shepherds of the congregation' (*das Amt eines Lehrers und Hirten der Gemeinde*).⁸¹ 'A theologian of our age must have a sharp mind and be a philosopher', he stated. This meant that the theologian had to present his opinions 'in the language of scholars', with a 'skilful, elegant, and pleasant' disposition. But the theologian also had 'to avoid as much as possible, any accusations' of being sectarian.⁸² Though a strong advocate for an educated clergy, Mosheim nonetheless thought that in an 'enlightened' age, polemical theology ought not be grounded in a strict, narrow confessionalism. 'In our day, at least in the Christian West, people are more civilized, intelligent, [and] enlightened; [a clergyman] must therefore deal with them differently and be more educated himself'.⁸³ The times had changed, and theologians needed to grow out of a purported slavish adherence to ecclesiastical creeds and confessions and become, essentially, polymathic in order to survive in a cultured, urbane world.

Yet, for Mosheim, this change also created the conditions for theologians to bolster their apologetic strategies in defence of Christianity during a time of increased scientific criticism of belief. 'A theologian in our age who desires to be worthy of the

⁷⁹ Mosheim penned various memoranda for Münchhausen on the university as a whole and proposed the statutes for the theological faculty two years before the university's establishment. See Rössler (ed.), *Die Gründung der Universität Göttingen*, 20–7, 270–97.

⁸⁰ Buff, *Münchhausen*, 77.

⁸¹ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 1–3.

⁸² Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 172–3.

⁸³ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 7.

name finds himself in a very difficult position', he wrote. 'In the age of our fathers, it was far easier to hold the name with honour. In our time, religion is contested by almost every human science. Therefore, a theologian in our time must know something about practically every scholarly discipline, so that, with this, he can fend off the objections of unbelief and defend religion.'⁸⁴

Mosheim asserted that theology as a discipline comprehended 'doctrine and practice' (*Glaubenslehre und Lebenslehre*).⁸⁵ He contended that students of theology must be grounded in the individual 'theological sciences' coordinated to these two goals. These 'sciences', each possessing its own method, included dogmatics, ethics, biblical studies and hermeneutics, church history, and pastoral theology.⁸⁶ He also echoed Semler's notion of a cleavage between personal piety and the academic study of theology. '[T]oday, theology must be carried on in a way completely different from that of the past', he reasoned. 'It is self-evident that among the first duties of a theologian is the care for his piety, but it does not have any immediate influence on scientific studies, and therefore this is not the place to deal with it.'⁸⁷ These categorical distinctions, some of which appeared already with Jena's Johann Georg Walch (1693–1775), gradually gained a wide acceptance.⁸⁸ Each would become hallmarks of modern academic theology.

⁸⁴ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 170.

⁸⁵ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 7.

⁸⁶ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 97–169.

⁸⁷ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 20, 33.

⁸⁸ Johann Georg Walch, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften* (2nd edn, Jena, 1753). Cf. Christoph Matthaeus Pfaff, *Introductio in historiam theologiae literariam notis amplissimis, quae novum opus conficiunt, illustrata*, 3 vols (Tübingen, 1724–6).

STATE MINISTERS AND UNIVERSITY TRANSFORMATIONS

Two further developments occurred at the University of Göttingen during the middle of the eighteenth century, which served as catalysts for not only the ‘scientization’ (*Verwissenschaftlichung*) of the academic literature on theological method and instruction, but also the reworking of all the disciplines in the university: first, a transformation in the manner in which professors announced their lectures; and second, a shake-up in the curriculum that carved out explicit space for introductory accounts of the various academic disciplines.

Lecture catalogues—the ‘royal road to the academic subconscious’, in William Clark’s colourful phrase—conveyed more than the nuts and bolts of university schedules.⁸⁹ In ways that would please later idealists, the catalogue itself could represent in external and physical form an internal and higher reality—the ‘true’ organization of knowledge, or what philosophy approximated in its most noble sense: the science of all sciences (*Wissenschaft aller Wissenschaften*). Relationships among the lecture catalogue, the university, the faculties, and the state brimmed with meaning. Lecture catalogues are analogous to the censuses, maps, and museums dissected by Benedict Anderson: ‘Together they profoundly shaped the way in which the . . . state imagined its dominion—the nature of the human beings it ruled over, the geography of its domain, and the legitimacy of its ancestry.’⁹⁰ The catalogue ‘represented’ a world of its own. Where historical maps justified the territorial intrigues of colonial powers, course catalogues, like early modern state archives,

⁸⁹ William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 33.

⁹⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (rev. edn, London: Verso, 2006), 167–8.

could evidence the reach of state control over the organization of knowledge.⁹¹

Scholarly journals, local and regional weekly newspapers available to the public, and literary review periodicals all reprinted such catalogues and lecture lists at various points throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁹²

In the seventeenth century, publication of course catalogues remained an irregular business; their regular and timely appearance, almost always in Latin, only become canonical, as it were, in the eighteenth century. Göttingen produced at its founding in 1737 one lecture catalogue in Latin. From 1748 onward, the university produced two: the familiar variety in Latin and a relatively novel one in German. Both were organized according to longstanding precedence: first in appearance was the faculty of theology, second jurisprudence, third medicine (jurisprudence and medicine sometimes switched places)—the three ‘higher’ faculties—and fourth, philosophy or the remaining arts and sciences, the ‘lower’ faculty preparatory to the others. In the Latin catalogue, the order in which individual lectures appeared within each faculty division depended on the seniority of the professors offering them. So, first came full professors *Ordinariae* according to each faculty listed by seniority, then associate professors *Extraordinariae* in the same pattern. ‘Iohanni Laurentius a Mosheim’, or Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, is thus listed first in the catalogue, as university chancellor and head of the theological faculty.⁹³ In the German-language catalogue, the time of lecture during the day set the order rather than the rank of the professor.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Cf. Randolph Head, ‘Knowing Like a State: The Transformation of Political Knowledge in Swiss Archives, 1450–1770’, *JMH* 75/4 (2003), 745–82.

⁹² Cf. Horst Walter Blanke, ‘Bibliographie der in periodischer Literatur abgedruckten Vorlesungsverzeichnisse deutschsprachiger Universitäten, 1700–1899’, *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 6 (1983), 205–27.

⁹³ *Catalogus praelectionum publice et privatim in Academia Georgia Augusta per aetatem MDCCXXXVIII a die inde XXIX aprilis habendarum* (Göttingen, 1748), 3.

⁹⁴ *Göttingische Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen* 31 (March 1748), 241–8.

In the winter of 1755–6, however, Münchhausen engineered a shift in the German-language catalogue, a ‘scientific, systematic’ restructuring, in the observation of an external report commissioned by Prussia’s Friedrich Wilhelm II and compiled by the educator and member of the Prussian Superior School Board, Friedrich Gedike (1754–1803).⁹⁵ Now, the order in which lectures appeared under each faculty heading depended on an internal order of subject and discipline, a ‘rationalized order of academic labor’, in Clark’s terms, invoking Max Weber, and not on the basis of lecture times or seniority of professors.⁹⁶ The catalogue presented a twofold rubric: ‘Part One, Knowledge in General’ (*Wissenschaft überhaupt*); followed by ‘Part Two, Particular Disciplines’, in the usual order of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy (which here comprised mathematics, history, philology, German and other European languages, and physical exercise).⁹⁷ As Gedike’s 1789 report relayed:

In Göttingen two lecture catalogues are printed bi-annually.

1. A Latin one in which the professors, ordered one after the other in terms of seniority, announce their lectures. In this catalogue, only the professors are listed, and not the lecturers.
2. A German one in terms of a scientific, systematic order. In this one, all the lecturers are also included.⁹⁸

Clark suggested that the 1755 restructuring occurred ‘to facilitate ministerial paperwork’.⁹⁹ As the renowned Göttingen Hebrew scholar J. D. Michaelis (1717–91) recounted, ‘the Curator at the time, the immortal Mr von Münchhausen, demanded a tabular list of classes, as a means for easing his correspondence, and the person to whom he entrusted this advised him to include the lectures of the *Privatdocenten*—be it tabular, as in Göttingen, or alphabetic’. Publicly, university officials stated that the

⁹⁵ Richard Fester, *‘Der Universitäts-Bereiser’ Friedrich Gedike und sein Bericht an Friedrich Wilhelm II* (Berlin: Duncker, 1905), 26.

⁹⁶ Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 54.

⁹⁷ *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* 117 (September 1755), 1085–98.

⁹⁸ Fester, *Friedrich Gedike*, 24.

⁹⁹ Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 54, 61.

structural change would ease the concerns voiced by fathers of prospective students who routinely enquired whether the university offered certain courses.¹⁰⁰ At any rate, individual disciplines took centre stage. What is more, the shift from seniority to a ‘scientific, systematic order’ of lectures to be taught in each faculty underscored the room for introductory courses.

Next, in 1756, Münchhausen arranged for the four faculties to hold specific and detailed introductory lectures—in his words, a ‘*collegium encyclopaedicum*’—to orient beginning students at the outset of their course of study.¹⁰¹ The published announcement carried his succinct rationale: the faculties shall provide lectures on ‘the encyclopaedia of all learning, as well as the individual parts, for the good of those who want to overview in brief either their own or another discipline’.¹⁰² In other words, the innovation covered the systematic unity and coherence of all subjects. The new courses on encyclopaedia, moreover, appeared first in the list of lectures under each faculty heading in the catalogue, demonstrating their primacy. Already at the time of the university’s founding, Münchhausen had requested the legal scholar J. J. Schmauß to undertake something of the sort.¹⁰³ Theodor Hagemann, a jurist who studied at Helmstedt and Göttingen from 1780 to 1784, noted two years later that the ‘unforgettable Münchhausen was completely convinced of the use and advantage of encyclopaedia lectures . . . such that he regarded them as absolutely indispensable’.¹⁰⁴

Heeding Münchhausen’s call, in the following winter semester of 1756–7, J. W. Feuerlein (1689–1766) held forth on ‘the encyclopaedia, or a brief outline of

¹⁰⁰ Johann David Michaelis, *Raisonnement über die protestantischen Universitäten in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main, 1768–76), iii, 9 ff. Cf. *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* 117 (September 1755), 1085.

¹⁰¹ Buff, *Münchhausen*, 126.

¹⁰² *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* 110 (September 1756), 962.

¹⁰³ Johann Jakob Schmauß, *Entwurf eines Collegii Juris praeparatorii, welches er seinen Auditoribus publice zu halten willens ist* (Göttingen, 1737).

¹⁰⁴ Theodor Hagemann, *Plan und Vorschlag zu einer juristischen Lese-Bibliothek auf der Akademie zu Helmstedt, nebst einer kurzen Vorerinnerung vom juristischen Studium* (Helmstedt, 1786), 10.

divinity (*Gottesgelahrtheit*) as a whole'; J. S. Pütter (1725–1807) treated 'the encyclopaedia of jurisprudence and the method for learning law'; and G. G. Richter (1705–1802) covered 'the encyclopaedia of medical science', in the higher faculties of theology, law, and medicine, respectively. In the lower faculty, J. M. Gesner (1691–1761) addressed 'the encyclopaedia of philosophy, philology, and history'; A. G. Kästner (1719–1800) treated 'the encyclopaedia of mathematics and physics'; and J. P. Murray (1726–76) handled 'encyclopaedia, or an introduction to history, according to all of its parts, including diplomacy, heraldry, and the study of currency'.¹⁰⁵ Each scholar thus set the agenda for his respective discipline.¹⁰⁶

By 1765, the new pedagogical practice was firmly entrenched.¹⁰⁷ J. C. Gatterer (1727–99), who taught history at Göttingen from 1759 until his death, noted in his own encyclopaedic textbook, *Abriß der Genealogie* (1788), that he had long grown accustomed to lecturing 'on a kind of historical course, sought after but not quite matching the name of historical encyclopaedia' (*historische Encyclopädie*). His lectures on the topic encompassed not only 'the teaching alone of what is usually understood by the word encyclopaedia: general overview, method, and literature of historical knowledge', but also depicted 'the most distinguished and generally most useful efforts and events . . . from the entire breadth of the historical field'.¹⁰⁸ For these performances and contributions to 'universal history' (*Universalhistorie*) and 'world history' (*Weltgeschichte*), together with his colleague A. L. Schlözer (1735–

¹⁰⁵ *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* 110 (September 1756), 961–75; *Catalogus praelectionum publice et privatim in Academia Georgia Augusta per hiemem MDCCLVI a die inde XIV octobris habendarum* (Göttingen, 1756).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the descriptive remarks on the first lecture 'encyclopaedic' lectures under Münchhausen by Johann Nicolaus Niclas (1733–1808), affixed to a later edition of Gesner's printed lectures. Niclas had studied at Göttingen in the 1750s and Gesner counted him as a star pupil. Niclas, preface to Johann Matthias Gesner, *Primae lineae isagoges in eruditionem universalem nominatim philologiam historiam, et philosophiam* (3rd edn, Leipzig, 1774), i. vii–vix.

¹⁰⁷ Johann Stephan Pütter, *Versuch einer academischen Gelehrten-Geschichte von der Georg-Augustus-Universität zu Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1765), 277.

¹⁰⁸ Johann Christoph Gatterer, 'Vorrede', *Abriß der Genealogie* (Göttingen, 1788).

1809), Gatterer stood out as the ‘ideal of an eighteenth-century German scholar’.¹⁰⁹

Kästner attested to the worth of the new curriculum in a speech to the German Linguistic Society in Göttingen. ‘A scholar may have considerable achievements in a single science’, he pronounced, but unless he attempt an encyclopaedia of either his own or another field, he becomes ‘like an honest citizen of a middling city who has never travelled, never dealt with strangers. . . . [Producing] an encyclopaedia of each scholarly science does not necessarily make a *Polyhistor*’, Kästner concluded, ‘but it does bring with it considerable adulation.’¹¹⁰

Münchhausen and his advisors often attempted innovative policy measures. These included relieving the faculties of their traditional corporate rights to designate their own members in favour of state-controlled appointments and circumscribing the ability of theology professors to exercise the right of censorship (*Zensurrecht*) over other instructors in the university. This restriction of the theological faculty, Götz von Selle observed, functioned as ‘the pivot for the great turn in German life, which moved its centre of gravity from religion to the state’.¹¹¹ In Rudolf Vierhaus’s analysis, it foretold that ‘the confessional age [had] ended for the universities’.¹¹² Münchhausen also contributed to the establishment of Göttingen’s scientific society, the *Königliche Societät der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, later *Akademie der Wissenschaften*, which benefited the young university.¹¹³ Changing catalogues and changing curriculums went hand in hand.

¹⁰⁹ K. J. Vietz, *Das Studium der allgemeinen Geschichte: Nach dem gegenwärtigen Stand der historischen Wissenschaft und Literatur* (Prague: Haase, 1844), 200. Cf. Herbert Butterfield, *Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 42.

¹¹⁰ Abraham Gotthelf Kästner, *Vorlesungen: In der Königlichen deutschen Gesellschaft zu Göttingen gehalten* (Altenburg, 1768), 43.

¹¹¹ Selle, *Die-Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, 41.

¹¹² Rudolf Vierhaus, ‘1737—Europa zur Zeit der Universitätsgründung’, in Bernd Moeller (ed.), *Stationen der Göttinger Universitätsgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 21.

¹¹³ See Buff, *Münchhausen*, 77–8; and ‘Nachträgliches Votum Münchhausens über die Einrichtung der Universität in der Sitzung des geheimen Raths-Collegium’, in Rössler (ed.), *Die Gründung der Universität Göttingen*, 33–8.

Göttingen's enterprising moves generated ripples of emulation. By 1790, the introductory textbooks composed by its prominent scholars across the faculties found use in nearly every German university.¹¹⁴ The University of Ingolstadt, the Catholic (Jesuit) institution on the banks of the Danube, and its Protestant neighbour to the north situated on the Regnitz, the University of Erlangen, became—like numerous other institutions from the period—characteristic in this regard. At the former, for instance, Stephan Wiest (1748–97) taught theological encyclopaedia for a number of years, which resulted in his own Göttingen-inspired textbook.¹¹⁵ Still, it remains to discuss briefly Halle's adoption of the course through the figure of Johann Joachim Spalding.¹¹⁶

Spalding (1714–1804) was first and foremost a Lutheran pastor, known especially for his sermons and his *Betrachtungen über die Bestimmung des Menschens* (1748; 11th edn, 1794).¹¹⁷ He also served as a member of the Prussian Upper Consistory (*Oberkonsistorium*) in Berlin from 1764 to 1788, where he was able to direct the nature of 'neology' or Protestant Enlightenment theology in the Prussian kingdom. Inspired by the practices of Göttingen's theological faculty in Hanover, Spalding proposed a motion to the Upper Consistory in 1765 to modify the theological curriculum across Prussia's universities.¹¹⁸ The proposal, ultimately

¹¹⁴ R. Steven Turner, 'The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative, 1806–1848', Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1973), 117.

¹¹⁵ Stephan Wiest, *Praecognita in theologiam revelatam, quae complectuntur specimen encyclopaediae ac methodologiae theologicae sive institutionum theologicarum*, i (Ingolstadt, 1788). For the course at Erlangen, see, e.g., *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* 54 (April 1791), 451.

¹¹⁶ The account here challenges the idea of a distinct 'Halle tradition' of theological encyclopaedia, in, e.g., Marianne Schröter, 'Enzyklopädie und Propädeutik in der Halleschen Tradition', *PN* 35 (2009), 115–47.

¹¹⁷ On Spalding, see Joseph Schollmeier, *Johann Joachim Spalding: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1967), 13–38. See also Michael Printy, 'The Determination of Man: Johann Joachim Spalding and the Protestant Enlightenment', *JHI* 74/2 (2013), 189–212.

¹¹⁸ Karl Themel, 'Die Mitglieder und die Leitung des Berliner Konsistoriums vom Regierungsantritt des Kurfürsten Johann Sigismund 1608 bis zur Aufhebung des königlichen preussischen Oberkonsistoriums 1809', *JBBK* 41 (1966), 52–111.

accepted, called for two new series of recurring lectures: ‘On the Truth of Religion’ and ‘Theological Encyclopaedia’.¹¹⁹

Spalding’s successful bid expanded the reach of Münchhausen’s reforms in and beyond Prussian theological faculties. In Königsberg, Immanuel Kant began to treat ‘philosophical encyclopaedia, with a short history of philosophy’, a course he taught ten times.¹²⁰ In the first offering, he used a recent compendium by the popular philosopher at Göttingen, Johann Feder, *Grundriss der philosophischen Wissenschaft* (1767; 2nd edn, 1769). Feder had resisted the pressure from his publisher to use the word ‘encyclopaedia’ in the title as a means of capitalizing on the success of the French *philosophes* and other German Enlightenment thinkers, choosing instead the less explicit word ‘sketch’ (*Grundriß*). This informed Kant’s work.¹²¹ Encyclopaedia, Kant noted, is a ‘short excerpt from a whole science’ (*Wissenschaft*) intended to ‘provide an overview of the whole’. Kant also hinted at claims that would reappear with a vengeance in his later arguments for the primacy of the philosophy faculty: ‘Philosophy has as its domain all human knowledge of matters of whatever origin. It is at the same time the highest tribunal of reason’.¹²²

Yet the fruits of reform were hardly confined to philosophy in Königsberg. At the University of Jena, for instance, encyclopaedic lectures became staples across the faculties.¹²³ At Prussia’s leading University of Halle, Semler assumed the duties of teaching theological encyclopaedia while Nösselt bore responsibility for the course on the truth of religion. Though the author of numerous introductory guidebooks that he could have adapted to meet the new course’s needs, Semler saw the lectures

¹¹⁹ Johann Joachim Spalding, *Lebensbeschreibung*, ed. Georg Ludewig Spalding (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1804), 83–4. Cf. Albrecht Beutel and Tobias Jersak, ‘Erläuterungen’, in Johann Joachim Spalding, *Kritische Ausgabe*, vi, ed. Albrecht Beutel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 302.

¹²⁰ Immanuel Kant, *Vorlesungen über philosophische Enzyklopädie*, in Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, xxix.

¹²¹ John H. Zammito, *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 286.

¹²² Kant, *Vorlesungen*, 7.

¹²³ Jonas Maatsch, ‘Jenaer Vorlesungen zur Enzyklopädie und Wissenschaftskunde’, in Thomas Bach, Jonas Maatsch, and Ulrich Rasche (eds.), *‘Gelehrte’ Wissenschaft: Das Vorlesungsprogramm der Universität Jena um 1800* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 125–40.

as more of a burden than an opportunity to refine his ideas. In the summer semester of 1765, he acquiesced to the new course requirement, 'in order to satisfy the royal mandate'.¹²⁴ From the summer of 1769, Nösselt took over theological encyclopaedia at Halle, giving lectures in the subject seven times.¹²⁵

THE 'SPECIAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA' OF THEOLOGY

Göttingen's modernizations proved influential across Europe. This is particularly evident with the case of Göttingen's Johann Stephan Pütter, whose star shone brightly in the faculty of law. Educated at Marburg, Halle, and Jena, Pütter came to Göttingen in 1746 and remained there for the rest of his life, engaging in over sixty years of academic activity. He became well known as a pioneer in German constitutional history. By the end of the century, nearly all holders of high office in the state of Hanover had been Pütter's students.¹²⁶ The briefest listing of his pupils testifies to his legacy: Gustavo Hugo (1764–1844) and K. F. Eichhorn (1781–1854), who helped to found the so-called 'historical school' of law in the nineteenth century, and the progressive statesmen and Prussian reformers Karl Friedrich Freiherr von Stein (1757–1831) and Karl August von Hardenburg (1750–1822).¹²⁷

Pütter produced a guidebook for his students, *Entwurf einer juristischen Encyclopädie* (1757; 2nd edn, 1767), in conjunction with Göttingen's 1756 innovations.¹²⁸ The text is noteworthy for the clarity with which he deliberated over

¹²⁴ Quoted in Albrecht Beutel, *Kirchengeschichte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 210.

¹²⁵ See the indexed list reproduced in Malte van Spankeren, *Johann August Nösselt (1734–1807): Ein Theologe der Aufklärung* (Halle: Franckesche Stiftung, 2012), 324.

¹²⁶ McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 55.

¹²⁷ Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism*, 268 n. 108; Götz von Selle, 'Stein und Hardenberg als Göttinger Studenten', *Göttinger Nebenstunden* 5 (1927), 47. Cf. Wilhelm Ebel, *Die Göttinger Professor Johann Stephan Pütter aus Iserlohn* (Göttingen: Schwarz, 1975).

¹²⁸ Johann Stephan Pütter, *Entwurf einer juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie* (1757); 2nd edn, as *Neuer Versuch einer juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie* (Göttingen, 1767). References here are to the second edition.

the place of individual disciplines, like law, in the broader schematization of all branches of learning—a sentiment shared by numerous readers, including Goethe.¹²⁹ Pütter began by describing the elements that form a science. ‘Several truths that stand in consideration of a shared, particular purpose among themselves in a particular connection, and which can be viewed as a whole, constitute a science (*Wissenschaft*), (a discipline . . .) a part of learning’ (*Gelehrsamkeit*). In turn, several individual sciences (*Wissenschaften*) make up ‘parts’ of a ‘general main science’ (*allgemeine Hauptwissenschaft*). After noting the relation of the ‘whole’ to the ‘parts’ or individual disciplines, Pütter elaborated on the nature of the genre itself. All truths and thus all sciences, he stated, stand connected to one another in varying degrees; together, they make up the entirety of learning (*Gelehrsamkeit*). This assemblage ‘allows for a dissection (*Zergliederung*) of the entirety of learning in all disciplines and sciences, and therefore also [allows one] to think of the connection of the same as parts of a whole’. As a result, one arrives at ‘the concept of an encyclopaedia, that portion of learning wherein the connection that several sciences have among themselves is developed. Provided that this intention is directed to all sciences, there is a general encyclopaedia.’¹³⁰

Under the category, ‘On the difference between general and special encyclopaedia’, Pütter remarked: ‘According to the confession of a famous writer, “It is difficult and perhaps impossible to envisage the different parts of the entirety of learning in a natural connection subjected to no constraints, and to communicate the same, then, like a family tree, according to their closest relatives and ancestries.”’¹³¹ That ‘famous writer’ was Johann Georg Sulzer (encountered in Chapter 2) who had recently composed his own student-oriented account of ‘all the sciences and other

¹²⁹ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Aus meinem Leben, Dichtung und Wahrheit*, in Erich Trunz (ed.), *Goethes Werke: Hamburger Ausgabe* (Munich: Beck, 1981), ix. 277.

¹³⁰ Pütter, *Juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie*, 1–2.

¹³¹ Pütter, *Juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie*, 2–3.

parts of learning'.¹³² If, like Sulzer, one accepted 'eight classes as the main subjects of all human learning', namely, philology, history, the arts, mathematics, physics, philosophy, law, and theology, then 'from this so many special encyclopaedias arise as a result. Thus it is, among others, with a legal or law encyclopaedia', Pütter wrote.¹³³ Perhaps without surprise, he pointed to the encyclopaedic attempts of his Göttingen colleagues, generated according to Münchhausen's arrangement, as exemplary 'special encyclopaedias' canvassing the mental map of human knowledge.¹³⁴

Samuel Mursinna (1717–95), the Reformed professor of theology at the University of Halle, was the first Protestant writer to employ the phrase 'theological encyclopaedia' in the title of a work with his *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae* (1764).¹³⁵ Before Mursinna, the Catholic theologian Martin Gerbert (1720–93) had titled the final chapter of his *Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicarum*, 'Of the Encyclopaedia, or the Mutual Connection of the Sources, and of Other Theological Resources'.¹³⁶ For this reason, a number of commentators have nominated Mursinna's text as the proper beginning of theological encyclopaedia as a genre.¹³⁷ Yet, for his own part, Mursinna explicitly acknowledged that he simply borrowed from similar propaedeutic volumes of the day, Pütter's above all.¹³⁸

The first paragraph of Mursinna's *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae* declared: '[G]eneral encyclopaedia (. . . *orbis doctrinae*), is the complex of all useful

¹³² J. G. Sulzer, *Kurzer Begriff aller Wissenschaften und anderer Theile Gelehrsamkeit* (2nd edn, Leipzig, 1759), 6.

¹³³ Pütter, *Juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie*, 3.

¹³⁴ Pütter, *Juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie*, 3. Cf. Johann Matthias Gesner, *Primae lineae isagoges in eruditionem universalem nominatim philologiam historiam, et philosophiam* (2nd edn, Göttingen, 1760); and Abraham Gotthelf Kästner, *Matheseos et physica idea generalis in unum lectionum encyclopaedicarum* (Göttingen, 1756).

¹³⁵ Samuel Mursinna, *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae in usum praelectionum ductae* (Halle, 1764).

¹³⁶ Martin Gerbert, 'De encyclopaedia, seu mutuo nexu fontium, aliorumque subsidiorum theologicorum', *Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicarum* (Fribourg, 1754; 2nd edn, 1764), 189–211.

¹³⁷ Ulrich Dierse, *Enzyklopädie: Zur Geschichte eines philosophischen und Wissenschaftstheoretischen Begriffs* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1977), 81; Farley, *Theologia*, 69.

¹³⁸ Mursinna, *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae*, 5–6.

truths of which man can attain knowledge. Quintilian uses this voice'.¹³⁹ Later authors continued to name the Roman scholar, but would make much more of him as a means of tracing their genealogy to antiquity and of distinguishing themselves from the lexical model. For Mursinna, the concept of general encyclopaedia contained the 'summary' or 'epitome' (*compendium*) of all knowledge (*eruditio*). As examples he cited a cross-section of the prominent reference works of the day: Alsted's *Encyclopaedia*, Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*, Zedler's *Universal-Lexicon*, and the French *Encyclopédie*. One knows either 'individual' matters, he continued, or 'universal' ones. 'Universal' matters for the would-be *Polyhistor* called for their own general surveys. 'Individual' matters, by contrast, concerned knowledge 'suitable and necessary for certain arts or sciences', which made up 'Encyclopaedia specialis'.¹⁴⁰

Mursinna stated three goals for his special encyclopaedia: (1) a description of and recommendation for the 'arts and sciences' related to theological knowledge; (2) advice for the young student concerning the order of study; and (3) a review of helpful books. The bulk of the work concentrated on the first goal. Thus, one finds Mursinna describing a lengthy list of scholarly fields but without providing any indication of how they relate to one another or to the overarching concept of *theologia*.¹⁴¹ On account of this lack, his work found little favour among subsequent theological encyclopaedists. Nevertheless, it roundly demonstrates Göttingen's influence. Even though later authors in the literature did not trace themselves back to Pütter or Münchhausen's curricular additions at Göttingen with regularity, the genre received its name and its initial impetus from the reforms enacted at the university.

¹³⁹ Mursinna, *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae*, 1.

¹⁴⁰ Mursinna, *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae*, 1–4.

¹⁴¹ Mursinna, 'Conspectus capitum', *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae*, n.p.

CONCLUSION

Institutional, ministerial, and pedagogical reform at places like Halle and Göttingen fostered sustained reflection on theology's status as an academic discipline.

Göttingen's Münchhausen, a creative bureaucrat, largely constructed the institutional framework for the scientific encyclopaedia in the increasingly modern German university. Across the faculties, the new courses on the encyclopaedia of each discipline flourished. Pütter's work garnered praise for its sound reasoning, clear organization, and disciplinary coherence, making it attractive as a model to emulate in the eyes of theologians like Mursinna.

Authors like Mosheim, Semler, Spalding, Bahrdt, and Less, furthermore, all received a wide hearing, with non-German readers soon picking up translations of their works in other languages, too. In the Netherlands, for instance, Dutch translations of this mixed group provoked a series of crises in Reformed and Lutheran circles alike for challenging confessional orthodoxy and advocating for new developments in philology, philosophy, and historical criticism.¹⁴²

Though diverse, the efforts charted here from the middle of the eighteenth century through Mursinna contained common themes. One discerns 'a decisive, if gradual, movement away from a sapiential, hortatory understanding of theological education, which in the post-Reformation era had privileged edification, piety, salvation, and glorifying God as central components of theological study'.¹⁴³ The modification of *theologia* from 'habitus' to a 'deposit, or collection of truths', created further conditions for change in the approach to the study of theology that would anticipate theology's eventual fragmentation. As theology (*Gottesgelahrtheit*) came to

¹⁴² Joris van Eijnatten, 'History, Reform, and *Aufklärung*: German Theological Writing and Dutch Literary Publicity in the Eighteenth Century', *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 7/2 (2000), 173–204.

¹⁴³ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 307–8.

name divine truths, ‘the way [was] paved for disciplines . . . sciences within *Gottesgelahrtheit*’.¹⁴⁴ The expression ‘theological sciences’ (*theologische Wissenschaften*)—in part or in whole—does indeed appear in the titles of Gundling’s and Walch’s works, and the ‘theological sciences’ received Mosheim’s scrutiny, as well.¹⁴⁵ In a word, ‘The one thing (*theologia*, divinity, *Gottesgelahrtheit*) thus became many things.’ Theological encyclopaedia began to address the question, ‘How do we justify and interrelate these many things?’¹⁴⁶ Without drawing an overly strong conclusion from the terminological shifts, the ventures to describe and prescribe the proper procedures and disciplinary boundaries for theological study only increased toward the end of the eighteenth century, leading to theology’s incipient historicization and modern reconstruction.

¹⁴⁴ Farley, *Theologia*, 61–2.

¹⁴⁵ Mosheim, *Kurze Anweisung*, 111–18. Cf. Johann Friedrich Kleuker, *Grundriß einer Encyclopädie der Theologie oder der christlichen Religionswissenschaft*, 2 vols (Hamburg: Perthes, 1800–1); and J. J. Bellermaun, *Der Theologe, oder, encyclopädische Zusammenstellung der Wissenwürdigsten und Neuesten im Gebiete der theologischen Wissenschaften, für Protestanten und Katholiken* (Erfurt: Henning, 1803–12), i. 1 ff.

¹⁴⁶ Farley, *Theologia*, 49–50.

Chapter 4

Enlightenment, History, and New Ideals

What is not to be expected from an age that is so obviously the boundary between two different orders of things!

Friedrich Schleiermacher, 1799

What they call the spirit of the times is their own spirit, in which the times are reflected.

Goethe, 1806

In 1804 the Göttingen theologian K. F. Stäudlin (1761–1826) proclaimed: ‘The Germans are still on the whole a very religious nation, and true religious formation (*Bildung*) and Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) have attained a higher level among them than any other nation. Just as it was among the Germans that the Reformation had its beginnings, so too among them in the eighteenth century there began a new revolution in religious knowledge and in the theological sciences (*Wissenschaften*). . . . They advanced religious knowledge and culture in keeping with the progress of other fields of knowledge. No nation has explored the theological sciences with as much spirit, taste, and thoroughness as have the Germans.’¹ Considered in light of the phenomena that had taken place at his own university and ramified throughout German-speaking Europe, what Stäudlin was partly getting at, I would submit, was a perspective on the transformation of theology during the second half of the eighteenth century that was dominated less, or more properly, not only, by the history of ideas—‘Enlightenment’, ‘historical criticism’—as by developments in

¹ Karl Friedrich Stäudlin, *Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik* (Tübingen: Cotta, 1804), ii. 324–5.

institutions of knowledge. At least in Prussia, for instance, theological faculties—like their sister faculties in the university—functioned as ‘institutions of the state’ (*Veranstaltungen des Staates*), as the 1794 Prussian Civil Code (*Allgemeines Landrecht*) mandated.² ‘Institutions of knowledge’, though, span a wider horizon than the self-aggrandizing ‘tutelary state’ (*Erziehungsstaat*) in Prussian society, which became ‘philosophically revolutionary’ as it sought legitimacy in German idealism.³ One cannot and should not separate institutions and ideas entirely—though interpreters have sometimes tended to elide the institutional mechanisms at work rather than give due credence to the interplay of each. The history of biblical criticism at Göttingen, for instance, clearly exhibits an intrepid exchange of theological and cultural reasoning with pragmatic university initiatives.⁴ To modify Lessing’s quip, institutions and ideas, like religious movements, are like ‘barrels of cider fermenting in the basement . . . one sets the other in motion; *one* does not move by itself’.⁵

But what of theology and the Enlightenment? ‘Among thinkers of the German Enlightenment’, Ernst Cassirer observed, ‘the fundamental objective is not the dissolution of religion but its “transcendental” justification and foundation.’⁶ The goal, contended Peter Hanns Reill, was ‘to rescue religion, not destroy it, through a transformation of its meaning and function’.⁷ In Fritz Ringer’s summary, ‘Quite generally, the German *Aufklärer* were not so much critics as modernizers of Protestant Christianity. They sought above all to rescue the spiritual and moral

² Johann Friedrich Koch (ed.), *Die preussischen Universitäten: Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1839–40), i. 6.

³ Hajo Holborn, ‘German Idealism in the Light of Social History’, in *Germany and Europe: Historical Essays by Hajo Holborn* (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 2.

⁴ See Michael C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

⁵ Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Theologiekritische Schriften I und II*, in Lessing, *Werke*, vii, ed. Herbert G. Göpfert (Munich: Hanser, 1976), 715. Cf. Theodore Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism and Its Institutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 3–17.

⁶ Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, trans. Fritz C. A. Koelin and James P. Pettegrove (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), 136.

⁷ Peter Hanns Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975), 6.

implications of the Christian religion by grounding them safely outside the threatened frameworks of the orthodox creeds.⁸ Secularization theorists further debate the features of religious ‘disenchantment’ (*Entzauberung*), as Max Weber called it, for modern European intellectual life in the wake of not only the Enlightenment, but the nineteenth-century ‘emancipation’ of historical consciousness from long-standing theological moorings, as well.⁹ In Hans Erich Bödeker’s estimation, ‘The greatest challenge to the churches and the greatest danger for them lay in the fact that the Enlightenment, far from turning itself from religion, instead took up its questions and attempted to answer them itself in order to achieve a new foundation for religion. This is the true problem of secularization.’¹⁰ Defining precisely the complex matrix of university, theology, and the late German Enlightenment remains fraught with difficulty.¹¹ But what did this process of remaking religion mean for the study of theology in the university?

In a classic account, Karl Aner described the age concurrent with Lessing (1729–81) as a time of ‘neology’ or Enlightenment theology.¹² His outlook influenced Karl Barth’s historical reconstruction of the era in the first part of Barth’s

⁸ Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969), 83.

⁹ Cf. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007); Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975); Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), 111–13; Konrad Jarausch, ‘The Institutionalization of History in Eighteenth-Century Germany’, in Hans Erich Bödeker et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 31; Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History: Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), 19, 191–203; and Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert M. Wallace (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983), 229 ff.

¹⁰ Hans Erich Bödeker, ‘Die Religiosität der Gebildeten’, in Karlfried Gründer and Karl Heinrich Rengstorff (eds.), *Religionskritik und Religiosität in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1989), 148.

¹¹ See the accounts by Simon Grote, ‘Religion and Enlightenment’, *JHI* 75/1 (2014), 137–60; Ritchie Robertson, ‘Religion and the Enlightenment: A Review Essay’, *GH* 25/3 (2007), 422–32; and Jonathan Sheehan, ‘Enlightenment, Religion, and the Enigma of Secularization: A Review Essay’, *AHR* 108/4 (2003), 1061–80.

¹² On the problematic term ‘neology’, see Albrecht Beutel, *Aufklärung in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 248–9. Cf. Michael Printy, ‘Protestantism and Progress in the Year XII: Charles Villers’s Essay on the Spirit and Influence of Luther’s Reformation (1804)’, *MIH* 9/2 (2012), 303–29.

benchmark study, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (1946).¹³ Worth noting is the fact that Barth's personal copy of Aner's text carries Barth's own pencil marks on nearly every page.¹⁴ Though considered only briefly in these histories, two significant figures among the last of the Enlightenment theologians in the period between Semler and Mosheim and the time of Stäudlin's report stand head and shoulders above their peers for their respective treatments of theological encyclopaedia: Johann August Nösselt (1734–1807) and Gottlieb Jakob Planck (1751–1833). Here I consider the works of these two theologians in the context of broader Enlightenment trends in religion and university life, suggesting that they warrant a more significant place in the history of the institutions and ideas involved in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century theological study than they have received. I conclude with an investigation into the powerful new conception of scholarship and academic vocation—the 'ideology of science' (*Wissenschaftsideologie*)—that began to take hold of Protestant theology and the German university in their time, flanking the entangled paths toward theological 'modernity'.

AN EMBATTLED ORDER:

JOHANN AUGUST NÖSSELT, PHILOSOPHY, AND THEOLOGY

Nösselt matriculated at Halle in 1751, where he came under Baumgarten's influence. After four years there, he spent 1755–6 on a study trip through Germany, Switzerland, and France, and then returned to Halle. In 1757, he began to give lectures at the university; in 1760, he received a call as *außerordentlicher Professor* of

¹³ Karl Aner, *Die Theologie der Lessingzeit* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1929); Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*, trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden (rev. edn, London: SCM, 2001), 91–251, esp. 122–58.

¹⁴ The volume is in KBAB, H621.

Theology, and in 1764, *ordentlicher Professor*. He remained there for the rest of his life.¹⁵ As a popular instructor, he received multiple invitations to leave Halle and teach at other universities, but turned them all down. Only at Halle, he said, could ‘[I] teach my views and conscience in full freedom’.¹⁶ Among those views was the growing conviction that, because the Bible was a ‘historical document’, it must be ‘open to scientific access’.¹⁷ Friedrich Wilhelm II’s Minister of Education and the curator of the University of Halle, Karl Abraham von Zedlitz, called Nösselt the ‘adornment of our university’.¹⁸ Students confirmed that opinion; one even added that if Friedrich II had only heard Nösselt lecture on dogmatics, ‘he would have been a much better judge of theology and theologians’.¹⁹

Toward the end of his life, Nösselt became embroiled in a conflict between Halle’s theological faculty and the new Prussian Minister of Justice, Johann Christoph Wöllner (1732–1800).²⁰ After Friedrich Wilhelm II ascended to the throne in 1786, Wöllner, himself a one-time theology student at Halle, received a ministerial appointment that carried with it the duty to oversee the state’s Department of Religious Affairs.²¹ He took over for Zedlitz, the minister to whom Bahrddt had paid homage and to whom Kant had dedicated the *Kritik der Vernunft*. In this capacity, Wöllner implemented the infamous *Religionsedikt* that promised to return Christian faith in Prussia ‘to its original purity . . . and protect it from all falsehoods’, through government censorship of religious and political writings, reforms in parish visitation

¹⁵ For Nösselt’s biography, see Malte van Spankeren, *Johann August Nösselt (1734–1807): Ein Theologe der Aufklärung* (Halle: Franckesche Stiftung, 2012).

¹⁶ Quoted in Ernst Barnikol, ‘Johann August Nösselt 1734–1807’, in Johannes Weigelt (ed.), *250 Jahre Universität Halle: Streifzüge durch ihre Geschichte in Forschung und Lehre* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1944), 80.

¹⁷ Spankeren, *Nösselt*, 234–5.

¹⁸ August Hermann Niemeyer (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts: Königl. Preuß. Geheimraths, Doctors und Professors der Theologie, nebst einer Sammlung einiger zum Theil ungedruckten Aufsätze Briefe und Fragmente* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1806–9), i. 31.

¹⁹ Christian Friedrich Bernhard Augustin, *Bemerkungen eines Akademikers über Halle und dessen Bewohner, in Briefen* (Quedlinburg, 1795), 145.

²⁰ See Spankeren, *Nösselt*, 262–81.

²¹ On Wöllner, see *ADB* xxxiv. 148–59. See also Guy Stanton Ford, ‘Wöllner and the Prussian Religious Edict of 1788’, *AHR* 15 (1910), 264–80.

practices, and by curtailing ‘irreligious clergymen’ at the universities.²² Nösselt and A. H. Niemeyer especially earned Wöllner’s rancour for propounding ‘radical (*neologische*) principles’.²³ Though the two ‘heterodox’ professors faced threats of dismissal from the university, ultimately only the king’s death in 1798 and Wöllner’s removal from office by Friedrich Wilhelm III (r.1797–1840) ended the ordeal.²⁴

Despite challenges from the state, Nösselt’s lectures on theological encyclopaedia resonated with his contemporaries. In March of 1786, Nösselt published the first volume of his comprehensive three-volume work that grew out of his lecture notes, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*. A second edition of the *Anweisung*, his magnum opus and the pre-eminent ‘neologische Enzyklopädie’, appeared in 1791.²⁵ To mark the 300th anniversary of the Reformation, his colleague Niemeyer produced a history of the University of Halle that rehearsed the institution’s influence in ‘scholarly and practical theology’. Explicitly tying Halle to Luther’s Wittenberg, Niemeyer made sure to point out that he had composed the preface to his history exactly on ‘the eve of the third jubilee celebration of the Reformation, 30 October 1817’.²⁶ As part of that commemoration, he undertook a third edition of Nösselt’s *Anweisung*, which represented one of the more important texts to have come from Halle’s theologians in recent decades.²⁷ A number of ecclesiastical administrators additionally praised the work. ‘What characterizes all of

²² See Wilhelm Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1894), i. 532–3; and Johann Karl Bullman, *Denkwürdige Zeitperioden der Universität zu Halle von ihrer Stiftung an, nebst einer Chronologie dieser Hochschule seit dem Jahre 1805 bis jetzt* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1833), 45.

²³ Wöllner to Nösselt, 3 April 1794, in Niemeyer (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts*, i. 56.

²⁴ Cf. Henri Brunschwig, *Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia*, trans. Frank Jellinek (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974); and Bullman, *Denkwürdige Zeitperioden der Universität Halle*, 48. See also Michael J. Sauter, *Visions of the Enlightenment: The Edict on Religion of 1788 and the Politics of the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century Prussia* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); and Ian Hunter, ‘Kant’s Religion and Prussian Religious Policy’, *MIH* 2/1 (2005), 1–27.

²⁵ Johann August Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, 3 vols (Halle, 1786–9; 2nd edn, 1791). References to the *Anweisung* here are from the second edition.

²⁶ August Hermann Niemeyer, *Die Universität Halle nach ihrem Einfluß auf gelehrte und praktische Theologie* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1817).

²⁷ Johann August Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, ed. August Hermann Niemeyer, 3 vols (3rd edn, Halle, 1818–9).

your work in such an advantageous and winning manner', J. J. Spalding wrote to Nösselt, 'I find here as well. Such a wealth of teaching, and told with such clarity and precision', full of 'the wisest care and moderation', sure to 'delight [with its] rewards'.²⁸ Spalding, who had petitioned for Prussia's universities to offer lectures on theological encyclopaedia, saw his hopes fulfilled.

In spite of Niemeyer's attempts to enlist him in the task of building a bridge from the age of Enlightenment back to Luther and Melanchthon, Nösselt gave evidence of an ever-widening rupture and of what one theorist has called the 'clashing regimes of historicity', alternative and heretofore minority, or seemingly minority, ways of understanding the past.²⁹ Cooking up new ways of relating theology's parts, and new interpretations of past relations, did not necessarily mean methodological anarchy, but it did open the door for novel resolutions to persisting methodological and epistemological questions in academic theology. Nösselt's *Anweisung* was a companion to his earlier and oft-republished bibliographical guidebook, calculated 'to instruct and initiate [students] into a professional appreciation of the ecclesiastical offices'.³⁰ With it, Germany's class of preachers (*Predigerstand*), lacking in theological knowledge (*Gelehrsamkeit*), might acquire 'a more scientific sense' and learn to 'strive after the highest in science' (*dem Höchsten in der Wissenschaft streben*), he claimed.³¹ Nösselt's treatment of theological encyclopaedia's historical roots was relatively succinct. He ranged over Erasmus and Hyperius in the sixteenth century and Gerhard's *Methodus* and Jean Mabillion's *Traité des études monastiques* (1692) in the seventeenth. For the eighteenth century, he

²⁸ Spalding to Nösselt, 4 November 1781, in Niemeyer (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts*, i. 107–10.

²⁹ I borrow this notion from Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 106–13.

³⁰ Albrecht Beutel, *Kirchengeschichte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 211. For the guidebook, see Johann August Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Kenntniß der besten allgemeinern Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie* (Leipzig, 1779). Subsequent editions appeared in 1780, 1790, and 1800.

³¹ Niemeyer (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts*, i. 199–200.

treated Louis Ellies du Pin, Buddeus, Köcher, Walch, Mosheim, Semler, and Herder.³² Christian Wolff's rationalist legacy at Halle flowed throughout the work.³³ Other writings that would seem to belong to the genre, he held, were 'too less acquainted with these [theological and philosophical] sciences or with the needs of our time'.³⁴

Nösselt arranged his work into four parts, without providing a clear rationale for their integration or unity.³⁵ The first treated theology's 'preparatory and helping sciences' (*Vorbereitungs- und Hilfswissenschaften der Theologie*). These comprised philology, philosophy, history, and the 'beautiful sciences' (*schöne Wissenschaften*) like art and poetry. The second expounded a fourfold division of theology along exegetical, historical, systematic, and symbolic or 'churchly' lines. The third addressed the traditional features of pastoral theology since Hyperius—homiletics, catechesis, and ecclesiastical polity—under the management 'of the office of a teacher of religion', while the final part traced out how would-be religious teachers could assess and increase their natural abilities. A practical emphasis came to the fore, though not in Hyperius's terms. Rather, Nösselt stressed the overriding use of reason and philosophical insight in all the pursuits of the religious teacher. He even called 'wissenschaftliche Philosophie' the 'Grundwissenschaft'.³⁶ Philosophy's status in his scheme could not be clearer. Rational philosophy, he insisted, represented 'the queen of all the sciences; and those who scorn it, scorn all reason and assurance in thinking and acting'.³⁷ Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* guided his theological

³² Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, i. 49–50.

³³ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, i. 1 ff., 192 ff. Cf. Werner Schneiders (ed.), *Christian Wolff 1679–1754: Interpretationen zu seiner Philosophie und deren Wirkung* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1983).

³⁴ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, i. 51.

³⁵ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, 1. 51–2. Cf. Karl Friedrich Stäudlin, *Lehrbuch der Encyklopädie, Methodologie und Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Hanover: Hahn, 1821), 12–13.

³⁶ Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle*, i. 483.

³⁷ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, i. 192.

programme, which he readily acknowledged.³⁸ Though each of these steps took Nösselt away from the Reformation-era prolegomena, Niemeyer made the somewhat puzzling and clearly partisan claim that Nösselt's emphasis on philosophy was only another dimension of his concern for practice, and, suggestively, his special 'devotion to history in general and to historical theology in particular'.³⁹

RUPTURES AND REVOLUTIONS: THE CASE OF GOTTLIEB JAKOB PLANCK

In the midst of the Wöllner case, a rival to Nösselt's textbook appeared from Planck at the University of Göttingen.⁴⁰ Planck had studied at Tübingen and served as a tutor there and in nearby Stuttgart. He received an appointment to fill the chair in church history at Göttingen in 1784, only just rendered vacant by the death of W. F. Walch, the son of Johann Georg Walch, who had made his own contributions to the genre.⁴¹ Planck's own son Heinrich would follow in his footsteps as a professor of theology at Göttingen.⁴²

Deep undertones of 'crisis'—theological, political, and institutional—ran throughout Planck's work. As Friedrich Lücke commented, Planck sought to respond to 'the crisis of the time about the nature and the relationships, the conditions and the purpose of theology. The old structure was already broken off in part. Conflict and destruction had come to the foundations themselves; in the end,

³⁸ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, i. 199. Cf. Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1781; 2nd edn, 1787), in Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1902–97), iii–iv.

³⁹ Niemeyer (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts*, i. 159.

⁴⁰ G. J. Planck, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1794–5). Cf. Planck, *Grundriß der theologischen Encyclopädie zum Gebrauche bey seinen Vorlesungen* (Göttingen: Schneider, 1813).

⁴¹ Johann Georg Walch, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften* (2nd edn, Jena, 1753).

⁴² For Planck's biography, see Christoph T. Nooke, *Gottlieb Jakob Planck (1751-1833): Grundfragen protestantischer Theologie um 1800* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

even the purpose and necessity of theology had been put in doubt.⁴³ Discussing Göttingen's theological faculty in the 1820s, one student recalled: 'The lectures of the elder Planck nourished doubts and were unable to revive one's life. His lectures on church history and dogma gave the distinct impression that one was hearing the story of a lunatic asylum. The younger Planck [Heinrich], however, was monotonous to the point of being unbearable. . . . [Consequently] he was only visited by a few listeners. [Göttingen] was not a university to train for the ministry'.⁴⁴

If the formative steps taken by Mosheim meant that pious ministerial training did not rate highly, the study of history certainly did. Planck, an esteemed church historian, had made his name through an extensive publication record which included a monumental history of Protestant doctrine.⁴⁵ At Göttingen he found himself in congenial company. J. D. Michaelis, a shrewd contemporary observer and Göttingen colleague, noted that history was 'the favourite science of our time'.⁴⁶ Along with Stäudlin, Planck belonged to a group of Göttingen church historians who prepared the way for a 'melting down' of sacred history (*historia sacra*) into a secularized or profane version of 'world history' (*Weltgeschichte*), a process which his 'secular' colleagues at Göttingen, J. C. Gatterer and A. L. Schlözer, would continue to refine.⁴⁷ The tradition of 'universal history' (*Universalgeschichte*), made famous by Philip Melancthon during the Reformation and originally derived from the four monarchies in the seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel, had shed its dependence on

⁴³ Friedrich Lücke, *Dr. Gottlieb Jacob Planck: Ein biographischer Versuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1835), 47–8.

⁴⁴ K. K. Munkel, *Karl Johann Phillip Spitta: Ein Lebensbild* (Leipzig: Fries, 1861), 26.

⁴⁵ G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zu der Einführung der Konkordienformel*, 6 vols (Leipzig, 1791–1800).

⁴⁶ Johann David Michaelis, *Raisonnement über die protestantischen Universitäten in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main, 1768–76), i. 192.

⁴⁷ John Stroup, 'Protestant Church Historians in the German Enlightenment', in Hans Erich Bödeker et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte*, 169–92. Cf. Karl Friedrich Stäudlin, *Universalgeschichte der christlichen Kirche* (4th edn, Hanover: Hahn, 1833), 394–5; and Stäudlin, *Lehrbuch*, 268–85.

biblical chronology and theological commitments.⁴⁸ Though historians at the eighteenth-century reform universities mostly remained propaedeutic educators for the faculties of theology and law, responsible for the training of future cameralists, the outlines of their nascent professionalization began to sharpen in this era.⁴⁹ The University of Göttingen, in fact, largely birthed the modern historical practice.⁵⁰ As Dilthey remarked, at Göttingen ‘the worldly sciences freed themselves from theological considerations’.⁵¹

It is instructive to compare the first ‘institutional’ phases of theological encyclopaedia with contemporaneous changes in the field of history. Historical scholarship at Göttingen registered novel, penetrating reflection on the presuppositions, methods, and goals of the emerging science of history, giving rise to the genre of *Historik*. Though associated perhaps above all with the Berlin historian J. G. Droysen (1808–84), colleague of the famous historian Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886), *Historik* as a technical term indicated the ‘literary reflections on what historians do: on the writing of history, on historical research, on historiography’.⁵² Lectures from Droysen’s earliest course at the University of Jena in 1857, titled ‘Encyclopaedia et methodologia historiam’, first appeared in print as *Grundriß der Historik* (1882).⁵³ The founder of the so-called Prussian school of history, Droysen

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Adalbert Klempt, *Die Säkularisierung der universal-historischen Auffassung: Zum Wandel des Geschichtsdenkens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1960).

⁴⁹ David Telman, ‘Clio Ascendant: The Historical Profession in Nineteenth-Century Germany’, Ph.D. diss. (Cornell University, 1993), 136–222. On the relationship between jurisprudence and history, see Notker Hammerstein, *Jus und Historie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

⁵⁰ See Georg Iggers, ‘The University of Göttingen and the Transformation of Historical Scholarship, 1760–1800’, *Storia della Storiografia* 2 (1982), 11–37; Josef Engels, ‘Die deutschen Universitäten und die Geschichtswissenschaften’, *HZ* 189 (1959), 223–378; and Herbert Butterfield, *Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955). Cf. Frederick C. Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); and Georg Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (rev. edn, Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983).

⁵¹ Wilhelm Dilthey, *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii (Stuttgart: Tuebner, 1942), 261.

⁵² Horst Walter Blanke, Dirk Fleischer, and Jörn Rüsen, ‘Theory of History in Historical Lectures: The German Tradition of *Historik*, 1750–1900’, *HT* 23 (1984), 331.

⁵³ See Johann Gustav Droysen, *Historik*, ed. Peter Leyh and Horst Walter Blanke, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1977–2008).

relayed to his close friend Wilhelm Arendt in 1857: 'I have taken the bold decision to read in the next semester encyclopaedia and methodology of the historical sciences and thus, it is my desire to establish a discipline whose analogue in the field of philology has wrought quite extraordinary consequences.'⁵⁴ Droysen had in mind the lectures on the encyclopaedia of philology from the two pillars in classics, Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824), whose encyclopaedic lectures dated back to 1785, and Wolf's student, August Boeckh (1785–1867)—further evidence for the tremendous influence of Göttingen's reforms.⁵⁵

The German historiographical tradition kicked off in earnest with the magisterial work of J. M. Chladenius (1710–59). An orthodox Lutheran who nevertheless harboured Wolffian sympathies, Chladenius taught various subjects in theology and philosophy at Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Erlangen. Like Mosheim's and Semler's works in theology, Chladenius's *Allgemeine Geschichtswissenschaft* (1752)—hailed as 'the founding document of the historicist tradition'—appeared before the institutionalization of lectures in encyclopaedia.⁵⁶ After Chladenius, professors like Gatterer and Schlözer developed similar discipline-reflexive strategies. The foundation of the first dedicated history faculty at the University of Berlin (1810) preserved that tradition. In the practice of *Historik*, 'reflections in historiography [became], as it were, institutionalized . . . part of the rationality which historical studies require as an academic discipline'.⁵⁷

Planck's theological encyclopaedia, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften* (1794–5), came from the same historical matrix, and similarly privileged historical

⁵⁴ Droysen to Arendt, 20 March 1857, in Droysen, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Rudolf Hübner (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1929), ii. 442. Cf. Horst Walter Blanke, Dirk Fleischer, and Jörn Rüsen, 'Historik als akademische Praxis: Eine Dokumentation der geschichtstheoretischen Vorlesungen an deutschsprachigen Universitäten von 1750 bis 1900', *Dilthey-Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Geschichte der Geisteswissenschaften* 1 (1983), 182–255.

⁵⁵ Christiane Hackel, *Die Bedeutung August Boeckhs für den Geschichtstheoretiker Johann Gustav Droysen* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2006), 7–8.

⁵⁶ Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition*, 62.

⁵⁷ Blanke, Fleischer, and Rüsen, 'Theory of History', 365.

reasoning. For instance, when discussing what a historical critique of theological tradition would mean for the study of the ancient church, he wrote:

Not long ago even among ourselves and in our church, we were greatly and fearfully considerate of the sayings of the ancient Church Fathers, and even more so of the decisions of the ancient and especially the Ecumenical Councils, in determining some dogmatic truths. We were very reluctant to deviate from any idea which they had stamped as Christian truth, and even more reluctant to approach any idea that they had anathematized as un-Christian. If that time is over among us, if a freer spirit now leads our doctrinal investigations, if, among us it is possible now to say loudly that no dogmatic idea is true merely because old Athanasius or the Council of Nicaea declared it to be true, let alone false merely because St Augustine and a few African councils viewed it as heretical—then whom have we to thank for this but church history (*Kirchengeschichte*), which alone revealed, and could reveal, the concerns that all too often motivated the good Church Fathers in their sayings, and the Councils in their decisions.⁵⁸

What is more, ‘even if one does not wish to engage in assessing the value, the inner truth, or the obligatory nature of the doctrines of systematic theology’, Planck averred, ‘history is yet indispensable for their mere understanding’.⁵⁹

Nösselt and Planck both defined theology as ‘the scholarly knowledge of religion’ (*die gelehrte Erkenntniß der Religion*).⁶⁰ Theology for Planck entailed ‘the scholarly knowledge of the doctrines and truths that give us the instruction necessary for our felicity and contentment concerning our relations to God, our duties that arise from these relations, and the hopes that we may build on these relations’.⁶¹ With these, one thinks perhaps of Kant’s basic queries: ‘What can I know?’ ‘What must I do?’ and ‘For what may I hope?’⁶² But Planck pushed on from previous generations in his approach to the individual branches of theology as distinct ‘sciences’ (*Wissenschaften*), taking the inchoate formulations of Semler, Mosheim, and Gundling

⁵⁸ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 108–9.

⁵⁹ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 109. Cf. Silke-Petra Bergjan, ‘Die Beschäftigung mit der Alten Kirche an deutschen Universitäten in den Umbrüchen der Aufklärung’, in Christoph Marksches and Johannes van Oort (eds.), *Zwischen Altertumswissenschaft und Theologie: Zur Relevanz der Patristik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 31–61.

⁶⁰ Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehende Theologen*, i. 6; Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 22.

⁶¹ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 29.

⁶² Kant, *Kritik*, A805/B833.

into uncharted territory.⁶³ The time in which he wrote, the turn of the eighteenth century to the nineteenth, witnessed the dispersion of theology into a multiplicity of fields, and the advent of what had previously been called *Hilfswissenschaften*—ancillary or complementary disciplines like philology and history whose chief function had been to assist theologians—as autonomous and culturally-influential disciplines in their own right.⁶⁴ Nösselt had made gestures in their direction, but it was Planck who furnished an elaborate discussion of the ancillary fields.⁶⁵ Selections from his work, in fact, appeared in English translation in 1834 as a stand-alone treatise on the singular ‘science’ of sacred philology.⁶⁶

Though Planck mentioned the usual predecessors—Mabillon, Du Pin, Buddeus, Lange, Francke, Walch, Mosheim, Semler, and Herder—he singled out Nösselt for ‘treating all parts of theology with the same care, the same clarity, and the same accuracy, and in the most appropriate order’.⁶⁷ He also followed Nösselt in marking out four main areas of theological study:

It is now almost universally agreed upon to order under four major subjects everything that should belong to a scholarly knowledge of religion, one subject of which is exegesis, a second is historical theology, the third systematic theology, and the fourth devoted to those special sciences that one could very properly describe by the name applied theology. . . . It can be shown easily that this division of theology has its solid foundation in the nature of *Wissenschaft* itself, in the nature of knowledge, and in the singularity of the purposes which the subjects must address. . . . The entire and complete idea is to consider separately each individual part, with its own dimensions, its connections, and make its relationships to the whole and to the other parts more precisely known.⁶⁸

Furthermore, scholarly innovation and the formation of new learned organizations and institutions bringing together individual expertise, historical sensitivity, and

⁶³ Cf. Gottfried Hornig, *Johann Salomo Semler: Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996), 251 ff.

⁶⁴ See Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 12 ff.

⁶⁵ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 149–271.

⁶⁶ G. J. Planck, *Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation*, trans. Samuel H. Turner (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1834).

⁶⁷ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 141–8.

⁶⁸ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 89.

professional rigour all put the discipline of theology on a new plane, Planck said. His striking language permits extended quotation:

However much the forms of most sciences (*Wissenschaften*) have changed in our century [the eighteenth], there is hardly one in which such a total transformation resulted as that experienced in theology. This transformation . . . affected not only the form, but also the matter. . . . One cannot deny, even if one wanted to, that our theology now has not only an entirely different form but also a very different spirit than that which it had in the middle of the century . . . and the transformation occurred not only in the special systems of individual theologians, nor with an individual party of theologians, but rather across the theology of the age. . . . One could assert with the greatest clarity that there are no scholarly theologians among us who would not deviate at even one point from the system of the previous century, and indeed, at an essential, or rather, formerly held to be essential, point. Even those . . . who still defend the old system have nevertheless given up several of its most basic provisions. Some, perhaps without knowing or intending, departed from them; or, what amounts to the same thing, believed at the moment that these provisions lost the importance they had in the old system. This most certainly heralds the transformation that has taken place in the science!⁶⁹

Conscious that a vast, seemingly intractable, gulf lay between the ‘theology of the past’ and his own programme on the doorstep of the nineteenth century, Planck declared: ‘[T]he transformation in *Wissenschaft* has also made necessary the transformation of the manner and method of [theological] study’.⁷⁰

Much ink has been spilt on the meaning of Schleiermacher’s treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity as an appendix to his dogmatic theology.⁷¹ An even more profound example of ‘relegating’ a theological doctrine or topic to the final pages of a large work occurred with Planck. In this case, however, it was not an essential doctrine but a key branch of theology. Planck’s *Einleitung* ran well over 1,000 pages spread over two volumes. In spite of his verbose style, he confined the fourth branch of theological study, practical, or as he termed it, ‘applied’ theology, to the final

⁶⁹ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 1–2.

⁷⁰ Planck, *Einleitung*, i. 3.

⁷¹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaubenslehre* (1821–2; 2nd edn, 1830–1), in *KGA* i/13.2. 514–32; Eng. trans. in Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 738–51. See also Jacqueline Mariña (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 171–88.

fourteen pages.⁷² With this move, he signalled the tectonic shift in the university from ‘Old Protestantism’ to ‘New Protestantism’.

‘What would come of history if we should think away everything that did not please us and did not harmonize with our conceptions, or regard them as something whose coming to the fore has been a detriment to the church?’ So asked F. C. Baur in *Die Epochen der Kirchengeschichtsschreibung* (1852), discussing Planck’s blend of history and ‘pragmatism’.⁷³ Planck unquestionably considered himself an ‘enlightened Protestant’. He ‘opened the way for later attempts to use (in the service of institutional Protestantism) the legitimating notion of a forward development of history’ with his *Einleitung*, revealing the sea change happening in university theology.⁷⁴

THE ETHOS OF *WISSENSCHAFT*

In 1806, the theologian Carl Daub broadcast: ‘Theology is *Wissenschaft* in the strongest meaning of the word.’⁷⁵ Tied up with the transitions to which Nösselt and Planck attested was the onset of a new academic vision of ‘science’ (*Wissenschaft*) leading up to and during the German Vormärz (1815–48), described by R. Steven Turner as more of a set of beliefs about science, a *Wissenschaftsideologie*, than merely scientific practice itself.⁷⁶ The intellectual origins of *Wissenschaft* as an academic ideology in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century stemmed primarily from

⁷² Planck, ‘Anhang über diejenige theologische Wissenschaften die zu der angewandten Theologie gehören’, *Einleitung*, ii. 593–607.

⁷³ F. C. Baur, *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1852), 183; Eng. trans. from Peter C. Hodgson (ed. and trans.), *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 192.

⁷⁴ Stroup, ‘Protestant Church Historians’, 184.

⁷⁵ Carl Daub, ‘Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie im Verhältniß zum akademischen Studium beider: Fragment einer Einleitung in die letztere’, in Carl Daub and Friedrich Creuzer (eds.), *Studien*, ii (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1806), 4.

⁷⁶ R. Steven Turner, ‘The Growth of Professorial Research in Prussia, 1818–1848—Causes and Context’, in Russell McCormmach (ed.), *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, iii (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), 137–82.

four spheres.⁷⁷ First among these was neohumanism, the late eighteenth-century literary, aesthetic, and cultural movement of J. J. Winckelmann, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, and so many others. Neohumanists campaigned for the elevation of human culture, for ‘rapturous Graecophilia’, classical philology, and character formation (*Bildung*), the last of which W. H. Bruford glossed memorably as ‘salvation through culture’.⁷⁸ But the world of Goethe and Schiller, Suzanne Marchand reminds us, ‘also called forth the *Gymnasien*, the regimented classical secondary schools that served as exclusive credentialing institutions for the bureaucracy and free professions, and that warren of research seminars and experimental laboratories known as the University of Berlin’.⁷⁹

Second—and arguably an extension of neohumanist principles—the new ideal correlated with the educational theories of Pestalozzi, Rousseau, and others in the second half of the eighteenth century, described previously. Visions for university and pedagogical reform dovetailed with ‘philhellenism’—inducing one summary of the neohumanist and reform programmes as ‘Bildung durch Wissenschaft’.⁸⁰

Third, and perhaps most importantly, Kantian and post-Kantian German idealist philosophy served as a midwife for the *Wissenschaftsideologie*. In his *Wissenschaftslehre* (1794), Johann Gottlieb Fichte championed the ‘science of knowing’.⁸¹ Friedrich Schlegel was not alone in the belief that Fichte’s work struck a

⁷⁷ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 137–42.

⁷⁸ W. H. Bruford, *The German Tradition of Self-Cultivation: ‘Bildung’ from Humboldt to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 13, 27.

⁷⁹ Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), xvii. On the *Gymnasien*, see Anthony La Vopa, *Prussian Schoolteachers: Profession and Office, 1763–1848* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

⁸⁰ Helmut Schelsky, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen* (Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1971), 63. Cf. David Sorkin, ‘Wilhelm von Humboldt: The Theory and Practice of Self-Formation (*Bildung*), 1791–1810’, *JHI* 44/1 (1983), 55–73; and Rudolf Vierhaus, ‘Bildung’, in *GGB* i. 508–11.

⁸¹ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *The Science of Knowledge*, ed. and trans. Peter Heath and John Lachs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

chord with his entire generation as ‘one of the greatest tendencies of the age’.⁸²

Fichte, in fact, progressively stated his conception of *Wissenschaft* with religious, even mystical, overtones. On 19 October 1811, in his opening rectorial address at the University of Berlin, he professed that the new university was ‘the most holy thing which the human race possesses’ and that the transmission of knowledge through the generations was ‘the visible representation of the immortality of our race’.⁸³ Hegel likewise proclaimed, ‘Protestantism is not entrusted to the hierarchical organization of a church but lies solely in general insight and *Bildung*. . . . Our universities and schools are our churches’.⁸⁴ Schleiermacher declared that a ‘scientific’ state of mind allowed one to ‘lay open the whole body of learning and expound both the principles and the foundations of all knowledge’.⁸⁵ In his retrospective account of the period, the imperial-era scholar Friedrich Paulsen recorded that ‘the academically educated constituted a kind of intellectual and spiritual aristocracy in Germany’.⁸⁶

Metaphysical claims about the unity of knowledge and humanity’s capacity for comprehension brought forward by the idealist-minded scholars pulsed in the heart of the new conceptions of *Wissenschaft*. As an extension of this third source—or more specifically, a characteristic underlying the new academic vision as a whole—I would add the central concept of encyclopaedia not only as a tool for the organization of knowledge, but also as a theological-philosophical system in its own right, which occupied a central position in the era’s foundational debates about university reform. The idealist literature on university studies at the turn of the century was shot through with calls to ‘awaken the idea of *Wissenschaft*’ and cultivate

⁸² Friedrich Schlegel, ‘Athenäumsfragment no. 216’, in Schlegel, *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ii/1, ed. Ernst Behler (Munich: Schöningh, 1967), 198.

⁸³ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Über die einzig mögliche Störung der akademischen Freiheit* (Berlin, 1812; repr., Heidelberg: Winter, 1905), 48–9.

⁸⁴ Johannes Hoffmeister and Friedhelm Nicolin (eds.), *Briefe von und an Hegel* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1969–81), ii, 272.

⁸⁵ Friedrich Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten in deutschem Sinn, nebst einem Anhang über eine neue zu errichtende’ (1808), in Eduard Spranger (ed.), *Fichte, Schleiermacher, Steffens über das Wesen der Universität* (Leipzig: Dürr, 1910), 126.

⁸⁶ Friedrich Paulsen, *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universitätsstudium* (Berlin: Asher, 1902), 149.

a sense for the organic unity of knowledge.⁸⁷ Schelling, Daub, and Hegel, in particular, described this process in evolutionary and developmental language: growing, maturing, unfolding, moving toward a state of perfection. A ‘prevailing sense of movement, the expectation of infinite advance’, percolated through the new scholarship, ‘for the older, static concepts had died quietly in the academic revolution’.⁸⁸ Boeckh spoke in Schelling’s dialect when he announced that ‘no field of knowledge is already exhausted to the point of infertility. . . . The new discoveries must come as soon as, in the progress of knowledge, the time for them has arrived.’⁸⁹ ‘Science’ possessed its own inner principles and laws. The ‘living entity’ of knowledge advanced seemingly unabated—‘dynamic, limitless, constantly unfolding’.⁹⁰ As Boeckh said: ‘The task of learning (*Wissenschaft*) [is] an infinite labour of the spirit’ (*Geist*).⁹¹ I tease out these features with reference to Schelling and Schleiermacher subsequently.

Theological encyclopaedia in this context underwent a dramatic recasting, from being an instrument for pedagogical and methodological reflection to a comprehensive, ‘living’ apparatus of theology. Such pursuits of knowledge—marked out in part by the rise in calls for scholarship devoted to *Wissenschaft*, rather than the older *Gelehrsamkeit*—ran hand in hand with an incipient ‘research imperative’, in which professorial identity rested on publication of original research. The research

⁸⁷ R. Steven Turner, ‘The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative, 1806–1848’, Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1973), 259.

⁸⁸ Turner, ‘The Prussian Universities’, 321.

⁸⁹ August Boeckh, ‘Zur Begrüssung der Herrn Weber, Parthey und Theodor Mommsen in der Akademie’ (1858), in Boeckh, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, ii, ed. Ferdinand Ascherson (Leipzig: Teubner, 1859), 483–4.

⁹⁰ Turner, ‘The Prussian Universities’, 322.

⁹¹ August Boeckh, ‘Von der Philologie, besonders der klassischen in Beziehung zur morgenländischen, zum Unterricht und zur Gegenwart’ (1850), in Boeckh, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, 190–1.

imperative became a key feature of the professionalization of the academic disciplines in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁹²

The fourth source of the *Wissenschaftsideologie* emerged from a growing sense of national identity—a patriotic ‘imagined community’.⁹³ This provenance is not surprising when one considers the broader political context in which the ideology arose: the French Revolution, the demolition of the Holy Roman Empire and the extension of Napoleon’s power, and the ensuing puzzlement over German ‘nationhood’ after the Wars of Liberation. Fichte’s *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, for instance, brought out these components in full force.⁹⁴ Schleiermacher’s invocations of *Wissenschaft* ‘in the German sense’, made during the French occupation of Berlin in 1807–8, became a watchword for a new, rigorous, critical and historical science of theology throughout German-speaking Europe.⁹⁵ ‘Those who propose to us that the universities be dispersed and turned into specialized schools’, he said—a clear tilt toward France—‘are acting thoughtlessly or are infected by a ruinous, non-German spirit’, operating with a ‘deplorable narrow-mindedness’ in which ‘science must decline and its spirit slumber’.⁹⁶ Schelling’s short essay, ‘Über das Wesen deutscher Wissenschaft’ (1811), composed in direct response to German ‘national’ humiliation by Napoleon’s troops, even dared to say that ‘the German mind’ alone could promote the ‘highest kind of knowledge’. What distinguished Germans as a people was the need and ability to probe the boundaries of human existence in a national quest for knowledge.⁹⁷

⁹² Cf. R. Steven Turner, ‘University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany, 1760–1806’, in Lawrence Stone (ed.), *The University in Society*, ii (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 495–532.

⁹³ Cf. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (rev. edn, London: Verso, 2006).

⁹⁴ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1808).

⁹⁵ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, in *KGA* i/6. 15–100.

⁹⁶ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 45–6.

⁹⁷ F. W. J. Schelling, ‘Über das Wesen deutscher Wissenschaft’, in Manfred Schröter (ed.), *Schellings Werke* (Munich: Beck, 1927–66), iv. 377–94.

The subsequent post-1806 history in Prussia of an idealized ‘tutelary state’ (*Erziehungsstaat*) or ‘culture state’ (*Kulturstaat*) as a powerful political engine, often described as concomitant with the onset of German modernity, corresponds in places with this focus. Linking ‘national education’ with the production of ‘appropriate citizens’, Matthew Levinger has noted, meant fostering ‘the moral and intellectual development’ of Prussia’s people. ‘This tutelary ideal became central to Prussian political discourse largely because many intellectual and political leaders believed that it was vitally necessary to harmonize the desires of the people with the will of the state.’⁹⁸ Relatedly, the Prussian Minister of Cultural Affairs (*Kulturminister*) Karl von Altenstein declared in a memorandum from 1819: ‘The most important thing is the [state’s] care for competent clergy. To this end, one must provide a proficient education not merely [to furnish] a pastor but a theologian (*nicht bloß als Seelsorger, sondern als Theologe*). A learned education is deeply embedded in the character of Protestantism. It is the surest means of maintaining an able clergyman . . . inestimable in promoting the general education of the nation (*Volksbildung*), important as well in the fight against Catholicism and the sectarian spirit. It is the surest means against a regrettable development in the *Zeitgeist*’. He concluded: ‘The modern age has paved the way for this education, although much, much more remains to be done.’⁹⁹

Pulling together these strands, Eduard Spranger perceived that in the years surrounding 1800, the ‘occupation with *wissenschaftliche* ideas in the sense of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel appeared [as] *the* path toward the perfection of personality, and the fully and richly unfolded humanistic personality also seemed the

⁹⁸ Matthew Levinger, *Enlightened Nationalism: The Transformation of Prussian Political Culture, 1806–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 37. Cf. James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 6.

⁹⁹ Karl von Altenstein, ‘Denkschrift über den Zusammenhang des Kultusministeriums mit der gesamten Staatsverwaltung’ (May 1819), in Ernst Müsebeck, *Das preußische Kultusministerium vor hundert Jahren* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1918), 282. On Altenstein, see *ADB* xxxv. 645–60.

best guarantee of a free, conscientious, and intellectually alert citizenry'.¹⁰⁰ As Thomas Nipperdey summarized the following Prussian university reforms, 'the state served education and in the final reckoning, education served the true, free, and rational state. These were, of course, idealistic assumptions in which the realities of power were obscured.'¹⁰¹

Some historians have distinguished between early (1790s–1830s) and later (post-1830s) senses of *Wissenschaft*.¹⁰² Idealist expressions on the 'totality of science' (*Ganzheit der Wissenschaft*) marked the earlier conceptions, which underwrote the elaborate systematic and historical constructions of Christianity and the study of theology for Schelling and Schleiermacher. Later in the nineteenth century, *Wissenschaft* shed its grandiose idealist shell for a more limited definition in terms of empirical rigour, professional and disciplinary specialization, and objectivity and neutrality, morphing into 'that majestic phrase—*wissenschaftliche Objectivität*', as Edward A. Ross (1886–1951), an American sociologist who studied in Berlin, styled it in 1936.¹⁰³

This later sense of *Wissenschaft* embraced the 'absence of presuppositions' (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*), championing 'presuppositionless' (*voraussetzungslos*) historical or empirical research of the kind detected in Ranke's famous and frequently misunderstood dictum: 'History has been assigned the high office of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future ages. To such high offices this work does not aspire: it wants only to show what actually happened' (*wie es eigentlich*

¹⁰⁰ Eduard Spranger, 'Das Wesen der deutschen Universität', in Michael Doeberl et al. (eds.), *Das akademische Deutschland*, iii (Berlin: Weller, 1930), 4.

¹⁰¹ Thomas Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 1800–1866*, trans. Daniel Nolan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 48. Cf. Winfried Speitkamp, 'Educational Reforms in Germany between Revolution and Restoration', *GH* 10/1 (1992), 1–23.

¹⁰² Cf. Joseph Ben-David, *The Scientist's Role in Society: A Comparative Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 108–9.

¹⁰³ Edward A. Ross, *Seventy Years of It: An Autobiography* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936), 38.

gewesen).¹⁰⁴ Ranke dominated the horizons of many history-book writers and theologians alike—on both sides of the Atlantic—functioning, in Peter Novick’s felicitous idiom, as the ‘mythic hero of empirical science incarnate’.¹⁰⁵ The kind of reasoning he seemed to stand for would find its way into theological and church-historical reflection in Germany through the work of Baur, David Friedrich Strauss, and others in the mid-nineteenth century.¹⁰⁶

For theologians, this often meant welcoming historical criticism (*Kritik*). Adolf Hilgenfeld (1823–1907), who had studied at Halle, founded the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* in 1858 for that purpose. ‘The burning . . . question of the day’, Hilgenfeld stated in the first editorial, is ‘whether an unscientific or scientific spirit (*Unwissenschaftlichkeit oder Wissenschaftlichkeit*) reigns in theology, whether the German people should have a clergy of fanatics (*Schwärmerei*) hostile to spiritual and intellectual inculturation (*geistigen Bildung*), or rather a clergy friendly to science and thoroughly educated.’¹⁰⁷ He reasoned that just as ‘German philosophy has had its great critical period, so too the more recent turn of German theology, by which it may deserve the name “science” (*Wissenschaft*), must be called its critical turn’. Theologians had to make a clear choice between historical criticism and ‘un-criticism’.¹⁰⁸ At the end of the century, Theodor Mommsen maintained that the ‘life nerve’ (*Lebensnerv*) of the modern university had become ‘presuppositionless research’

¹⁰⁴ Leopold von Ranke, *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1874), vii. Cf. Georg Iggers and James Powell, *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990).

¹⁰⁵ Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The ‘Objectivity Question’ and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 21–31. Cf. Zachary Purvis, ‘Transatlantic Textbooks: Karl Hagenbach, Shared Interests, and German Academic Theology in Nineteenth-Century America’, *CH* 83/3 (2014), 650–83.

¹⁰⁶ See Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 73–95.

¹⁰⁷ Adolf Hilgenfeld, ‘Die wissenschaftliche Theologie und ihre gegenwärtige Aufgabe’, *ZWT* 1 (1858), 21.

¹⁰⁸ Hilgenfeld, ‘Die wissenschaftliche Theologie’, 13.

(*voraussetzungslose Forschung*).¹⁰⁹ In 1903, the German Protestant theologian Otto Baumgarten gave the rectorial address at the University of Kiel, which he boldly titled, 'The Absence of Presuppositions in Protestant Theology'.¹¹⁰ In 1929, Spranger lectured to Prussia's *Akademie der Wissenschaften* on the 'absence of presuppositions in the humanities'.¹¹¹

Two examples bring out more fully this second, 'positivist' sense of *Wissenschaft*. First, in a frequently noted address in 1913 on changes within German universities over the previous 100 years, Spranger mused over the various ways in which specialized research gradually overtook earlier beliefs in the unity of science, an 'overcoming' which culminated in a condition of deep-rooted intellectual fragmentation. 'We have reached the point at which the current conception of science (*Wissenschaft*) differs fundamentally from that of German idealistic philosophy. Present-day science does not worry about the whole; it thus no longer strives after a worldview and the capacity for a worldview. Rather, it works on individual problems and regards the highest acclaim in solving special research problems through the most refined methods and the most careful individual research. In other words', Spranger concluded, 'present-day science stands under the decisive influence of positivism . . . an almost anarchic positivism, which knows only limitless scientific activity'.¹¹² Disciplinary specialization and the growth of the natural sciences helped refashion the meaning of *Wissenschaft*.¹¹³

Second, Max Weber remarked in his renowned 1917 address, 'Wissenschaft als Beruf', that 'science' in the German universities of the late nineteenth and early

¹⁰⁹ Theodor Mommsen, 'Universitätsunterricht und Konfession', in Mommsen, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), 432. Cf. Ernst Troeltsch, 'Voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft', *CW* 15 (1901), 1177–82.

¹¹⁰ Otto Baumgarten, *Die Voraussetzungslosigkeit der protestantischen Theologie* (Kiel: Lipsius und Tischer, 1903).

¹¹¹ Eduard Spranger, *Der Sinn der Voraussetzungslosigkeit in den Geisteswissenschaften* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1929).

¹¹² Eduard Spranger, *Wandlungen im Wesen der Universität seit 100 Jahren* (Leipzig: Wiegandt, 1913), 23.

¹¹³ Cf. Kathryn M. Olesko (ed.), 'Science in Germany: The Intersection of Institutional and Intellectual Issues', *Osiris* 5 (1989).

twentieth century had undergone and continued to undergo ‘a phase of specialization previously unknown’.¹¹⁴ The scholar ‘can acquire the sure consciousness of achieving something . . . in the field of science only in case he is a strict specialist’, unburdened with moral and religious claims.¹¹⁵ ‘Science today’, he said, ‘is organized in special disciplines in the service of self-clarification and knowledge of interrelated facts. It is not the gift of grace of seers and prophets dispensing sacred values and revelations, nor does it partake of the contemplation of sages and philosophers about the meaning of the universe. This, to be sure, is the inescapable condition of our historical situation.’¹¹⁶

Of course, the ideals of professional scholarship in German university theology did not remain static over the course of the nineteenth century.¹¹⁷ While idealist thought encouraged synthetic, encyclopaedic tendencies, it also precipitated in some sense the modern research imperative.¹¹⁸ In the shift toward free, unconstrained research, ‘science’ in this sense ‘was constituted as research-science, that is, as empirical science. . . . It became an open and changeable system of knowledge, indeed one committed to change, in which systematization was subordinated to the ideal of innovation. It was a totality, the identity of which came principally from rules of procedure and standards of testing’.¹¹⁹ Wilhelm von Humboldt’s (1767–1835) argument that *Wissenschaft* presupposed ‘a never completely

¹¹⁴ Max Weber, ‘Science as Vocation’, in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 134.

¹¹⁵ Weber, ‘Science as Vocation’, 134, 148–9.

¹¹⁶ Weber, ‘Science as Vocation’, 152. Cf. W. M. Simon, *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963).

¹¹⁷ For a discussion of shifting attitudes toward gender and academic practice, see Patricia M. Mazón, *Gender and the Modern Research University: The Admission of Women to German Higher Education, 1865–1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 19–49.

¹¹⁸ Cf. R. Steven Turner, ‘The Prussian Universities and the Concept of Research’, *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 5 (1980), 68–93.

¹¹⁹ Herbert Schnädelbach, *Philosophy in Germany 1831–1933*, trans. Eric Matthews (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 91.

solved problem' enlivened the new university in Berlin.¹²⁰ As the subsequent chapters argue, the likes of Schelling and Schleiermacher moved theological study in this direction, albeit leaving certain ambiguities in their discussions. Among the nineteenth-century theological encyclopaedists, Hagenbach gave unparalleled voice to this idea in his succinct statement that theological encyclopaedia represented 'the epitome of theological knowledge. . . . The study of encyclopaedia can never be exhausted. . . . [A]nd as exponents change with varying magnitudes, so encyclopaedia keeps pace with *Wissenschaft*'.¹²¹ The classical literature of theological encyclopaedia, which spans the conceptual bisection of *Wissenschaft* in the 1830s, encapsulated both idealist and positivist senses. In an age of specialization, the genre illustrated 'the powerful inertia of idealism's totalizing impulse'.¹²²

CONCLUSION

Recent scholars like David Sorkin have compellingly argued the case for expanding 'the canon of Enlightenment thinkers and literature to include theologians and theology. Only by reclaiming these heretofore ostracized thinkers', he noted, 'can we begin to replace the master narrative of a secular Enlightenment with a more historically accurate notion, complex, differentiated, and plural.'¹²³ Attending to late eighteenth-century theologians like Nösselt and Planck adds an overlooked dimension to the discussion and helps elucidate the myriad ways in which categories like 'religion' and 'history' functioned in the academic study of theology. The same

¹²⁰ Wilhelm von Humboldt, 'Über die innere und äußere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten zu Berlin' (1809–10), in Ernst Anrich (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität: Die fünf Grundschriften aus der Zeit ihrer Neubegründung durch klassischen Idealismus und romantischen Realismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956), 377.

¹²¹ K. R. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (9th edn, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1874), 1, 4.

¹²² Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 32.

¹²³ David Sorkin, *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 5. Cf. Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

holds for the 'scientific ideology'. Inspired by early idealist and neohumanist principles and 'dedicated to a Faustian search for "pure truth"', the *Wissenschaftsideologie* carried weighty ramifications for modern theology.¹²⁴ Nösselt's and Planck's acknowledgement of theology's 'auxiliary sciences' (*Hilfswissenschaften*) may have contributed to an eventual splintering of *theologia* into numerous more or less discrete fields, resulting in the loss of a coordinating sense of what constituted academic theology, but it is important to recognize that it originated as a defence of the credibility of modern theological knowledge in a period of intense political and theological 'crisis', to employ Planck's language.¹²⁵ Both offered a 'dress-rehearsal of arguments' about the past, about scholarly methods, and about the unity and diversity of theology and science that university theologians would continue to stage throughout the nineteenth century.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Ringer, *Decline of the German Mandarins*, 104. Cf. Holborn, 'German Idealism', 14–17.

¹²⁵ Cf. John E. Thiel, 'J. S. Drey on Doctrinal Development: The Context of Theological Encyclopedia', *HJ* 27/3 (1986), 292.

¹²⁶ Cf. David Blackbourn, *History of Germany 1780–1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (2nd edn, Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), xv.

Chapter 5

Theology, Encyclopaedia, and *Wissenschaft* in the ‘Quiet War’

History is really the science of that which is, for everything before now is revealed as the basis for the present.

Friedrich Schleiermacher, 1793

I have learned to see that religion, public faith, and life in the state form the point around which everything else revolves.

F. W. J. Schelling, 1806

Once ‘the power of speculation seized me’, the philosopher-scientist, Norwegian-born Dane, and chronicler of German life Heinrich Steffens reported, ‘it was never to leave me again’.¹ Paragons of such power, Steffens held, could be found in two of his heroes and sometime colleagues: Friedrich Schelling and Friedrich Schleiermacher. In 1798, Steffens brushed off the guidance of the Danish authorities who had granted him a stipend to study metal-refining in Saxony in order to visit the early Romantics in Jena, ‘Schelling above all’. His first reading of Schelling’s essay, *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur* (1797), had marked the ‘decisive turning point’ in his life. He listened to Schelling’s inaugural lecture in Jena that same year, ‘completely carried away’ with the idea of the unity of nature expounded by the philosopher *Wunderkind*.² Though they fell in and out of favour with one another over the years,

¹ Heinrich Steffens, *Was ich erlebte: Aus der Erinnerung niedgeschrieben* (Breslau: Josef Max, 1840–4), iii. 253.

² Steffens, *Was ich erlebte*, iv. 1–2, 64–5, iii. 337–9, iv. 75–6.

Schelling delivered a lengthy eulogy for Steffens two months after the latter's death in 1845.³

Steffens's initial bond to Schleiermacher, described by Theodore Ziolkowski and Henri Brunschwig as an honorary member of the Jena circle, came a few years later, when both received appointments at the University of Halle in 1804 as rising stars.⁴ The author of the 1799 speeches to the 'cultured despisers of religion' made his professorial debut with Steffens, and the dynamic pair, along with the philologist F. A. Wolf and the physician J. C. Reil, quickly formed a circle of students around them. 'An insight into the higher significance of speculative considerations permeated each of our scientific (*wissenschaftliche*) pursuits', Steffens opined. 'Everyone, theologian, philologist, physician, endeavoured to grasp and to realize life and science in a higher sense.'⁵ As close friends, they also shared experiences of the invading French army in the fall of 1806.

Steffens's 'speculative' delights established a link between Schelling and Schleiermacher, chronologically and thematically. Still another exchange, one lurking in the background to the events in Halle, conjoined the two in a momentous way. Four years before Steffens and Schleiermacher faced Napoleon in Halle—the world soul (*Weltseele*) on horseback', as Hegel called him—Schelling had announced that the present epoch was 'surely bound to give birth to a new world', with universities occupying the vanguard.⁶ Schelling's *Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums* (1803), addresses he delivered in Jena in 1802, profoundly shaped the future of German higher education in general, and the founding of the

³ F. W. J. Schelling, 'Aus einem öffentlichen Vortrag zu H. Steffens Andenken', in *Nachgelassene Schriften von H. Steffens* (Berlin: Schroeder, 1846), iii–lxiii.

⁴ Theodore Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism and Its Institutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 262; Henri Brunschwig, *Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia*, trans. Frank Jellinek (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 230.

⁵ Steffens, *Was ich erlebte*, v. 152. Cf. Robert J. Richards, *The Romantic Conception of Life: Science and Philosophy in the Age of Goethe* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2002), 252–88.

⁶ Johannes Hoffmeister and Friedhelm Nicolin (ed.), *Briefe von und an Hegel* (Hamburg: Meiner 1969–81), i. 120; F. W. J. Schelling, 'Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', in Manfred Schröter (ed.), *Schellings Werke* (Munich: Beck, 1927–66), iii. 235.

new Prussian University of Berlin (1810)—a replacement for Prussia’s humiliating loss of the University of Halle in 1806—in particular.⁷ After the Peace of Tilsit in 1807, Friedrich Wilhelm III pronounced, ‘the state must replace intellectually what it has lost physically’, and Schelling’s *Vorlesungen*—along with a series of other proposals I take up in Chapter 6—constructed much of the intellectual framework for that task.⁸ Furthermore, the *Vorlesungen* wielded a ‘determining influence’, Arnaldo Momigliano once suggested, upon the ‘first phase of the so-called “Historismus”’, promoting ‘empirical history against the theory of a history *a priori*’.⁹

Schelling’s lectures elicited a lengthy critical review by Schleiermacher. As the ‘Church Father’ of the nineteenth century, Schleiermacher’s relation to Schelling had considerable ramifications for the orientation of Christianity in modern Europe. Formidable scholars from F. C. Baur to Albrecht Ritschl and Ernst Troeltsch found in both a deep well from which to draw for their own accounts of the Christian

⁷ On European universities in general during the revolutionary era, see Walter Rüegg, ‘Themes’, in *HUE* iii. 3–31; L. W. Brockliss, ‘The European University in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850’, in M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vi/1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 77–133; and R. R. Palmer, *The Improvement of Humanity: Education and the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985). On the traditional view of Berlin and the Prussian university reforms, see Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany 1700–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 99–150; Winfried Speitkamp, ‘Educational Reforms in Germany between Revolution and Restoration’, *GH* 10/1 (1992), 1–23; and Daniel Fallon, *The German University: A Heroic Ideal in Conflict with the Modern World* (Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press, 1980). On revisionist accounts downplaying Berlin’s centrality in the German university system, see R. C. Schwinges (ed.), *Humboldt International: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001); Rüdiger vom Bruch, ‘A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the Development of German Universities, 1810–1945’, in Michael G. Ash (ed.), *German Universities: Past and Future* (Providence, RI: Berghahn, 1997), 3–27; and Sylvia Paletschek, ‘The Invention of Humboldt and the Impact of National Socialism: The German University Idea in the First Half of the Twentieth Century’, in Margit Szöllösi-Janze (ed.), *Science in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), 37–58. Another revisionist account emphasizing socioeconomic factors—bureaucratic ‘ministers and markets’—over German idealism and the Humboldtian tradition, comes from William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006); cf. Helmuth Plessner, *Diesseits der Utopie* (Hamburg: Dietrichs, 1966), 121–43; and Karl Mannheim, *Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. Paul Kecskemeti (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), 124–33, 191–229.

⁸ R. Köpke, *Die Gründung der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Berlin: Schade, 1860), 37.

⁹ Arnaldo Momigliano, ‘Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography’, *JWCI* 9 (1946), 161. Cf. Paul Ziche and Gian Franco Frigo (eds.), ‘Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften’: Schellings ‘*Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums*’ als Wissenschafts- und Universitätsprogramm (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2011).

religion and the study of theology.¹⁰ Members of the ‘Catholic Tübingen School’ evidenced perhaps to an even greater extent the influence of Schelling’s and Schleiermacher’s ideas arising from their interaction—a line of influence that reached even to the Second Vatican Council.¹¹ Despite this, historians and theologians alike have neglected Schleiermacher’s review. Accounts of Schelling and Schleiermacher together usually rest on a handful of studies conducted before World War I, spearheaded by Hermann Süsskind, Hermann Mulert, and Gustav Mann. Süsskind (1879–1914), in fact, a *Privatdozent* and student of Troeltsch’s at the University of Tübingen prior to 1914, was the second of Tübingen’s faculty to die in the war.¹² This distance lends additional warrant for recovering the historical contours of Schleiermacher’s engagement with Schelling.

In this chapter, I contend that their acrimonious exchange left a lasting impression on the development of the modern university and the nature of Schleiermacher’s pivotal and formative ideas on academic theology; that is, their disagreements masked deeper commonalities, which together contributed to the historicization of theology in the nineteenth century. The affair turned on the organization and methodological coherence of academic disciplines, the status of philosophical speculation and historical criticism in theology—the ‘speculative’ and

¹⁰ Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 25–72, 135–249.

¹¹ See Bradford E. Hinze, *Narrating History, Developing Doctrine: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Johann Sebastian Drey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Michael Kessler and Ottmar Fuchs (eds.), *Theologie als Instanz der Moderne: Beiträge und Studien zu Johann Sebastian Drey und zur Katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Tübingen: Francke, 2005); and Donald Dietrich and Michael J. Himes (eds.), *The Legacy of the Tübingen School: The Relevance of Nineteenth-Century Theology for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Crossroad, 1997). Cf. Thomas O’Meara, *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982), though it contains certain historiographical difficulties.

¹² See Hermann Süsskind, *Der Einfluss Schellings auf die Entwicklung von Schleiermachers System* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1909); Hermann Süsskind, *Christentum und Geschichte bei Schleiermacher: Die geschichtsphilosophischen Grundlagen der Schleiermacherschen Theologie untersucht* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911); Hermann Mulert, *Schleiermachers geschichtsphilosophische Ansichten in ihrer Bedeutung für seine Theologie* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1907); and Gustav Mann, *Das Verhältnis der Schleiermacher’schen Dialektik zur Schelling’schen Philosophie* (Stuttgart: Vereins-Buchdruckerei, 1914). Cf. Hans-Hermann Tiemann, ‘Hermann Süsskind, Otto Lempp und die Anfänge der theologischen Schule Troeltschs’, in Horst Renz (ed.), *Ernst Troeltsch zwischen Heidelberg und Berlin* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 2001), 266–89.

the ‘historical’, as Steffens relayed—and how both fit together in contested models of German higher education. Without reducing disagreements solely to matters of biography, the particular personality of each figure factored into the altercation. In his contentious review, Schleiermacher critiqued Schelling at numerous points, but proceeded in his own work to repeat many of the same concerns he found so distasteful. With suggestive imagery given the tumult of the French Revolution and commencing Napoleonic Wars, Schleiermacher observed that he was engaged in a ‘quiet war’ with Schelling.

First, then, I explore Schelling’s *Vorlesungen* in the context of the European reform movements targeting universities from the late eighteenth century to the founding of the University of Berlin. Second, I consider Schleiermacher’s review and the import for his own statements on the structure of the German university and the academic study of theology. In addition, I interpret the significance of biographical matters: in the midst of their ‘quiet war’, the two figures nearly became colleagues at the Bavarian University of Würzburg, adding layers of intrigue and complexity. Their encounter inspired later paradigms of Protestant and Catholic university theology that would dominate German intellectual life, enabling original and creative research into the twentieth century.

SCHELLING, THE FACULTIES, AND THEOLOGY’S DUAL INTERESTS

Like numerous other towering German intellectuals of the same era, Schelling was a pastor’s son, descending from Lutheran clergy on both sides of his family.¹³ He was born in the small town of Leonberg, west of Stuttgart, where his father Joseph

¹³ Robert Minder, ‘Das Bild des Pfarrhauses in deutschen Literatur’, in *Kunst und Literatur in Deutschland und Frankreich* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1963), 44–72.

Friedrich was an assistant pastor. The family moved in the year of Schelling's birth to Bebenhausen, where his father had received a call to teach theology at the Protestant school. Life at Bebenhausen, a former Cistercian monastery, paralleled the nearby sister school in Maulbronn—they merged in 1808—made famous by Hermann Hesse's *Bildungsroman*, *Beneath the Wheel* (1906). As in Hesse's novel, Swabian pietism informed Schelling's upbringing: his father and his grandfather were followers of the speculative pietists Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752) and Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702–82), initiating Schelling into their company well before he read Jacob Böhme and made the acquaintance in Munich of Franz von Baader, who himself had deep ties to Meister Eckhart, Böhme, and Saint-Martin.¹⁴ At age 15, Schelling entered the venerable Tübingen *Stift*, famously sharing rooms with Hegel and Friedrich Hölderlin.¹⁵ In 1798, only 23 years of age, he received a call from Goethe to lecture at Jena. He would later hold various positions in Würzburg, Munich, Stuttgart, Erlangen, and Berlin.¹⁶

At Berlin, the last and frequently studied of his active academic periods (1841–5), he was called to fill Hegel's vacant chair by Friedrich Wilhelm IV, with the express purpose to crush 'the dragon-seed of Hegelian pantheism'.¹⁷ He is routinely remembered for his 1841 lectures on the philosophy of revelation, which boasted, albeit fleetingly, such illustrious attendees as Leopold von Ranke, Jacob Burckhardt,

¹⁴ Ernst Benz, *Les sources mystiques de la philosophie romantique allemande* (Paris: Vrin, 1968); and Robert Schneider, *Schellings und Hegels schwäbische Geistesahnen* (Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938).

¹⁵ Wilhelm G. Jacobs, *Zwischen Revolution und Orthodoxie? Schelling und seine Freunde im Stift und an der Universität Tübingen: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1989); Horst Fuhrmans, 'Schelling im Tübinger Stift Herbst 1790–Herbst 1795', in Manfred Frank and Gerhard Kurz (eds.), *Materialien zu Schellings philosophischen Anfängen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975), 53–87.

¹⁶ Biographical details come from Xavier Tilliette, *Schelling: Un Philosophie en Devenir*, 2 vols (Paris: Vrin, 1970); F. W. J. Schelling, *Briefe und Dokumente*, ed. Horst Fuhrmans, 3 vols (Bonn: Bouvier, 1962–75); G. L. Plitt (ed.), *Aus Schellings Leben: In Briefen*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1869–70); and Frederick C. Beiser, *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism, 1781–1801* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 465–596.

¹⁷ F. W. J. Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung, 1841/42*, ed. Manfred Frank (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977), 486. Cf. Max Lenz, *Geschichte der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1910–18), ii. 42–9.

Friedrich Karl von Savigny, Søren Kierkegaard (who claimed his life was at risk on account of the overcrowded and zealous audience), and Karl Marx, while Friedrich Engels reported on the activities in the press. Yet as Warren Breckman and John Toews note, the oft-discussed ‘Schelling in Berlin’ cannot be identified neatly with the ‘Schelling of the early Romantic movement’, nor with Schelling as he prepared to leave Jena and began to settle in Würzburg and Munich.¹⁸

Schelling’s lectures on academic study belonged to a lengthy series on the topic of universities at the cradle of German Romanticism, the University of Jena, at a time when the fate of Germany’s universities remained in question. A malaise brought on by falling enrolments, poor funding, and persistent attacks on the prestige and perceived status of university education—the kinds of critiques proffered by literary pioneers and radical reformers from Lessing and Goethe to Salzmann and Bahrddt—afflicted the traditional institutions of higher education across central Europe. The universities of Halle and Göttingen glimmered faintly against the ‘dismal spectacle [of] the university system’ in eighteenth-century Germany.¹⁹ By the late eighteenth century, though, ‘ongoing lethargy, decline, and frequent crises’ plagued German universities in general.²⁰ A basic comparison of university conditions from the end of the eighteenth century with those from the end of the seventeenth reveals extensive differences. The earlier university, Friedrich Paulsen observed, was ‘a backward, obsolete institution sunk in pedantry and sterile drudgery’. By 1810 (with Berlin), however, universities ‘occupied a leading place in

¹⁸ Warren Breckman, *Marx, The Young Hegelians, and the Origins of Radical Social Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 20–63; John E. Toews, *Becoming Historical: Cultural Reformation and Public Memory in Early Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–23.

¹⁹ Friedrich Paulsen, *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universitätsstudium* (Berlin: Asher, 1902), 50; Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten: Vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart* (3rd edn, Leipzig: Veit, 1919–21), ii. 145–6.

²⁰ McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 33.

the life of the German people'.²¹ In 1805, when the British Privy Councillor and professor of 'worldly wisdom' at Göttingen, Christoph Meiners, surveyed the history of German universities in the eighteenth century, he likewise spotted two institutional bearings: one toward decay and stagnation, and the other toward renewal, led by Halle and Göttingen.²²

Though conditions at the University of Jena (founded in 1576) during the early modern period earned the school a notoriously ignoble reputation built upon regular accounts of duelling and student unrest, a number of important modernizations occurred there near the end of the eighteenth century.²³ These should be understood alongside the radical, rapid-fire changes stretching between the fall of the Bastille in 1789 and the Battle of Waterloo and Congress of Vienna in 1815. The French Revolution subjected universities and theological faculties to an unrelenting onslaught of hostility.²⁴ During Napoleon's imperial reign, his reforms throughout the satellite states resulted in the closing of many of Europe's prestigious universities. 'Every German government had to discover ways to deal with the expansion of French power, to fulfil its demands, and to withstand its destructive impact', James Sheehan summarized. '[P]olitical survival would require more than the ability to endure. To exist in a revolutionary age demanded mastering the revolution itself, acquiring the revolution's power but turning to one's own uses the forces it had unleashed.'²⁵

The redrawn European map had major consequences for scholarly life, relations among university faculties, and the future of academic theology. In 1789

²¹ Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*, ii. 145. Cf. Anton Schindling, 'Die protestantischen Universitäten im Heiligen Römischen Reich deutscher Nation im Zeitalter der Aufklärung', in Notker Hammerstein (ed.), *Universitäten und Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1995), 9–19.

²² Christoph Meiners, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen unser Erdtheils* (Göttingen: Röwer, 1802–5), iv. 371–8. Cf. Notker Hammerstein, 'Epilogue', in *HUE* ii. 621–40.

²³ Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism*, 228–34.

²⁴ See Robert M. Stamp, 'Educational Thought and Practice during the Years of the French Revolution', *HEQ* 6 (1966), 35–49.

²⁵ James J. Sheehan, *German History, 1770–1866* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 251–2.

Europe counted 143 universities; by 1815 there were only 83. France had abolished its twenty-four universities, while forming specialized schools and independent faculties in twelve towns as their replacement. Spain lost fifteen of its twenty-five universities.²⁶ In the 1820s and 1830s, Swiss reformers proposed collapsing all of Switzerland's universities into one remaining national institution. French state centralization of higher education and abolishment of universities in favour of scientific academies occupied a wave of progressive thinkers across Europe.²⁷ Among Protestant universities in Germany, seven folded in this period: Altdorf (closed in 1807), Rinteln (1809), Helmstedt (1809), Frankfurt an der Oder (1811), Erfurt (1816), and Wittenberg (1817); Halle (1807) and Breslau merged subsequently with Wittenberg and Frankfurt an der Oder, respectively. Those universities that survived, like Marburg, Tübingen, Heidelberg, and Göttingen, did so mainly because they were in relatively better financial shape and received support from the newly expanded territorial states established by Napoleon.²⁸ Nine Catholic universities also closed their doors: Cologne (in 1794), Mainz (1798), Trier (1798), Bamberg (1803), Dillingen (1804), Paderborn (1808), Fulda (1809), Breslau (1811, before its reconstitution with Frankfurt an der Oder), and Münster (1818). The University of Ingolstadt relocated to Landeshut in 1802 before settling in Munich in 1826.²⁹

Alongside these closures, consolidated revolutionary-era educational institutions like the *École polytechnique* (established in 1794) took on greater importance.³⁰ Napoleon forced Prussia's weakened monarchy to reinstate the liberal

²⁶ Rüegg, 'Themes', 3.

²⁷ Brockliss, 'The European University', 89–104.

²⁸ H. George Anderson, 'Challenge and Change within German Protestant Theological Education during the Nineteenth Century', *CH* 39/1 (1970), 36–48. See also James Dennis Cobb, 'The Forgotten Reforms: Non-Prussian Universities, 1797–1817', Ph.D. diss. (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980).

²⁹ Max Braubach, 'Die katholischen Universitäten Deutschlands und die französische Revolution', *HJB* 49 (1929), 263–303.

³⁰ Cf. Bruno Nevo, 'L'Église l'État et l'Université: Les Facultés de Théologie Catholique en France au XIXe Siècle', in Nigel Aston (ed.), *Religious Change in Europe 1650–1914* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 325–44.

statesman Karl Freiherr vom Stein (1757–1831), whose one-year tenure in 1808 witnessed a number of far-reaching resolutions but did not address the question of a new academy in Berlin with the same tenacity that Karl Friedrich Beyme (1765–1832), chief of the king’s civil cabinet, had in preceding years.³¹ Other state ministers and civil servants, comprising ‘an ambitious cadre of reform-minded officials’,³² from Prussia’s first *Kultusminister* Karl von Altenstein (1770–1840) in the north to Maximilian von Montgelas (1759–1838) in the Bavarian south, continued to face down these challenges and carve out new opportunities for educational reform.³³ ‘It was under such men’, Thomas Nipperdey remarked, ‘that the foundations of the modern state . . . in Germany were laid’.³⁴

As the curtain fell on the eighteenth century, a host of societies, unions, and public intellectuals in places like Prussia and Saxe-Weimar wrangled over these developments and their implications for German national identity. Berlin’s *Mittwochsgesellschaft*, the distinguished secret society of statesmen and noble intellectuals, debated earnestly the place of Prussian universities in the new climate in 1795.³⁵ In 1798, Immanuel Kant published his *Streit der Fakultäten*, composed in the midst of the Wöllner affair, which contributed to the ongoing discourse on the

³¹ Marion W. Gray, *Prussia in Transition: Society and Politics under the Stein Reform Ministry of 1808* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1986), 47; Reinhart Koselleck, *Preußen zwischen Reform und Revolution* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1967), 163–216.

³² Matthew Levinger, *Enlightened Nationalism: The Transformation of Prussian Political Culture, 1806–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 44.

³³ Cf. Eduard Spranger, ‘Altensteins Denkschrift von 1807 und ihre Beziehung zur Philosophie’, *FBPG* 18 (1906), 107–58; Frank Schuurmans, ‘Economic Liberalization, Honour, and Perfectibility: Karl Sigmund Altenstein and the Spritualization of Liberalism’, *GH* 16/2 (1998), 165–84; and Karl-Heinz Manegold, ‘Das “Ministerium des Geistes”: Zur Organisation des ehemaligen preußischen Kulturministeriums’, *Die deutsche Berufs- und Fachschule* 63 (1967), 512–21. See also Laetitia Boehm and Johannes Spörl (eds.), *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität: Ingolstadt, Landshut, München, 1472–1972* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1972), 177–250.

³⁴ Thomas Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 1800–1866*, trans. Daniel Nolan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 19. Cf. Otto Hintze, ‘Das preussische Staatsministerium im 19. Jahrhundert’, in Hintze, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, iii (2nd edn, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 530–619.

³⁵ Regina Meyer, ‘Das Licht der Philosophie: Reformgedanken zur Fakultätenhierarchie im 18. Jahrhundert von Christian Wolff bis Immanuel Kant’, in Hammerstein (ed.), *Universitäten und Aufklärung*, 97–114.

hierarchy of the four traditional faculties and, indeed, sought to overturn the longstanding 'medieval' order of theology's pre-eminence.³⁶

In *Streit der Fakultäten*, Kant attempted to bolster the philosophy faculty as an autonomous sphere of liberal, rational enquiry within the university.³⁷ The philosophy faculty for Kant consisted of two distinct spheres: 'historical knowledge' and 'pure rational knowledge'. The former included 'history, geography, philology, and the humanities, along with all the empirical knowledge contained in the natural sciences', while the latter comprehended 'pure mathematics and pure philosophy, the metaphysics of nature and of morals'. Philosophy studied the relations of these two spheres and extended, therefore, 'to all parts of human knowledge'.³⁸ Any reforms needed not only to retain the philosophy faculty, he believed, but expand its influence. 'It is absolutely essential that the learned community at the university also contain a faculty that is independent', he wrote, 'one that, having no commands, is free to evaluate everything, and concerns itself with the interests of science (*Wissenschaft*), that is, with truth: one in which reason (*Vernunft*) is authorized to speak out publicly.'³⁹ He was determined to raise philosophy's profile, rendering it no longer subservient to the higher faculties. In his arrangement, philosophy would monitor and critique the other faculties. '[A] university must have a faculty of philosophy. Its function in relation to the three higher faculties is to control (*controlliren*) them and, in this way, be useful to them, since truth (the essential and first condition of learning in general) is the main thing, whereas the utility the higher

³⁶ Immanuel Kant, *The Conflict of the Faculties/ Der Streit der Fakultäten*, trans. Mary J. Gregor (New York: Abaris Books, 1979). Cf. Götz von Selle, *Geschichte der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg in Preußen* (2nd edn, Würzburg: Holzner, 1956), 186 ff.; and Frederick C. Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution, and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought 1790–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 48–9, 78, 128–30.

³⁷ Günther Bien, 'Kants Theorie der Universität und ihr geschichtlicher Ort', *HZ* 219 (1971), 134–60.

³⁸ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 45.

³⁹ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 27–8.

faculties promise the government is of secondary importance.’⁴⁰ Kant revelled in what he called ‘the philosophy faculty’s right to sit as an opposition bench against the theological faculty’.⁴¹

Additionally, Kant stated, ‘If the source of a sanctioned teaching is historical, then—no matter how highly it may be commended as sacred to the unhesitating obedience of faith—the philosophy faculty is entitled and indeed obligated to investigate its origin with critical scrupulosity.’⁴² Ultimately, this scheme would knock academic theology from its long-held position of dominance. ‘We can also grant the theology faculty’s proud claim that the philosophy faculty is its handmaid’ (*Magd*), Kant said, ‘provided [philosophy] is not driven away or silenced’. But to this he added: ‘though the question remains, whether the servant is the mistress’s torchbearer or trainbearer’?⁴³

Building upon the three *Kritiken* and his widely debated *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* (1793), Kant rounded out the nature of the rational religion he allowed theology to study: ‘Faith in a merely historical proposition (*bloßen Geschichtsaussage*) is, in itself, dead. . . . [T]his kind of interpretation may not only fail to promote but can hinder the real end of religious teaching—the development of morally better men. . . . The God who speaks through our own (morally practical) reason is an infallible interpreter of his words in the Scriptures, whom everyone can understand. And it is quite impossible for there to be any other accredited interpreter of his words (one, for example, who would interpret them in a historical manner); for religion is a purely rational matter’ (*eine reine Vernunftsache*).⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 45.

⁴¹ Kant to K. F. Staudlin, 4 December 1794, in Kant, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Otto Schöndörffer (Leipzig: Meiner, 1924), ii. 688.

⁴² Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 54–5.

⁴³ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 45.

⁴⁴ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 120–1. Cf. Kant, *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, trans. Theodore H. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson (Chicago: Open Court, 1934).

Sparring over ‘the division of the faculties’ (*Einteilung der Fakultäten*), to be sure, did not begin with Kant. In 1795, Wilhelm Abraham Teller of the *Mittwochsgesellschaft* declared: ‘The monastic division into faculties, in which philosophy walks behind like a handmaiden, should cease; everyone should be able to lecture on whatever he wants; students should be subjected to regular civil jurisdiction; and those who want to attend the university should be tested more carefully as to their talents and prior knowledge.’⁴⁵ Meiners contended that ‘the disciplines of human knowledge, which in the universities one understands to be within the parameters of the philosophical faculty’, have been ‘enhanced powerfully during our [eighteenth] century, and will, so it seems, continue to be so.’ In due course, he concluded, philosophy would lay claim permanently to theology’s title as ‘the queen of the sciences, the first among her sister faculties’.⁴⁶ Zedler’s *Universal-Lexicon* stated that, owing to ‘rank and precedence at universities, as well as outside them, this order is observed as a rule: doctors of theology precede all the others, being followed by the jurists, and after them the physicians’.⁴⁷ Halle’s Christian Thomasius, by contrast, had called the traditional division into four faculties headlined by theology a ‘papal invention’ to gain control over the academy.⁴⁸ In 1682, the jurist Ernst Gockel had identified the four faculties—in the usual order of precedence as theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and arts and philosophy—respectively, with the four elements (fire, air, water, and earth) and with four grades of being (*esse, vivere, sentire, intelligere*).⁴⁹ Another linked theology to Jupiter,

⁴⁵ Quoted in Adolf Stölzel, ‘Die Berliner Mittwochsgesellschaft über Aufhebung oder Reform der Universitäten (1795)’, *FBPG* 2 (1889), 206.

⁴⁶ Christoph Meiners, ‘Ueber Facultäten’, *Ueber die Verfassung und Verwaltung deutscher Universitäten* (Göttingen: Röwer, 1801–2), i. 325.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Marian Füssel, ‘The Conflict of the Faculties: Hierarchies, Values and Social Practices in Early Modern German Universities’, *HU* 25 (2011), 82 n. 7.

⁴⁸ Johann Georg Walch, *Philosophisches Lexikon* (4th edn, Leipzig, 1775), 1207–9.

⁴⁹ Ernst Gockel, *Deliciae academicae, in quibus natura et pleraeqve civitates universitatum* (Augsburg, 1682), 50–2.

jurisprudence to the moon, and philosophy to Mars.⁵⁰ Medieval professors, as well, sometimes envisaged the four faculties as Pishon, Gihon, the Tigris, and the Euphrates, the four rivers of paradise, with various accompanying arguments for the correct hierarchy of Eden's waters.⁵¹ Kant's *Streit der Fakultäten*, nonetheless, brought these questions to a critical juncture. 'With the decline of theology as the "queen science" holding together a scholastic curriculum', summarized one writer, 'reformers could seriously question whether there was any point in the "unity of knowledge" that gave the universities their organizational form and raison d'être.'⁵²

The University of Jena emerged in this context as the seat of an important dialogue on education that ran from 1789 to 1802. In the 1780s, Jena had begun to change course from its troubled past, as Goethe encouraged educational reforms to boost the intellectual health of Saxe-Weimar. That so many of Jena's young and promising thinkers, like Friedrich Schiller (1788–1805) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814), took the opportunity in their inaugural lectures to address the nature of the university as an institution is certainly symptomatic of the 'exuberance of spirit' at the turn of the century, despite Napoleon's dismantling of the educational status quo.⁵³ Schiller, Fichte, and Schelling all fixated on the question of the organization of knowledge in ways that reflected the new scientific ethos.

In the same year that Kant's book on university faculties appeared, Schiller began his short-lived academic career in Jena with a resounding success. His initial lectures tackled universal history. An audience of some 400 students, over forty times the size anticipated, forced Schiller to relocate from his modest rooms to the

⁵⁰ J. M. Schwimmer, *Tractatus politicus de academicis omnium facultatem professoribus academia et studiosus* (Jena, 1672), I.vii.lxi.

⁵¹ Füssel, 'The Conflict of the Faculties', 82.

⁵² McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 77.

⁵³ Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism*, 237.

largest auditorium in town.⁵⁴ There he discussed differences between the narrow-minded student bent on obtaining the bare minimum necessary to make a decent living—the ‘bread-scholar’ (*Brotgelehrte*)—and the imaginative student who pursues knowledge ‘because he has always loved the truth’—the ‘philosophical mind’ (*philosophische Kopf*).⁵⁵ Those most likely to fall into Schiller’s first category tended to come from poor backgrounds, had difficulty obtaining entry into a patronage system to finance even a meagre subsistence in a costly university town, and, frequently, studied theology because a concentration on the ‘bread-studies’ (*Brotstudium*) of basic theology courses allowed one to move through the university as quickly as possible. The case of the Göttingen classicist C. G. Heyne (1729–1812), who struggled to survive as a poor theology student at Leipzig, serves as one famous case in point.⁵⁶

Social profiles notwithstanding, Schiller disapproved of bread-scholars for hindering educational reform more than he criticized their singular focus on careers. A bread-scholar fails ‘to relate his activity to the great whole of the world’, Schiller said. ‘Every expansion of his bread-science (*Brotwissenschaft*) makes him uncomfortable because it demands new work from him or invalidates past work; every important innovation startles him because it shatters the old school form that he worked so hard to acquire. . . . Who holds up the progress of useful revolutions in the realm of knowledge [more] than the mob of bread-scholars?’⁵⁷ By contrast, a ‘longing for harmony’ sets apart the student with lofty goals from his nearsighted peers. The philosophical mind is directed ‘toward the completion of his knowledge; his noble impatience cannot rest until all his concepts have organized themselves into

⁵⁴ Friedrich Schiller to C. G. Körner, 28 May 1789, in Schiller, *Briefe*, ii, ed. Fritz Jonas (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1893), 289–94.

⁵⁵ Friedrich Schiller, ‘Was heisst und zu welchem Ende studiert man Universalgeschichte?’ in Schiller, *Sämtliche Werke in 5 Bänden*, iv, ed. Gerhard Fricke und Herbert G. Göpfert (Munich: Hanser, 2004), 749–67.

⁵⁶ A. H. L. Heeren, *Christian Gottlob Heyne: Biographisch dargestellt* (Göttingen: Röwer, 1813), 23–8. See also Anthony La Vopa, *Grace, Talent, and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 18–133.

⁵⁷ Schiller, ‘Universalgeschichte’, 751.

a harmonious whole, until he is standing in the middle of his art, his science, and from this point surveys his realm with a satisfied gaze'.⁵⁸

Five years later, Fichte continued the theme in his own public lectures 'on the duties of scholars'.⁵⁹ Mounting the same lectern in the same auditorium as Schiller, Fichte also achieved the same general success.⁶⁰ The true scholar (*der Gelehrte*), he argued, 'dedicates his life' to the acquisition of knowledge, which Fichte differentiated into the three categories of philosophical, philosophical-historical, and purely historical. In addition to the traditional academic activities of teaching and research, Fichte's *Gelehrte* carried the special social responsibility for humanity's progress and ethical refinement, a task for which the scholar—indeed, philosopher, like Fichte himself—was uniquely suited. This social responsibility elevated the scholar's role in the world compared to more specialized professions. 'The true vocation of the scholarly class (*Gelehrtenstand*) is the supreme supervision of the actual progress of the human race in general and the unceasing promotion of this progress'—a 'lofty ideal', he acknowledged.⁶¹ He returned to the topic in his *Über das Wesen des Gelehrten* (1806), a proposal for reorganizing the internal structure of the University of Erlangen, and in his 1811 lectures from Berlin, *Über die Bestimmung des Gelehrten*.⁶² Fichte's *Gelehrte* stood in essential accord with Schiller's 'philosophical mind' such that Schiller recommended Fichte's account in the next year in his acclaimed *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (1795).⁶³

⁵⁸ Schiller, 'Universalgeschichte', 752–3.

⁵⁹ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Über die Bestimmung des Gelehrten*, in Fichte, *J. G. Fichte-Gesamtausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, i/3, ed. Reinhard Lauth et al. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1966), 25–68.

⁶⁰ See Fichte to Johanna Rahn, 26 May 1794, in Fichte, *Gesamtausgabe*, 19.

⁶¹ Fichte, *Über die Bestimmung des Gelehrten*, 54.

⁶² Cf. G. H. Turnbull (ed.), *The Educational Theory of J. G. Fichte* (London: University of Liverpool Press, 1926), 259–62.

⁶³ Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, ed. and tran. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 17.

But the series reached its apotheosis with Schelling's lectures 'on the method of academic study'.⁶⁴ Like Fichte, Schelling returned to the motif more than once, as in his essay, *Über das Wesen deutscher Wissenschaft* (1811).⁶⁵ Yet he did not simply repeat antecedent arguments. Each of the fourteen lectures from 1802 radiated his emphasis on 'absolute science' (*Wissenschaft*), commanding even more applause than the prior addresses; even Wilhelm von Humboldt devoured them 'with admiring approval'.⁶⁶ Taken together, they amounted to Schelling's scholarly 'Wissenssystem', or overall system of knowledge.

Remedying the confusion of young students roused Schelling such that he used the problem to frame his opening arguments. The 'world of science' often confronts impressionable young minds 'as a chaos', in which one can 'distinguish nothing, or an ocean upon which one is launched without compass or guiding star'. Lesser minds succumb to vulgar appetites, short-circuiting their education as they memorize by 'mechanical industry' the skills they suppose will benefit them in a future trade or profession.⁶⁷ Instead, Schelling countered, students must discern the unity of knowledge. 'Recognition of the organic whole of the sciences (*Wissenschaften*) must precede the definite pursuit of a specialty'. Specialists must learn to see their endeavours 'in relation to the harmonious structure of the whole', while grasping their specialization 'not as a slave, but as free men', in 'the spirit of the whole'.⁶⁸

Later in the lectures Schelling evoked Kant's definition of Enlightenment: when entering academic life, students have their 'first experience of emancipation

⁶⁴ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 329–74. I have made my English translations in consultation with Schelling, *On University Studies*, ed. Norbert Guterman, trans. E. S. Morgan (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1966).

⁶⁵ Schelling, 'Über das Wesen deutscher Wissenschaft', in Schröter (ed.), *Schellings Werke*, iv. 377–94.

⁶⁶ Paul Robinson Sweet, *Humboldt: A Biography* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980), ii. 56.

⁶⁷ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 233–43.

⁶⁸ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 325.

from blind faith', their 'first practice in exercising their own judgment'.⁶⁹

'Individuality' (*Eigentümlichkeit* or *Individualität*) and genius—concepts embedded in the milieu of German Romanticism and idealism—held out some direction for talented students, Schelling granted, but these did not always come to full fruition, and students sometimes still looked upon their studies disparagingly as *Brotwissenschaften*.⁷⁰ Universities, therefore, should provide a course of general education that orients—without 'enslaving'—beginning students to the nature of academic study.

Anticipating Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1808), Schelling proclaimed that his ideal scientific university would form part of the 'new world' in Germany, and 'those who do not actively contribute to its emergence will inevitably be forgotten'.⁷¹ Like Fichte, Schelling considered the philosopher to be the only figure suited to bring about this revival, and accordingly, placed philosophy at the centre of the university. Only the philosopher 'can give rise to the vision of knowledge as an organic whole'. Philosophy is 'the science of all science' (*Wissenschaft aller Wissenschaft*) and the philosopher, who studies 'the living unity of all sciences', is able exclusively to communicate this vision.⁷²

In the second lecture, Schelling insisted that 'organizational matters' and 'temporal forms' of the university as an institution are not arbitrary, but mirror 'the spirit of the new world'. When ordered rightly, the outward forms bring together the specialized elements of education (*Bildung*). The actual structure of the university needed to be reformulated according to the logic of the organic unity of knowledge to

⁶⁹ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 350. For the contrast between Schelling and Kant on 'scientific education', see Frederick Gregory, 'Kant, Schelling, and the Administration of Science in the Romantic Era', *Osiris* 5 (1989), 17–35.

⁷⁰ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 236, 264–5. Cf. Gerald N. Izenberg, *Impossible Individuality: Romanticism, Revolution, and the Origins of Modern Selfhood, 1787–1802* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

⁷¹ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 235–6.

⁷² Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 236.

make this relation explicit.⁷³ He returned to this point in the third lecture, arguing that because all of the sciences are interconnected—in absolute *Wissenschaft*—their ‘internal organic unity’ should be ‘expressed objectively in the external organization of the universities’. This was the main thrust of Schelling’s university model, that the external organization of the institution must reflect the inner unity of the sciences; he called the result ‘a general encyclopaedia of the sciences’.⁷⁴

In the remaining sections, Schelling surveyed his general encyclopaedia, which included three disciplines, and discussed how they related to the four traditional faculties. He did not believe that philosophy should constitute a separate faculty, even if, like Kant, he retained its importance when compared to other branches of human learning. For Schelling, philosophy formed the basis for the other faculties: ‘that which is all things’, he concluded, ‘cannot for that very reason be anything in particular’. University faculties amounted to historical realities (the ‘Real’) of absolute knowledge (the ‘Ideal’). Theology, therefore, was the external or real science that studied the ‘absolute and divine being’, medicine was the science of nature, and jurisprudence was the science of law and ‘world order’. Recovering older language, he called these three disciplines ‘positive sciences’, that is, practical for the natural needs of humanity.⁷⁵

The positive sciences mapped on more or less to the traditional higher faculties. In Kant’s *Streit der Fakultäten*, theology, law, and medicine were not devoted to the search for truth per se, like philosophy, but to the search for the ‘natural ends’ of people: ‘being happy after death, having their possessions

⁷³ Schelling, ‘Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums’, 245–7.

⁷⁴ Schelling, ‘Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums’, 269.

⁷⁵ Schelling, ‘Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums’, 298–307. Cf. Jörg Dierken, ‘Das Absolute und die Wissenschaften: Zur Architektonik des Wissens bei Schelling und Schleiermacher’, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 99 (1992), 307–28; and Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 242–50. See also Andrew Bowie, *Schelling and Modern European Philosophy: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1993), 55–90.

guaranteed by public laws during their life in society, and finally, looking forward to the physical enjoyment of life itself'.⁷⁶ The positive sciences, administered in part by the state, had practical ends. The state had a legitimate interest in the positive sciences, because the common good depended on clergy, lawyers, and doctors—'instruments of the state'. In order to promote the common good to the highest degree, though, the state had to support disinterested knowledge, giving students the opportunity to acquire genuine scientific knowledge freed from all coercive measures. 'The usual view of the universities', Schelling said, 'is that they should produce servants of the state, perfect instruments for its purposes. But surely such instruments should be formed by science. Thus, to achieve such an aim through education, science is required. But science ceases to be science the moment it is degraded to a mere means, rather than furthered for its own sake.'⁷⁷ Where philosophy as absolute *Wissenschaft* pursued knowledge as a means in itself, the positive and professional fields, though related to absolute *Wissenschaft* and sharing concerns for rigorous scientific methods, attempted to fulfil humanity's basic needs. Schelling's final lectures surveyed the role of art and poetry in public life.

In lectures eight and nine, 'On the Historical Construction of Christianity', and 'On the Study of Theology', respectively, Schelling suggested how theology fit with his idealist, speculative philosophy.⁷⁸ He criticized the 'scholastic jumble of the old dogmatics' for endless 'hair-splitting' and 'fiddling with etymologies'. Older orthodox formulations needed to give way to new, speculative forms and come under the influence of what he called 'the spirit of the modern age'. Summing up, 'philosophy', he said, 'is the true organ of theology as science' (*das wahre Organ der Theologie als Wissenschaft*).⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Kant, *Streit der Fakultäten*, 49.

⁷⁷ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 251.

⁷⁸ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 308–17, 318–27.

⁷⁹ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 321–3.

Yet Schelling also dissociated himself from Kant's 'pure religion of reason' by making room for Christianity's historical development.⁸⁰ The philosophical religion he envisioned admitted the historicization of theology. 'Theology', Schelling declared, 'stands in a special relation to history. It is primarily in theology, which deals with speculative ideas, that philosophy becomes objective. For this reason, theology is the highest synthesis of philosophical and historical knowledge.'⁸¹ As he said in the eighth lecture, there is a 'great historical character of Christianity. This is the reason why the science of this religion cannot be separated from history, why it must indeed be completely one with it. Each historical synthesis, however, without which theology itself cannot be conceived, demands in its turn the higher, Christian view of history.'⁸² Historical categories are essential to the Christian religion, he argued, and so Christian theology must in turn adopt historicist methods. Christian theology does not merely have a historical component, but 'is, strictly speaking, its own history'.⁸³ At the same time, modern historical thought, expressed for Schelling in speculative philosophical terms, required a 'higher, Christian view of history'. This formulation suggested provocatively that the speculative philosophy of history and Christian theology would overlap considerably, even radically, while referencing the same historical background. In the ninth lecture he put the matter pointedly: 'the essential thing in the study of theology is to combine the speculative with the historical construction of Christianity and its principal doctrines'.⁸⁴

Schelling's contention surprised his contemporaries. Raised in a clerical family and encouraged in Old Württemberg piety, he moved toward and then away from the likes of Fichte, Hegel, and Spinoza (and back again, to Spinoza), while

⁸⁰ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 323. Cf. Ian Hunter, *Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 337–63.

⁸¹ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums,' 308.

⁸² Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 313.

⁸³ Zachhuber, *Theology as Science*, 11.

⁸⁴ Schelling, 'Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', 321.

uncoupling himself from Lutheran orthodoxy.⁸⁵ In Bavaria, he turned toward mythology, a pursuit already implicit in the *Vorlesungen*.⁸⁶ He had planned to write a parody of his education at the Tübingen *Stift*.⁸⁷ He dabbled in mockery with the blistering poem, *Epikurisch Glaubensbekenntniss Heinz Widerporstens* (1799), a revolt against Novalis's *Christenheit oder Europa* (1799) and its fondness for medieval Catholicism, as well as Schleiermacher's famous speeches to the 'cultured despisers' of religion, and it took Goethe's intervention to prevent the poem's publication in the Schlegels' journal of literary criticism, *Athenaeum*.⁸⁸ Adding to the tangled web, Schelling had his own 'splendid copy' of Schleiermacher's speeches 'bound like a truly holy book', observed A. W. Schlegel—who had given the book to Schelling as a gift from Schleiermacher and himself—in 'elegant black morocco', the leaves adorned with 'richly gilded and goffered edges'. Schelling confirmed its value, relaying that the elegant volume—in which Schleiermacher avowed, it is often forgotten, 'history is the highest object of religion'—gave him 'great joy'.⁸⁹

THEOLOGY BETWEEN SCIENCE AND STATE

Before Steffens established a link between Schelling and Schleiermacher, the talented Breslau-born, Moravian-reared Schleiermacher had studied at Halle, passed his final set of theology exams in 1794, served as a house tutor to the family of the Prussian statesman Count Dohna, and received a prominent position as chaplain to the

⁸⁵ See M. Kronenberg, *Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus* (Munich: Beck, 1912), ii. 273–81, 577–600.

⁸⁶ George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 19–71.

⁸⁷ O'Meara, *Romantic Idealism*, 34.

⁸⁸ Plitt (ed.), *Aus Schellings Leben*, i. 282–93.

⁸⁹ A. W. Schlegel to Schleiermacher, 7 September 1800, in *ASL* iii. 291; Walter Grossmann, 'Schelling's Copy of Schleiermacher's Über die Religion', *Harvard Theological Bulletin* 13 (1959), 47–9. Cf. Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion: Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihrem Verächtern* (1799), in *KGA* i/2. 232–33. On history in the *Reden*, see Theodore Ziolkowski, *Clio the Romantic Muse: Historicizing the Faculties in Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 79–88. Schelling's copy of the *Reden* is in AHTL, R. B. R. 610.2 S341.4ue 1799.

Charité Hospital in Berlin. For a time he lived with Friedrich Schlegel and became a regular member at the literary salon of Henriette Herz.⁹⁰ His celebrity status around 1802 fell short of Schelling's, though his speeches on religion brought him some notoriety.

When Schelling discoursed on theology's speculative-historical interests, Schleiermacher professed that he was counting down the days 'to the unhappiest year of my life', stuck in 'exile' in the Pomeranian village of Stolp, near the Danish border.⁹¹ In May of 1802, he had taken a preaching post in the confessionally-mixed town. F. S. G. Sack, his superior in the Prussian Upper Consistory, had harboured suspicions that Schleiermacher's circle of friends was detrimental to the life of a young minister, which the alleged 'Spinozism' of the *Reden* seemed to confirm. Schleiermacher's defence of Friedrich Schlegel's 'obscene' novel *Lucinde* (1799) created further problems in an environment of state-supported religious conservatism, so Sack sent him away in isolation.⁹²

So bleak was Stolp, Schleiermacher maintained, that his health began to waver on account of the harsh climate and lack of personal contact with friends. His thoughts turned darkly toward suicide.⁹³ Near the end of 1803, he wrote to Herz: 'I have played the great game to win much or to lose all, and have lost. What remains for me? That you tell me I can still be useful is nothing to be, absolutely nothing. If you can convince me that I could still become something, then of course I do not

⁹⁰ On this period in Schleiermacher's biography, see Kurt Nowak, *Schleiermacher: Leben, Werk und Wirkung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 74–186; and Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Geselligkeit: Friedrich Schleiermacher in Berlin 1796–1802* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009). See also Deborah Hertz, *Jewish High Society in Old Regime Berlin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

⁹¹ Schleiermacher to Henriette Herz, 21 November 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 114.

⁹² George Pattison, 'A Literary Scandal', *Kierkegaard, Religion and Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 116–36.

⁹³ Schleiermacher to Georg Reimer, 26 October 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 70.

want to die.⁹⁴ Still, he managed to take some solace in his commissioned review of Schelling's lectures for one of the premier literary publications in Europe, the *JALZ*.⁹⁵

The periodical, based in Jena, had been founded by Goethe and H. K. A. Eichstädt (1772–1848), Jena's professor of eloquence, in 1803–4 after the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, from which it descended, moved its centre of operations to Halle. Goethe, the patron, and Eichstädt, the editor, pressed Schleiermacher to become a reviewer for their fledgling outfit, hoping to secure the services of insightful, up-and-coming scholars of religion, literature, natural science, and art. Schiller would participate, they noted, and they leaned on another promised contributor, A. W. Schlegel, to aid their efforts of persuasion.⁹⁶ Schlegel wrote to Schleiermacher about the project, insisting that it would serve a rewarding 'twofold purpose: to establish criticism and to bring the old *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, now possessed of the devil, to ruin'.⁹⁷ Schleiermacher agreed to contribute, and of the first assignments over which he and Eichstädt came to terms—in addition to a volume on poetry, a drama about Prometheus, five works on pedagogy, and a volume on gravitational theories, a highly interesting list in its own right—the first was Schelling's lectures.⁹⁸

The Swedish diplomat Karl Gustav von Brinckmann, Schleiermacher's friend from their student days at Halle, first drew his attention to the *Vorlesungen*. Brinckmann commended Schelling's speculative–historical approach to theology and looked forward to Schleiermacher's verdict.⁹⁹ Schleiermacher, though, did not append his name to the review, choosing instead to make a pseudonymous pun. The review appeared under the initials 'P.p.s.' for *Peplopoios*, a Greek approximation for

⁹⁴ Schleiermacher to Herz, 17 December 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 165.

⁹⁵ Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Rezension von Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling: Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', in *KGA* i/4. 461–84. For the original, see *JALZ* 96–7 (21–3 April 1804), 137–51.

⁹⁶ Hermann Patsch (ed.), 'Schleiermachers Briefwechsel mit Eichstädt', *JHMTb/ZNThG* 2/2 (1995), 255–302.

⁹⁷ A. W. Schlegel to Schleiermacher, 26 September 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 33.

⁹⁸ Eichstädt to Schleiermacher, 7 November 1803, in Patsch, (ed.), 'Schleiermachers Briefwechsel', 268–70.

⁹⁹ Brinckmann to Schleiermacher, 29 November 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 137.

dressmaker (*Kleidermacher*) and clear allusion to the German ‘veil-maker’ or ‘Schleiermacher’. (Nietzsche would roll out a similar quip about Schleiermacher’s name in *Ecce Homo*, written in 1888; one wonders whether Nietzsche knew of Schleiermacher’s original wordplay some eighty years before.¹⁰⁰)

Schleiermacher’s review noted, rather half-heartedly, that some might recognize in Schelling’s lectures ‘the touchstone of true philosophizing’, the ability to perceive art and poetry in the midst of speculation, without which ‘one drifts about in the emptiness and void of dialectics’.¹⁰¹ In fact, one of the review’s striking features is how Schleiermacher raised objections to Schelling at nearly every turn, casting a strongly negative, and misleading, overall impression. Principally he agreed with Schelling that the inner logic of ‘absolute *Wissenschaft*’ should be manifested in the model of the university.¹⁰² Those with ‘scientific’ minds, he acknowledged, grant that the ‘external organization’ of academic study, ‘for the sake of the real sciences should be a faithful copy (*Abdruck*) of their inner and natural organic relationship, even if until now the cloudy mixture of heterogeneous elements has prevented the free development of the true external design’ (*Gestaltung*).¹⁰³ But Schelling’s system remained far too complex—‘too much tied to the esoteric’, meaning Schelling’s internal philosophical structure of the ‘absolute’—to be of any actual relevance in the daily life of students (*im Studienalltag*). He reminded the *JALZ*’s readers that students represented the major market for the lectures, a fact which did not sit well with Schelling’s complicated arguments.¹⁰⁴ Severe difficulties arise in the proper

¹⁰⁰ Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*, ed. Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, trans. Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 141.

¹⁰¹ Schleiermacher, ‘Rezension’, 464.

¹⁰² Schleiermacher, ‘Rezension’, 465.

¹⁰³ Schleiermacher, ‘Rezension’, 464–5.

¹⁰⁴ Schleiermacher, ‘Rezension’, 481.

integration of 'exoteric matters', external concerns of academic daily life, and the *Vorlesungen*'s ambiguous philosophical agenda, he held.¹⁰⁵

Schelling allowed 'that the external organizations of knowledge are comprehended in the state'. This, Schleiermacher wrote, presented 'an almost incomprehensible confusion'. If the positive sciences, as 'external organisms', come to exist through the state, then they digress from 'knowledge as such'.¹⁰⁶ Where Schelling promised to establish the faculties in the university as replicas or copies of the interconnected branches of knowledge, he 'failed' by relying on the state to justify and explicate their function. Despite employing rigorous scientific methods, the positive sciences retained external reference points, appealing to that which lay outside of the organism of purely scientific knowledge.

Schelling's treatment of Christianity's historical nature also absorbed Schleiermacher. 'It can be difficult', Schleiermacher insisted, 'to see how the science of the absolute divine being can receive through the state objective existence and external appearance.' The issue 'of a truly historical science of theology, that Christianity might be understood as a historical necessity, is truly more of a reminder of what the author should have provided here', but did not adequately explain.¹⁰⁷ For 'just as well and with the same words, this would also produce a truly historical science of philosophy'. Rounding out his puzzling critique, Schleiermacher decided that Schelling's comments on Christianity remained 'very cloudy' and yet perhaps contained something 'excellent'.¹⁰⁸ In the end, he judged the review his final 'deviation' (*Abweichung*) from Schelling, anticipating no future rapprochement.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Paul Ziche, "'Die Welt der Wissenschaft im Innersten erschüttern"—Schellings *Vorlesungen* als philosophisches Programm zur Wissenschaftsorganisation', in Ziche and Frigo (eds.), *Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften*, 3–26.

¹⁰⁶ Schleiermacher, 'Rezension', 467–8.

¹⁰⁷ Schleiermacher, 'Rezension', 469.

¹⁰⁸ Schleiermacher, 'Rezension', 470, 473–4.

¹⁰⁹ Schleiermacher to Joachim Christian Gaß, 6 September 1805, in *KGA* v/7. 307.

Schleiermacher's subsequent forays into the debate nevertheless reflected Schelling's aims, an outcome following the pattern Wilhelm Dilthey discerned in Schleiermacher's disinclination to acknowledge Kant's influence.¹¹⁰ First, Schleiermacher's *Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten in deutschem Sinn* (1808), the 'intellectual charter' of the University of Berlin, constructed a similar model of the university as an 'organism' of knowledge and adopted Schelling's position on the positive sciences.¹¹¹ Second, Schelling's rule for the academic study of theology came to partial fruition in Schleiermacher's decisive work, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1811; 2nd edn, 1830). I examine both of these texts at length in the next chapters. The development of a theory of the state, moreover, ran along parallel lines in both Schelling and Schleiermacher in the first years after 1800.¹¹²

Under an intriguing set of circumstances, Schelling and Schleiermacher nearly became colleagues in the thick of this exchange, which cast a shadow over Schleiermacher's adoption of Schelling's ideas. After Schelling left Jena in 1803, he received a position at the recently reconstituted Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg in the north of Catholic Bavaria, where he attempted, unsuccessfully, to launch some of his ideas on curricular reform.¹¹³ Many acquaintances also came to Würzburg, including his former mentor and friend H. E. G. Paulus (1761–1851). Paulus had taught oriental languages at Jena, but also left for Würzburg, partly due to grumbling over his erudite two-volume critical Latin edition of Spinoza's works. Initially, the two shared lodgings in their new city, but became increasingly ill-

¹¹⁰ Wilhelm Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers* (Berlin: Reimer, 1870), 87.

¹¹¹ Cf. Friedrich Paulsen, *The German University and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly and William E. Elwang (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 50.

¹¹² Miriam Rose, *Schleiermachers Staatslehre* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 89; Matthias Wolfes, *Öffentlichkeit und Bürgergesellschaft: Friedrich Schleiermachers politische Wirksamkeit* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), i. 108. See also Eduard Spranger, 'Philosophie und Pädagogik der preußischen Reformzeit', *HZ* 104 (1910), 278–321.

¹¹³ See Tilliette, *Schelling*, i. 140–58; Werner Engelhorn, *Die Universität Würzburg 1803–1848* (Neustadt: Degener, 1987), 2–87; and Faustino Fabbianelli, 'Ein unbekanntes Gutachten von Schelling aus dem Jahre 1804', *International Yearbook of German Idealism* 6 (2008), 301–10.

tempered in nearly all of their dealings with one another.¹¹⁴ By the 1840s, their contretemps grew into a large-scale feud: Schelling sued Paulus for plagiarism when he produced an unauthorized transcript of Schelling's 1841 lectures on the philosophy of revelation. News of the scandal spread quickly; Karl Marx and Ludwig Feuerbach openly pilloried Schelling's suit and mocked him as the 'holy' thirty-eighth member of the German Confederation.¹¹⁵

In Würzburg, Schelling found himself at odds with his Catholic peers. Bombarded by an incessant pamphlet campaign by Franz Berg (1753–1821), Würzburg's professor of church history known as the 'Franconian Voltaire' (*der fränkische Voltaire*) for championing the Catholic Enlightenment, Schelling received orders to suspend his lectures on religion for their alleged pantheism, mysticism, and atheism.¹¹⁶ Like Schleiermacher, who had once called Spinoza a man 'full of religion and full of [the] holy spirit' (*heiligen Geistes*), Schelling complained that he had to defend himself—even to his mother—against charges that he had both abandoned Christianity and become a Catholic.¹¹⁷

On 9 January 1804, Schleiermacher received word from Paulus offering a professorship in practical theology. Given his condition in Stolp, Würzburg plainly appealed, but was not without its drawbacks. Schleiermacher was reluctant to settle in a largely Catholic Bavarian state. While wavering over expatriation from Prussia, he commenced negotiations for a dual appointment as Preacher to the University, thinking that if he could teach and preach, to which he had grown accustomed, the

¹¹⁴ Johann Steiger, 'Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus (1761–1851) zwischen Spätaufklärung, Liberalismus, Philosemitismus und Antijudaismus: Zum 150. Todestag', *ZBK* 70 (2001), 119–35.

¹¹⁵ Marx to Feuerbach, 3 October 1843, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975–2004), iii. 3.

¹¹⁶ Peter Baumgart (ed.), *Vierhundert Jahre Universität Würzburg* (Neustadt: Degener, 1982), 114; O'Meara, *Romantic Idealism*, 69–72. Cf. Ulrich Lehner, *Enlightened Monks: The German Benedictines, 1740–1803* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 200. Efforts to reform the region's Jesuit schools led to the so-called 'Würzburg Theology', still in varying degrees of force during Schelling's time there. See Winfried Müller, *Universität und Orden: Die bayerische Landesuniversität Ingolstadt zwischen der Aufhebung des Jesuitenordens und der Säkularisation, 1773–1803* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1986).

¹¹⁷ Plitt (ed.), *Aus Schellings Leben*, ii. 352. Cf. Julia Lamm, *The Living God: Schleiermacher's Theological Appropriation of Spinoza* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1996).

confessional demographics and his Prussian-nationalist sympathies might be overcome. His ecclesiastical seniors advised him not to accept the offer. His principal obstacle nonetheless remained: he did not want to be associated with Schelling. 'This professorship is precisely the only one I could gladly accept, since I do not want to fill up my time with the learned specialties (*gelehrten Fächern*) of theology, and [yet] I do not want to hold a philosophical [post] where Schelling is', Schleiermacher declared. 'Far more vexing', he wrote, 'is what I face from Schelling himself, to whom I am in fact so very much opposed, despite a great apparent agreement, and who is much too keen-sighted not to notice it and much too arrogant and tyrannical to tolerate it. Unfortunately, he will find it difficult to bring himself to despise me . . . which for me would be the most desirable thing, and so I have soon to expect perpetual public attacks or secret bantering, such as only one professor can direct toward another.'¹¹⁸ Berg's invectives against Schelling clearly informed this perspective.¹¹⁹

Before his review of Schelling's *Vorlesungen* went to print, Schleiermacher admitted, 'I am anxious about what will become of the quiet war (*dem stillen Kriege*) in which Schelling and I are engaged.' After hinting at Schelling in his first work at Stolp, *Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre* (1803), he now thought that Schelling alluded to him in the *Vorlesungen*.¹²⁰ Schleiermacher appropriated from Friedrich Schlegel the complaint that Schelling's *Darstellung meines System der Philosophie* (1801) amounted to 'love-empty wisdom', a 'dismal system', and 'an unpleasant neighbour'—or 'Spinozism without love'.¹²¹ Both figures, with forceful

¹¹⁸ Schleiermacher to Friedrich Dohna, 9 January 1804 and February, 1804, respectively in *KGA* v/7. 187, and 229.

¹¹⁹ Dorothea Veit to Schleiermacher, 20 November 1802, in *KGA* v/7. 209.

¹²⁰ Schleiermacher to Georg Reimer, 11 November 1803, in *KGA* v/7. 93–4.

¹²¹ Schleiermacher to Georg Reimer, 1 February 1804, in *KGA* v/7. 213; Schlegel to Schleiermacher, 12 April 1802, in *KGA* v/5. 376.

conceptions of ‘individuality’, were well disposed for a ‘quiet war’ of implicit attack and subtle critique.

Unexpectedly, Schleiermacher accepted the Würzburg professorship.

‘Schelling’s contrary character’ awaits, he announced, ‘and I hope that his restless spirit’ will not get the best of him.¹²² ‘What a pity it is that the excellent Schelling does not know how to extract from his genius a certain bourgeois moderation; and I almost fear that in this way Würzburg too will soon become odious to him.’¹²³

Apparently, Schleiermacher did not perceive the irony. On 15 March 1804, he asked to be relieved of his duties in Stolp. On 4 April, he received his official appointment from the Bavarian court. Immediately, however, Friedrich Wilhelm III interceded, not wishing to lose Schleiermacher from Prussia. In a flurry of activity, a royal decree on 24 April refused Schleiermacher’s release from Stolp, and a second decree on 10 May promoted him to *außerordentlicher Professor* of Theology and Preacher to the University of Halle, where he began his celebrated academic career.¹²⁴

Though outside of the scope here to pursue subsequent phases of their ‘quiet war’—or potential agreements between Schelling’s *Identitätsphilosophie* and Schleiermacher’s later *Dialektik* or receptions of Schleiermacher’s dogmatics as ‘Schellingian’—I note one further chronological oddity: the final instalment of Schleiermacher’s review appeared in print on the morning of 23 April, merely one day before Friedrich Wilhelm III signed the edict preventing Schleiermacher and Schelling from becoming colleagues.¹²⁵

¹²² Schleiermacher to Ehrenfried von Willich, 25 February 1804, in *KGA* v/7. 243–4.

¹²³ Schleiermacher to Paulus, 29 February 1804, in *KGA* v/7. 252–3.

¹²⁴ For the relevant decrees and appointment documents, see Dankfried Reetz, *Schleiermacher im Horizont preußischer Politik: Studien und Dokumente zu Schleiermachers Berufung nach Halle, zu seiner Vorlesung über Politik im 1817 und zu den Hintergründen der Demagogenverfolgung* (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2002), 11–67. See also Albert Blackwell, ‘Three New Schleiermacher Letters Relating to His Würzburg Appointment of 1804’, *HTR* 69 (1975), 333–56.

¹²⁵ On potential symmetries between Schelling’s *Identitätsphilosophie* and Schleiermacher’s *Dialektik*, see, e.g., Christine Helmer, Christiane Kranich, and Birgit Rehme-Iffert (eds.), *Schleiermachers Dialektik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2003); Brent W. Sockness, ‘The Forgotten Moralist: Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Science of Spirit’, *HTR* 96 (2003), 317–48; and Andreas Arndt, (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermacher:*

CONCLUSION

Schelling hatched his lectures at least in part to help guide students through university life and theological study. In Schleiermacher's eyes, however, Schelling offered less a northern star than a dense philosophical treatment of abstract themes. Where Schelling allowed for concerns outside of pure *Wissenschaft* to function as organizing principles for the positive sciences, Schleiermacher would maintain the same role for church life as the goal of theology. Though Schleiermacher would agree that theology must redefine its methods along *wissenschaftliche* and historical lines in order to find a place in the modern university, he nevertheless preserved a modified form of the traditional focus of theological study—at least since Reformation-era writers like Hyperius—on the church.¹²⁶ Schelling's conception of the 'Christian view of history' and plea to unite the speculative and historical branches of Christianity would undergird Schleiermacher's very programme.

The dual construction of academic theology from Schelling and Schleiermacher had a substantial influence on Germany's classic intellectual period. In the semi-autobiographical novel *Theodor* (1822) by the prominent Old Testament scholar W. M. L. de Wette, the arrangement made a great impression upon the protagonist Theodor (ostensibly de Wette), which surfaced in de Wette's biblical criticism.¹²⁷ Later theologians, among them Ignaz Thanner (1770–1856), Carl Daub, and the Catholic Tübingens J. S. Drey and J. A. Möhler, applied the concepts resulting from Schelling's and Schleiermacher's exchange to a host of projects, as the

Dialektik (1811) (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986), ix–lxxxiv. On Schleiermacher's dogmatics as 'Schellingian', see Brian Gerrish, *Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 13–48.

¹²⁶ Cf. Brian Gerrish, *A Prince of the Church: Schleiermacher and the Beginnings of Modern Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

¹²⁷ W. M. L. de Wette, *Theodor, oder des Zweiflers Weihe: Bildungsgeschichte eines evangelischen Geistlichen* (Berlin: Reimer, 1822), i. 65.

following chapters argue.¹²⁸ Both speculative and historical concerns also received sustained attention, if conceived somewhat differently, in Hegel, Baur, and Ritschl, among others, who found in Schelling's and Schleiermacher's summation the fuel for an ambitious programme of historical theology that persisted deep into the nineteenth century.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Ignaz Thanner, *Encyklopädisch-methodologische Einleitung zum akademisch-wissenschaftlichen Studium der positiven Theologie, insbesondere der katholischen* (Munich: Lentner, 1809); Carl Daub, 'Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie im Verhältnis zum akademischen Studium beider: Fragment einer Einleitung in letztere', in Carl Daub and Friedrich Creuzer (eds.), *Studien*, ii (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1806), 1–69; and Johann Sebastian Drey, *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System* (Tübingen: Heinrich Laupp, 1819).

¹²⁹ See Christian Danz (ed.), *Schelling und die historische Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013). Cf. Christian Danz, 'Schellings Wesensbestimmung des Christentums in den Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', in Ziche and Frigo, (eds.), *Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften*, 153–84; Carl Hester, 'Gedanken zu Ferdinand Christian Baur's Entwicklung als Historiker anhand zweier unbekannter Briefe', *ZKG* 84 (1973), 249–69; and Claude Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), i, 69 ff. See also Simon Gerber, 'Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte bei Schleiermacher', *JHMTh/ZNThG* 17/1 (2010), 34–55; and Wilhelm Pauck, 'Schleiermacher's Conception of History and Church History', in Pauck, *From Luther to Tillich: The Reformers and Their Heirs*, ed. Marion Pauck (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984), 66–79.

Chapter 6

Schleiermacher from Halle to Berlin

How can the cold dead letter represent the heavenly flowering of the spirit?

Goethe, 1774

Schleiermacher had arrived triumphantly in Halle in October of 1804 as a new professor of theology. Despite the initial fanfare accompanying his arrival, the radical change in Prussia's political fortunes just two years later saw the university close its doors and left Schleiermacher without an academic position. Upon learning that Napoleon had placed Halle in the Kingdom of Westphalia (1807–13), the short-lived vassal state ruled by Napoleon's brother Jérôme Bonaparte, Schleiermacher confessed: 'I cannot accommodate myself to this government and must live under a German prince, so long as there is one. . . . It is impossible for a French government to let a German university exist in peace'. Near the end of 1807, he departed for Berlin.¹

Though Schleiermacher's stay in Halle lasted only from October 1804 to December 1807, it became one of the more fruitful periods in his life—not according to the ledgers of publication results or activity in public life, perhaps, but rather on account of his first experiences as a university theologian.² The constellation of political, educational, and theological events between his start in Halle and the

¹ Friedrich Schleiermacher to Charlotte von Katheren, 31 December 1807, in *KGA* v/8. 615.

² Cf. Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermacher in Halle 1804–1807* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013); and Kurt Nowark, *Schleiermacher: Leben, Werk und Wirkung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 147–63.

founding of the University of Berlin gave rise to his first attempts at describing the task of dogmatics, the nature of theological study, and the practice of hermeneutics—not to mention his Christmas Eve dialogue and a second edition of the *Reden* (1806).³ The final months of 1807 also saw him write his treatise on German universities, *Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten in deutschem Sinn* (1808).⁴ His future pioneering achievements all hearkened back to this period. Even so, the bulk of attention on these matters has centred on the social and political environment of Berlin.⁵ It is necessary, however, to pass first through Halle, the crucible for Schleiermacher's scholarly development.

This chapter and the next zoom in on the context of Schleiermacher's brief tenure at Halle and the eventual founding of the University of Berlin in the wake of Halle's closure. First, I discuss Schleiermacher's early lectures on theological encyclopaedia and the uneven development of his thought on theology as a university discipline. Second, I examine an important and formative series of disputes over the future of the theological curriculum, revolving around Halle but holding profound ramifications for the direction of nineteenth-century German university theology as a whole. Third, I survey the proposals for a new Prussian university in the early 1800s. Though I explored some of the key texts in the previous chapter—Schelling's especially—here I concentrate on Schleiermacher's political memorandum, *Gelegentliche Gedanken*, in conversation with the other leading proposals from Humboldt, Fichte, and Steffens. Without engaging in an exhaustive point-by-point elucidation of these texts, I focus on how the novel conception of

³ See *KGA* i/5. 39–98.

⁴ Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten in deutschem Sinn, nebst einem Anhang über eine neu zu errichtende' (1808), in *KGA* i/6. 15–100. I have derived my English translations of this work in consultation with Schleiermacher, *Occasional Thoughts on Universities in the German Sense, with an Appendix Regarding a University Soon to be Established*, trans. Terrence N. Tice and Edwina Lawler (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2005).

⁵ See Richard Crouter, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Between Enlightenment and Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 140–68.

Wissenschaft and what Schelling called the ‘general encyclopaedia of the sciences’ influenced the formation of the university and the nature of theological study.

THE PROMISE OF A NEW PROFESSOR

When Schleiermacher set foot in Halle, he found himself underprepared for and overwhelmed with the demands of his new vocation. A mixture of grand ambitions and extreme reluctance to commit ideas to print hung over his academic beginning. He admitted to friends that apart from loneliness, his ‘greatest complaint’ was that he could not manage any work beyond that which his lectures required. In addition to the challenge of organizing for the first time disparate thoughts in a coherent manner, the prospect of failing to finish other projects, like his translation of Plato’s dialogues, greatly distressed him. Despite ‘working myself deeper and deeper into my vocation, and with real zest’, he said, he confessed that nearly all tasks took him four times longer than anticipated.⁶ He was, in other words, merely attempting to stay afloat.

Over the course of its first hundred years of existence, the University of Halle oscillated between the eighteenth century’s two major poles: *Pietismus* and *Aufklärung*. Hence the popular student slogan from the period: ‘So you are going to Halle? You will either return a pietist or an atheist!’⁷ Francke’s pietist legacy had largely waned, overcome by successive appointments of Enlightenment thinkers from the 1750s onward. With Baumgarten and Semler, Halle’s theological faculty acquired a rationalist reputation that persisted into the nineteenth century. At the time that Schleiermacher took his post, the faculty included full professors Nösselt, Niemeyer, and G. C. Knapp (1753–1825)—holdovers from Schleiermacher’s students days at

⁶ See Schleiermacher to Henriette and Ehrenfried von Willich, 21 November 1804, 13 June 1805, and 26 November 1805, respectively in *KGA* v/8. 41–4, 233–6, and 375–8.

⁷ Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten: Vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart* (3rd edn, Leipzig: Veit, 1919–21), i. 537–9.

Halle—and J. S. Vater (1771–1826). Nösselt and Niemeyer, in particular, evoked descriptions among many conservative clergy of ‘Hallesche Rationalismus’. Their roles in the divisive, decade-long conflict with Wöllner over the *Religionsedikt* (1788) played no small part in constructing the image of Halle’s theological faculty as one of the most Enlightenment-influenced in Germany.⁸ Nösselt drew a large number of theology students to the university—even certain faculty members had spent brief periods of time as tutors in the Nösselt household.⁹

In fall of 1804, his first semester, Schleiermacher lectured on three courses: dogmatics, ethics, and the encyclopaedia and methodology of theology.¹⁰ When seeking out textbooks to accompany his own notes on theological encyclopaedia, he turned to the familiar tomes by Planck and Nösselt. He also used Nösselt’s complementary survey of theological literature.¹¹ Only a mere nine days before his first lecture, Schleiermacher wrote to his publisher Georg Reimer in Berlin in order to request a copy of Nösselt’s three-volume *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen* (1786–9; 2nd edn, 1791)—suggesting that he did not have a copy of the work before then—and only acknowledged receipt of it on 4 November, over two weeks after the semester’s start.¹² Quickly, however, he grew dissatisfied with both Nösselt’s and Planck’s texts. Neither was particularly concise—according to Schleiermacher, a fatal flaw. Nor did they offer anything particularly original, he held. He referred to ‘our honest (*ehrlichen*) Nösselt’ as being ‘no less garrulous (*geschwätziger*) than

⁸ Wilhelm Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1894), i. 513–33; Johann Karl Bullman, *Denkwürdige Zeitperioden der Universität Halle von ihrer Stiftung an, nebst einer Chronologie dieser Hochschule seit dem Jahre 1805 bis jetzt* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1833), 43–58.

⁹ Heinrich Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands am achtzehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert: nach ihrem Leben und Wirken* (Neustadt: Wagner, 1831–5), i. 563.

¹⁰ Cf. *Catalogus praelectionum in Academia Fredericiana per semestre hiemale anni MDCCCIV a die XV. octobr. institutendarum. Halae, formis Io. Christ. Hendelii* (Halle, 1804).

¹¹ See Schleiermacher to Georg Reimer, 6 September 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 304. Cf. Johann August Nösselt, *Anweisung zur Kenntniß der besten allgemeineren Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie* (3rd edn, Leipzig, 1790). Schleiermacher used an older edition; Nösselt issued a fourth edition in 1800.

¹² Schleiermacher to Reimer, 13 October 1804, Schleiermacher to Reimer, 4 November 1804, respectively in *KGA* v/8. 3, and 16–18. Cf. Reimer to Schleiermacher, 21 October 1804, in *KGA* v/8. 9–10.

Planck'.¹³ Not yet a 'system-builder' himself, Schleiermacher complained that both texts suppressed the logic by which theology could claim to be a single discipline in the university under the weight of wordy digressions. Intra-faculty politics also occasioned his frustration.

A total of thirty students enrolled for Schleiermacher's first course on theological encyclopaedia, delivered under the title 'Encyclopaedia et Methodologia studii theologici'; he repeated the course in the summer semester of 1805.¹⁴ During both semesters, Nösselt gave a series of companion lectures, on theological bibliography in the tradition of *historia literaria* and on the 'most useful study of theology' (*Anweisung zum nützlichsten Studium der Theologie*), assigning his own textbooks.¹⁵ On 4 November 1804, Schleiermacher wrote to Reimer, 'theological encyclopaedia is very important to me and I almost think to make it a fixed course. Perhaps it is also the first thing that I will have printed. . . . For one or another [subject], I would like to write an aphoristic compendium, as it is a lovely genre'.¹⁶ But Schleiermacher also expressed a marked reticence to diverge much if at all from Nösselt's organization of the material—he not only used Nösselt's work, but was thirty-four-years younger than his colleague; Nösselt had been a full professor at Halle since 1765, three years before Schleiermacher's birth.¹⁷ Though there are no extant notes from these initial lectures, a close look at Schleiermacher's correspondence provides insight into the development of his ideas.

Schleiermacher spoke often about his wish to publish his early notes on theological encyclopaedia, but, in point of fact, exhibited a chronic hesitation to circulate them for public consumption. Joachim Christian Gaß (1766–1831), who

¹³ Schleiermacher to Joachim Christian Gaß, 13 November 1804, in W. Gaß (ed.), *Fr. Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel mit J. Chr. Gaß* (Berlin: Reimer, 1852), 2.

¹⁴ Dirk Schmid, 'Historische Einführung', in *KGA* i/6. xxxvi.

¹⁵ *Intelligenzblatt Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* 155 (26 September 1804), 1256; 56 (6 April 1805), 449.

¹⁶ Schleiermacher to Reimer, 4 November 1804, in *KGA* v/8. 16–18.

¹⁷ Schleiermacher to Gaß, 13 November 1804, in *KGA* v/8. 24–5.

had studied at Halle with Schleiermacher in the 1780s, queried him repeatedly on their status, each time failing to elicit his desired response.¹⁸ At one point, Gaß pleaded: ‘Now that the third volume on Plato is finished . . . will you give us your compendium (*Leitfaden*) to the encyclopaedia, because it contains your view of theology? For the right view is lacking everywhere, and until this is produced, the prevailing confusion cannot be resolved. How thankful should your audience be, if they had a sense of what is right! Good heavens, what a miserable time it was when I studied theology; I truly cannot think of it without indignation’. Like Schleiermacher, Gaß bemoaned Nösselt’s theological encyclopaedia from his own student years on account of its lengthy and repeated bibliographic lists.¹⁹

In September of 1805, Schleiermacher confided that as he repeated his lectures on theological encyclopaedia, he felt a stronger conviction in his initial ideas. In about six months, he said, when his notes acquired a more mature form, he would solicit the opinions of friends; for it was ‘almost inevitable’ that a large public audience would misunderstand a work of aphorisms.²⁰ On 25 October, he relayed to Reimer that he was working on ‘a very small handbook to my lectures on theological encyclopaedia’ and intended to publish it in the following year. For a follow-up project, he thought of producing something in dogmatics.²¹ Over the winter months, Schleiermacher continued to send similar messages to his publisher, while also putting him off whenever necessary. In December, Schleiermacher confirmed for Reimer that he still had hopes for a ‘small theological compendium’; in February, he claimed that he would have the manuscript finished and ready to go to print in just over one year’s time.²²

¹⁸ Gaß to Schleiermacher, 1 September 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 301.

¹⁹ Gaß to Schleiermacher, 20 July 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 254.

²⁰ Schleiermacher to Reimer, 6 September 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 304.

²¹ Schleiermacher to Reimer, 25 October 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 348.

²² Schleiermacher to Reimer, 21 December 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 398; Schleiermacher to Reimer, 21 February 1806, in *KGA* v/8. 472–4.

Schleiermacher's letter to Gaß on 16 November 1805 offers a deeper glimpse into his aims for the 'aphoristic compendium' and the context in which he worked: 'Since it seems to bring you so much pleasure, I am sending to you . . . as much of my encyclopaedia as there is at present. Unfortunately, you will see at once that the first part is not complete, the second is lacking entirely, and of the third, only the first half is present', Schleiermacher wrote. 'I am especially keen to know now whether you approve of the given representation of the whole in the general introduction and the arrangement and structure of the historical part. I am determined rather firmly to have printed a very small overview in paragraphs when I re-read the course'. That firm determination stemmed from his desire 'to compel the academic theologians, as it were, to take some consideration' of 'their old negligence (which still powerfully haunts us in an official *Instruction for Prospective Theologians* [*Anweisung für angehende Theologen*])'.²³ After another request from Gaß, Schleiermacher responded finally in the summer of 1806 that come winter, when he was scheduled to teach the course a third time, he would in all likelihood finally publish his notes.²⁴ Napoleon's invasion of Prussia in that calamitous summer, however, disrupted those plans.

Despite the false promises and missed deadlines, it is clear that Schleiermacher was concerned with the relations between theology and history in his encyclopaedia even at this stage, and had already decided on a tripartite structure. He intended to take a swipe at some of his colleagues, whom he sarcastically called 'the academic theologians', but he did not specify whom he had in mind and for what reasons. These issues come into focus when considering the 'haunting' text he referred to at the end of the letter to Gaß, the *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, a guidebook for Halle's theological students.

²³ Schleiermacher to Gaß, 16 November 1805, in *KGA* v/8. 365–6.

²⁴ Schleiermacher to Gaß, summer 1806 (n.d.), in W. Gaß (ed.), *Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel*, 52.

A PERPLEXING GUIDEBOOK AND THE PRECARIOUS FUTURE OF THE CURRICULUM

On the first two days of April 1806, patrons of the *JALZ* found among its contents parts one and two of a thirteen-page, 4,500-word book review. On the face of it, this was a rather unremarkable occurrence. The *JALZ* had existed since 1804, went to print three times a week, and published countless reviews for Germany's reading public. It was the same periodical in which Schleiermacher had critiqued Schelling's *Vorlesungen*. In this case, the target of the extended, highly unfavourable review was rather unusual, but involved Schleiermacher as well: a thirty-two-page guidebook issued to matriculating theology students at the University of Halle in the autumn of 1805. Apart from making an odd choice for review, what, exactly, makes the incident noteworthy? The circumstances surrounding the guidebook, like Schelling's lectures, proved consequential for Schleiermacher's ideas on university theology and the shape of theological encyclopaedia.

The *Anweisung* resembled in both form and content a manual for the aid of students. It also represented a plan for reshaping the theological curriculum. Its title, *Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums*, alluded clearly to Nösselt's popular textbook.²⁵ Over the next few decades—even after the University of Halle merged with the University of Wittenberg in 1817—Halle's theological faculty regularly published new though mostly unchanged editions of it.²⁶ After offering a brief rationale for its appearance, the guidebook addressed four major

²⁵ The full title is *Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums und zur Kenntniß der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der Königlichen Preussischen Friedrichsuniversität* (Halle, 1805), in HABW, M: Pd 370 (2). References here are to this edition.

²⁶ Cf. the first edition with subsequent editions from 1821 (in HABW, M: Pd 370 (2a)), 1825 (in UBL, Theol.Enz.157/2), 1832 (in ULBSA, AB 140549), and 1837 (in UBT, Gi 3504 ah). The latter all testified to the Halle-Wittenberg merger; thus, *Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums zur Kenntniß der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der Königlichen Preussischen vereinigten Halle- und Wittenbergischen Friedrichsuniversität* (Halle, 1821).

concerns: first, an overview of the theological curriculum; second, a statement on the joint theological-pedagogical seminar; third, a report on the operating procedures of the local libraries; and fourth, a discussion of the course catalogue.²⁷

The *Anweisung* began by lamenting the poor preparation of students. ‘Long experience has taught us of very many who commenced without having any clear idea of the scope of [theology], the connection of its parts, and the most appropriate method to make them known’. Increasingly, it suggested, beginning students displayed little acquaintance with the ideas that theology assumes, entering the university with only a modicum of the requisite ‘preliminary knowledge’ required for serious study. Underprepared students made one incorrect judgment after another in choosing which lectures to attend—so much were they characterized by lack of planning in their education (*Planlosigkeit der Studiums*). Professors had grown tired of ‘the loudly-voiced complaints at the end of one’s academic years, [from those who] learned too late how differently these years should have been used’—a perennial concern! This sad state of affairs ‘compelled’ the faculty to issue to every incoming student a guidebook to structure their theological education.²⁸

The first major section was the most substantial, covering an ‘overview of theological study’. As a part of human learning (*Gelehrsamkeit*), the study of theology required ‘diversity in prior knowledge’ and a ‘general education in the humanities’, just like the ‘other so-called faculties of science’ (*Fakultätswissenschaften*). The guidebook counselled a thorough engagement with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and universal history.²⁹ Further, it declared, ‘the main purpose of the academic study of theology as such is none other than to raise the popular religious knowledge (*Religionserkenntniß*), which, due to its practical impact, should be found to some

²⁷ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 4.

²⁸ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 3–4.

²⁹ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 5.

degree in every thinking person, to a scholarly and scientific knowledge' (*gelehrten und wissenschaftlichen Erkenntniß*).³⁰ One discerns here traces of Halle's original theological seminar, the *Franckesche Stiftung*, created by Francke for training students in Hebrew and Greek and preparing future clergy.³¹ The declaration also reflected the gradual transformation away from a hortatory approach to theological study enacted with Mosheim and Semler, both of whom distinguished 'religion' from 'theology'. 'Scholarly or academic theology (*gelehrte Theologie*) considered as a whole', it read, 'consists in a series of interrelated learned skills (*Kenntnisse*) and sciences' (*Wissenschaften*); assertions of the necessity of piety remained conspicuously absent.³²

The *Anweisung* employed theology's conventional fourfold pattern: exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical. In order to properly orient new students, Halle's faculty observed, 'a complete overview [of theology] including the concept, content, extent, and purpose of each individual discipline and their interrelationship is to be had in the theological encyclopaedia. . . . Everyone should begin his studies with this'. The core component of the guidebook was, in fact, this specific recommendation of an introductory, unifying course. The faculty even stated that the *Anweisung* as a whole presented 'the first overview of the field, a very brief description of it, [and] the first foundations of an encyclopaedia'.³³ Later editions repeated these pronouncements verbatim.³⁴

After taking the course on theological encyclopaedia, the student of theology would spend the rest of the first year in the university increasing proficiency in

³⁰ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 6.

³¹ On the history of Halle's seminar, see Adolf Wuttke, *Zur Geschichte des theologischen Seminars der Universität Halle: Aus den Acten des Facultätsarchiv* (Halle: Plötz, 1869).

³² *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 7.

³³ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 7.

³⁴ Cf. 'Studienplan für die Studirenden der Theologie auf der Universität Halle', in Johann Friedrich Koch (ed.), *Die preussischen Universitäten: Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1839–40), ii. 216–33.

‘auxiliary sciences’ like the biblical and classical languages, philology, and history, and then take up exegetical studies, carefully attending to hermeneutics and *critica sacra*, applying the methods of classical textual criticism to the biblical texts.

Systematic and historical theology would occupy the second year, with a pronounced accent placed upon the latter. ‘The history of the Christian religion and . . . the Christian church, is by far the most important thing for the Christian theologian.

Christian church history is also of the greatest usefulness to all other parts of theology, especially systematics, and serves as well to survey the state of the theological sciences (*Wissenschaften*) in every age. Because of the exceptional wealth of material, at least one year’s course of study [in historical theology] is necessary.’³⁵

Historical theology’s components included the history of Christian dogma, symbolics (the ‘historical-dogmatic explanation of the confessions of the Protestant church’), the study of antiquity (*die Alterthumskunde*) and biblical archaeology, and theological bibliography—the latter so as not ‘to remain ignorant of the most important books in our discipline’.³⁶ The third year would focus on practical theology and the activities of the theological-pedagogical seminar, including homiletical training. The *Anweisung* concluded with a list of all lectures offered in the standard order in which students should attend them.³⁷

The *JALZ*’s critical review of the *Anweisung* appeared under the initials of ‘P.F.T.’, but was penned by one Johann Stephan Schütze (1771–1839), known more for his contributions to the arts and his connection to Goethe in Weimar than for any theological accomplishments.³⁸ Born in the western edge of Magdeburg to a wealthy farmer, Schütze studied theology briefly at Halle and Erlangen from 1794 to 1797.

³⁵ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 11–12.

³⁶ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 12.

³⁷ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 30–1. For a related list at the University of Kiel, see Johann Otto Thieß, *Gelehrten Geschichte der Universität zu Kiel* (Kiel, 1800–3), i. 286.

³⁸ ‘Rezension: Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Übersicht ihres Studiums und zur Kenntniss der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der königlichen preußischen Friedrichs-Universität’, *JALZ* 77–8 (1–2 April 1806), 1–13. Cf. *KGA* v/9. 4.

Around the time that he wrote the review, he was a member of the Weimar salon of Johanna Schopenhauer, mother of the pessimistic philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer.³⁹

Schütze's review opened by exclaiming that just as Pestalozzi had reformed the education of Germany's youth, the 'dead' curriculum in the Germany university system desperately needed a new, living spirit to reanimate it according to the demands of the present day. It is 'urgent to examine openly and rigorously the standards of teaching and learning . . . inherited from the Middle Ages', which remain 'a ruin of barbarous antiquity'.⁴⁰ Book catalogues, however, already overflowed with mediocre proposals for reform. What made Halle's guidebook different, in Schütze's eyes, was its particularity or potential usefulness to the specific community of Halle. 'There is no shortage of instructions for the study of theology in general: rare are works that sketch out for the members (*Bürger*) of a particular university, according to circumstances of time and place, the path on which one can most securely pursue one's goal'.⁴¹

After its hopeful beginning, the review acquired a highly critical, censorious tone. The idea behind Halle's guidebook was sound, Schütze granted, but the execution was not. Above all, he faulted the guidebook for failing to deliver on its promises: as "'the first foundations of an encyclopaedia", it is really all too poor, too imperfect. . . . The description of the individual parts rely on several somewhat archaic notions'. The name of *Wissenschaft*, he said, was given to a 'most unworthy' collection of skills. Time allotted to so-called 'auxiliary sciences' should be expanded, and the exacting requirements for proficiency across theology's specialized subdisciplines should be relaxed. At the same time, the curriculum, apart

³⁹ Cf. J. S. Schütze, 'Die Abendgesellschaften der Hofrätin Schopenhauer in Weimer, 1806–1830', in *Weimars Album zur vierten Säcularfeier der Buchdruckerkunst am 24. Juni 1840* (Weimar: Albrecht, 1840), 185–204.

⁴⁰ 'Rezension: Anweisung', 2.

⁴¹ 'Rezension: Anweisung', 1.

from a general emphasis on history, seemed to lack a clear goal: ‘nowhere is there a *facultas theologi* in a scientific sense (*wissenschaftlichem Sinne*), but the whole of theology is a composition of some parts of philosophy, some of philology, and many of history’. With so many ‘defects’ in the plan, the abilities of the ‘venerable society’ comprising Halle’s theological faculty would surely be called into question—or was some ‘subaltern hand’ behind the entire guidebook? The proposals constantly dressed up trivialities with the robes of scholarly pretence, Schütze argued, complaining that terms like ‘encyclopaedia’ and ‘exegesis’ appeared not in German, but ‘ostentatiously’ and ‘pedantically’ in Greek. Halle’s faculty ‘stifled freedom’ and damaged the ‘uplifting feelings of youth’ by imposing stringent regulations governing the required ‘testimony of the faculty’—a kind of report card for outgoing students—all of which amounted to a ‘miserable mechanism’.⁴² The sweeping proposals from Bahrddt and Campe in the 1780s and 1790s lurked unmistakably in the background of the review. By the end, Halle’s plan possessed virtually no positive qualities at all.

Schleiermacher read the review as soon as it was published. On 18 April 1806, Eichstädt, editor of the *JALZ*, sent Schleiermacher a note which pleaded for him to consider the critical review of ‘the Ordo Theologiae Halensis’ with an open mind, and be willing to give censure where censure was due.⁴³ One week later, Schleiermacher wrote to Gaß: ‘There was recently a very honest (*brav*) review of the *Anweisung* of the theological faculty here in the *Jenaische Literatur-Zeitung*. I saw it first in Berlin, and both there and here [in Halle] many want to attribute it to me. I have declared overtly through it all that essentially I would be in complete agreement with the review, but that I would be sorry if one were to credit me with such

⁴² ‘Rezension: Anweisung’, 3–4, 7, 9, 11–12. On the faculty testimony, see *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 30–2. Cf. Johann Christoph Hoffbauer, *Geschichte der Universität zu Halle bis zum Jahre 1805* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1805), 420; and F. A. G. Tholuck, *Geschichte des Pietismus und des ersten Stadiums der Aufklärung* (Berlin: Wiegandt, 1865), 29–31.

⁴³ H. K. A. Eichstädt to Schleiermacher, 18 April 1806, in *KGA* v/9. 4–5.

impropriety (*Unschicklichkeit*). Poor Niemeyer . . . who comes off the worst'.⁴⁴

Niemeyer had long presided over Halle's pedagogical seminar. Schleiermacher's statement to Gaß reveals that he had no involvement with the plan, even though his name was included among its list of authors. The guidebook's title page announced only that 'the faculty of theology' edited it. The preface similarly assigned responsibility to 'the members of the faculty of theology'.⁴⁵ Exact authorship remained anything but clear. These declarations masked the figures primarily responsible for its composition and smoothed over considerable frictions within the faculty.

If Schleiermacher was sympathetic to the review, Halle's other theologians were not. On 14 May 1806, the faculty issued a public response in the *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung*, a wing of the *JALZ* for announcements and advertisements. Recent comments in the *JALZ*, insisted the response, 'compelled' the faculty to explain that the guidebook had been composed with the 'complete agreement' of all faculty members, who 'best know the needs of the theologians studying here [in Halle].' The explanation concluded by listing the names of Nösselt, Knapp, Niemeyer, Vater, and, lastly, Schleiermacher.⁴⁶ Despite the show of solidarity, Schleiermacher had no actual involvement with the explanation, either. The affair, an embarrassing contradiction for those who knew where Schleiermacher stood, threatened to further embroil the faculty if it continued in the public sphere. 'What will you say about the fact that I have signed the "explanation" of the faculty here against the Jena review!' Schleiermacher quizzed Gaß.

⁴⁴ Schleiermacher to Gaß, 25 April 1806, in W. Gaß (ed.), *Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel*, 44–6.

⁴⁵ *Anweisung für angehende Theologen*, 4.

⁴⁶ 'Erklärung', *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* 71 (14 May 1806), 568.

Knapp drafted the explanation and put my name to it, with the remark in the [faculty] bulletin: he did so specifically, because I, after all, would see the text before the printer would. . . . Niemeyer had sent the proof sheet to me and asked me whether I had something to add; [but] I could not give my approval to the entire enterprise at that time and . . . of course I had not noticed anything. The main intent of the explanation seemed to me, however, only to go against the vicious insinuations of the review, and there was, moreover, the first order of business, which seemed in the faculty. So I wrote only in the [faculty] bulletin that however things stood in the explanation, it found no application with me. Still, I joined in the main point; I had nothing against the signature. I am happy to admit, however, that it would have pleased me if I could have had even one occasion to explain myself publicly about the matter. In my lectures I have the opportunity to do so indirectly enough, and the most direct time will come next winter when I teach the encyclopaedia again and probably also publish [the notes]—which, in view of this history, seems only all the more certain.⁴⁷

Ostensibly, this strange episode was only a blip in the practice of criticism: a reviewer, identified only by three initials, lambasted a small guide, offered free of charge to incoming university students, in a journal for the German literati, and the faculty—or at least some of the faculty—responded.

But the episode also pointed to fundamental problems confronting the academic study of theology. On a broader historical note, it illustrates a growing dissatisfaction with late eighteenth-century attitudes toward theology as an academic discipline, toward its internal character and organization, and an increasing demand for a ‘modern’ method. The old approach of book lists, massive intellectual feats of memorization, instruction in philosophy only as preparatory to theology, had, in Schleiermacher’s view and that of the *JALZ* critique, come to a head. Nothing seemed to anchor theology’s branches to one another in the welter of the revolutionary context. Though intermixing obvious hagiographical notions, Heinrich Scholz, in the first critical edition of Schleiermacher’s encyclopaedia from 1910, characterized Halle’s guidebook as ‘a manifesto of 32 pages’, a ‘genuine sign of the times, that is, the epoch that Schleiermacher and his generation were appointed to overcome’. Scholz subjected the *Anweisung* to a litany of stinging adjectives:

⁴⁷ Schleiermacher to Gaß, summer 1806 (n.d.), W. Gaß (ed.), *Schleiermacher’s Briefwechsel*, 52–3.

‘Mindless (*Geistlos*), formless, cluttered, and pedantic, it represented the scholastic and schoolmasterly (*schulmäßigschulmeisterlichen*) activity in as many disciplines as possible without regard for ideal factors as the normal form of theological study, though the generation of Schleiermacher, under the leadership of Fichte and Schelling, had discovered the . . . true value of *Wissenschaft*’.⁴⁸

In the turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, opinions on theological pedagogy underwent a radical shift, the cumulative force of which rivalled the sweeping changes from the Reformation era.⁴⁹ The pedagogical literature from the 1780s onward bore the marks of a tension between two orientations. On one hand, there was a desire to reform and to modernize, sometimes with an eye cast affectionately toward the French system of academies in place of ‘obsolete’ and ‘medieval’ universities. Increasingly, the call went out to ‘meet the demands of a new day’, each time with more force and with proposed reforms untethered from older, comparatively modest, suggestions in works like John Locke’s *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693). On the other hand, the *Gelehrtenstand*, the learned estate populated with long-time scholars both inside and outside of traditional educational institutions, hoped to retain the traditions of the past, classical languages and literature, theology, and general broad-based learning. Niemeyer, Nösselt, and Halle’s *Anweisung* exhibited this complex, contradictory legacy. In this regard, Scholz was correct to identify the *Anweisung* as ‘a sign of the times’.

Less than a month after Nösselt’s death in 1807, Schleiermacher found it difficult to muster even the slightest appreciation for his former professor and colleague. ‘That our old Nösselt died, you know from all the newspapers’, he mentioned to Gaß. ‘To me, the man is a true demonstration of how one can be very

⁴⁸ Heinrich Scholz, introduction to Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf Einleitender Vorlesungen*, ed. Heinrich Scholz (Leipzig: Deichert, 1910; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), xv.

⁴⁹ Cf. Rudolf Mau, ‘Programme und Praxis des Theologiestudiums im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert’, *ThV* 11 (1979), 71–91.

learned and have a great reputation, and yet accomplish so little'. What does the world benefit from Nösselt's knowledge of books (*Bücherkenntniß*)? Schleiermacher asked, though he himself relied on the *Bücherkenntniß* to keep up with new scholarship. In the lecture hall, he continued, Nösselt exhibited 'little lively stimulation; in general, the man had less spirit (*Geist*) and talent than is now—thank God—required. And of his many grateful pupils', concluded Schleiermacher, 'there is probably not even one who could boast that [Nösselt] unlocked for him the temple of wisdom'.⁵⁰ Like Halle under Napoleon, the old order crumbled.

'And yet', Henrich Steffens ventured, 'just at the time when the country seemed half-ruined . . . and a sorrowful future seemed to await the whole land, an effort was put forth that even after ten years of perfect peace would seem incredible. . . . At that moment Fichte stepped forward . . . Schleiermacher, too. . . . Everyone looked with confidence to the founding of the new University of Berlin . . . the centre of the brightest hopes for Germany. The founding of the university was a grand event.'⁵¹

THE IDEA AND THE MODEL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

A landmark in the history of universities, the University of Berlin resulted from a remarkable political initiative organized principally by the high-ranking Prussian official Karl Friedrich Beyme, among others.⁵² The initiative to which Schleiermacher's university proposal belonged attracted other memoranda from the likes of Fichte, Humboldt, and Steffens, which addressed the structure and ethos of

⁵⁰ Schleiermacher to Gaß, 6 April 1807, in W. Gaß (ed.), *Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel*, 64.

⁵¹ Henrich Steffens, *Was ich erlebte: Aus der Erinnerung niedergeschrieben* (Breslau: Josef Max, 1840–4), iv, 136–7, 140–2.

⁵² On Beyme, see *NDB* ii. 208.

the university and the proper balance between the free pursuit of knowledge and the interests of the state.⁵³ Humboldt had received a call to serve as Director of the Section for Ecclesiastical Affairs and Education at the Ministry of the Interior from the autumn of 1808, a post he held until just before the opening of the university in 1810. Accordingly, scholars have long characterized the new institution as infused with ‘Humboldtian ideals’ of education (*Bildung*), government, academic freedom, and research.⁵⁴ Friedrich Paulsen called Schleiermacher’s proposal the ‘intellectual charter’ of the University of Berlin.⁵⁵ Schleiermacher also served as part of a four-member commission tasked with drafting statutes for the university. The provisional statutes of 1810 and the official statutes of 1817—approved after the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna—all rested heavily on Schleiermacher’s ideas. In a section on teaching duties, the statutes intriguingly enjoined Berlin’s professors to cover the encyclopaedia and methodology of theology.⁵⁶ Fichte, moreover, became the first elected rector of the university.⁵⁷ For our purposes, I foreground the

⁵³ See the proposals reproduced in Ernst Anrich (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität: Die fünf Grundschriften aus der Zeit der ihrer Neubegründung durch klassischen Idealismus und romantischen Realismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956). See also Elinor S. Shaffer, ‘Romantic Philosophy and the Organization of the Disciplines: The Founding of the University of Berlin’, in Andrew Cunningham and Nicholas Jardine (eds.), *Romanticism and the Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 38–54; and Herbert Richardson, *Schleiermacher and the Founding of the University of Berlin: The Study of Religion as a Scientific Discipline* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1991).

⁵⁴ See, e.g., Rudolf Vierhaus, ‘Wilhelm von Humboldt’, in Wolfgang Treue and Karlfried Gründer (eds.), *Wissenschaftspolitik in Berlin: Minister, Beamte, Ratgeber* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1987), 63–76. For the relevant records during his tenure, see Wilhelm Weischedel (ed.), *Idee und Wirklichkeit einer Universität: Dokumente zur Geschichte der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960); and R. Köpke, *Die Gründung der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Berlin: Schade, 1860). Cf. Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, ‘Die Universität zu Berlin—Vorgeschichte und Einrichtung’, in Rüdiger vom Bruch and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden* (Berlin: Akademie, 2012), i. 3–76; and Walter Rüegg, ‘Der Mythos der Humboldtschen Universität’, in Matthias Krieg and Martin Rose (eds.), *Universitas in theologia, theologia in universitate* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1996), 155–76.

⁵⁵ Friedrich Paulsen, *The German Universities and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly and William W. Elwang (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1906), 50.

⁵⁶ ‘Die Statuten der theologischen Fakultät’, in Paul Daude (ed.), *Die königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin: Systematische Zusammenstellung der für dieselbe bestehenden gesetzlichen, statutarischen und regelmentarischen Bestimmung* (Berlin: Müller, 1887), 56, III. §39.

⁵⁷ Theodor Schmalz (1760–1831) was appointed as the initial rector in 1810, but soon resigned. After a faculty senate vote, Fichte was elected to the position. See Max Lenz, *Geschichte der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1910–18), i. 327, 397–402.

consensus on ‘encyclopaedic science’ among the models of the university advanced by these thinkers, and note what this entailed for academic theology.

In the first place, the memoranda shared the assumption that *Wissenschaft* embodied the true sense of philosophy, the discipline responsible for the organization of knowledge. Philosophy as ‘the science of science’, they agreed, occupies the core of the ideal university and justifies the organic unity of knowledge amid the diversity of scientific fields. Each text was drafted in the midst of French challenges not only to the university’s continued existence, but also to the idea of a distinctly German ‘national’ institution of education. In December 1807, only two months after finishing his own memorandum, Fichte delivered the first of fourteen lectures in the amphitheatre of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, beginning his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*.⁵⁸ Similarly, Schleiermacher intended to highlight ‘the contrast between the German universities and French special schools’.⁵⁹ Before turning to Schleiermacher’s proposal, I first take up the texts from Humboldt, Steffens, and Fichte.

In his fragmentary memorandum of c.1809, ‘Über die innere und äußere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin’, Humboldt set down eloquently the intellectual purpose of the university as the cultivation of the ‘pure idea of *Wissenschaft*’.⁶⁰ Yet Humboldt’s ‘pure idea’ contained more than the typical idealist conception of *Wissenschaft* as the totality of human knowledge. To this view he brought a new, internal impulse, one part and parcel with the modern research imperative. In his plan for the new university, *Wissenschaft* acquired

⁵⁸ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Addresses to the German Nation*, ed. Gregory Moore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), xi.

⁵⁹ Schleiermacher to Karl Gustav von Brinckmann, 1 March 1808, in *ASL* iv. 149.

⁶⁰ Wilhelm von Humboldt, ‘Über die innere und äußere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin’, in Anrich (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität*, 377. The memorandum was never published, but was found among Humboldt’s estate in the late nineteenth century. See Bruno Gebhardt, *Wilhelm von Humboldt als Staatsmann* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1896–9), i. 118. Cf. Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 179–80.

dynamic qualities. 'It is further characteristic of higher institutions of learning that they all treat *Wissenschaft* as a not yet wholly solved problem and are therefore never done with research. This is in contrast to the schools, which take as their subject only the complete and agreed-upon results of knowledge and teach these. This difference completely changes the relationship between teacher and student . . . [so that] the teacher no longer exists for the sake of the student; both exist for the sake of *Wissenschaft*.'⁶¹ Humboldt acknowledged that schools have the responsibility to teach a set body of knowledge to students, but he also counselled teachers to sustain an ongoing research programme dedicated to the discovery of new fields of knowledge, even in the midst of their many teaching responsibilities. Pursuit of *Wissenschaft* in the university meant engaging in a process of critical enquiry that would lead to spiritual and intellectual character formation (*Bildung*). In the new institution, Humboldt maintained, 'everything depends on the preservation of the principle that *Wissenschaft* is to be regarded as something not wholly found and never wholly able to be found, but always as something to be searched for. . . . As soon as one stops searching for *Wissenschaft*, everything is irrevocably and forever lost.'⁶²

Steffens relayed a similar vision in a series of seven lectures, 'Über die Idee der Universitäten', delivered during the winter of 1808–9 in Halle, which by then belonged to the Kingdom of Westphalia.⁶³ His proposal underlined the opportunity to create a cutting-edge institution of the highest calibre that would rise above the surrounding chaos and disorder. '[A]ll parts of life have been shaken; states to which we belonged, overthrown; forms of life that seemed indestructible, suddenly disappeared. . . . [And] did you think the dead letter of the scholars (*die toten Buchstaben der Gelehrten*) could remain indestructible, while all forms of life are subject

⁶¹ Humboldt, 'Über die innere und äußere Organisation', 377–8.

⁶² Humboldt, 'Über die innere und äußere Organisation', 379.

⁶³ Henrich Steffens, 'Vorlesungen über die Idee der Universitäten', in Anrich (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität*, 309–74.

to change by force?’⁶⁴ What should distinguish the future university, Steffens declared, is that all efforts ‘be focused on the inner essence of *Wissenschaft*, on the internal organization of all knowledge, that is, on the highest [task] of all speculation’. ‘From this centre of the whole’ (*Mittelpunkt des Ganzen*), he continued, in terms reminiscent of Schiller and Schelling, ‘the light extends first to the individual parts, and these are by no means conceived of as isolated, but rather as living parts of the one and indivisible knowledge’.⁶⁵ The same idealist, encyclopaedic ethos found among his peers permeated Steffens’s thought. Though his lectures did not exercise as much influence on the precise shape of Berlin’s new institution as the other proposals, they nevertheless rounded out the impressive theoretical discussion among the ‘Grundschriften’ or founding treatises of the University of Berlin.

Among all of the proposals, Fichte’s was the most radical and innovative. He wrote his *Deduzierter Plan einer zu Berlin zu errichtenden höhern Lehranstalt* (1808), a charter document of sorts for the university, in the fall of 1807.⁶⁶ As the title indicates, Fichte sought to ‘deduce’ a concept of the university from rational principles.⁶⁷ He envisioned it as a ‘purist community’, which ‘would have combined the zeal of a monastery with the intellectual drive of Plato’s academy’.⁶⁸ Indeed, Fichte’s ‘philosophical artist’, a figure not unlike Plato’s philosopher-king, would preside over the quasi-monastic institution, and students, like monks, would reap the benefits of ‘complete isolation’ from all worldly distractions.⁶⁹ ‘When the institution begins, this philosophical artist must be a single person and no one else will have any

⁶⁴ Steffens, ‘Über die Idee der Universitäten’, 317–8.

⁶⁵ Steffens, ‘Über die Idee der Universitäten’, 320.

⁶⁶ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, ‘Deduzierter Plan einer zu Berlin zu errichtenden höhern Lehranstalt, die in gehöriger Verbindung mit einer Akademie der Wissenschaften stehe’, in Anrich (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität*, 125–217. Cf. G. H. Turnbull (ed.), *The Educational Theory of J. G. Fichte* (London: University Press of Liverpool, 1926), 170–259.

⁶⁷ Fichte, ‘Deduzierter Plan’, 150–1.

⁶⁸ Crouter, *Schleiermacher*, 148. Cf. Frederic Lilge, *The Abuse of Learning: The Failure of the German University* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 43–52.

⁶⁹ Fichte, ‘Deduzierter Plan’, 135–40.

influence on the pupil's development in philosophizing', he pronounced.⁷⁰

Unsurprisingly, given Fichte's essay on the duties of scholars, he set philosophy and the philosopher at the centre of the university, and declared that the other faculties needed to get in step with philosophy's *wissenschaftlich* character. Only 'a school of the art of using the understanding scientifically' could achieve these ends.⁷¹

Though Fichte followed Schelling's argument for training students in the organic unity of the sciences before advancing toward specialization, he curtailed the list of subjects in which one might specialize, leaving only the 'philosophical academy'. The higher faculties of theology, law, and medicine had little place in Fichte's model because, he reasoned, they had emerged as historical accidents. The existence of these practical disciplines stemmed only from the state's need to train clergy, lawyers, and physicians. The traditional higher faculties possessed 'a part which does not belong to the scientific art but to the very different practical art of application in life'. The 'scientific' and the 'practical' must be disconnected from one another, he held, in order to cultivate the kind of critical enquiry that a modern academy demanded. Each practical discipline must 'separate itself as completely as possible and concentrate upon itself'. Students might still train for a career in a practical discipline, he allowed, but that education would have to occur outside of the university in vocational schools or 'other self-contained institutions'.⁷²

To get a sense of the force of Fichte's argument, one might compare it to the position of John Henry Newman in the 1850s. In a series of lectures on 'The Idea of a University', delivered during his stint as rector at the recently established Catholic University of Ireland (University College Dublin), Newman elaborated on the theme

⁷⁰ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 148.

⁷¹ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 131.

⁷² Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 155.

of the university as, fundamentally, ‘a place of teaching universal knowledge’.⁷³ He insisted that theology had a rightful home in the university because it shared in universal knowledge. Without theology, the university could not claim to represent the totality of human learning. ‘Religious doctrine is knowledge’, Newman averred, ‘in as full a sense as Newton’s doctrine is knowledge. University Teaching without Theology is simply unphilosophical. Theology has at least as good a right to claim a place there as Astronomy.’⁷⁴ To establish a new university without provisions for theological instruction would be ‘an intellectual absurdity’.⁷⁵ Fichte’s line of thought could not have diverged more sharply.

Fichte provided another reason for expelling theology from the university: theology’s purported reliance on the supernatural, on knowledge that was not open or generally shared. He blasted traditional academic theology for trafficking in the dubious categories of ‘mystery’ and ‘revelation’, without engaging enough with the historical and philological components of religious study. For him, this confirmed theology’s basically irrational nature. ‘[W]hatever did not allow the use of reason and set itself up from the very beginning as an incomprehensible secret (*unbegreifliches Geheimnis*) would be excluded from [the new academy] by its very nature’, he warned. ‘A school for the use of the understanding could not concern itself with theology if the latter were still to insist that there is a God who wills something without reason, that no one understands the content of that will, but God must communicate it to him directly by a special ambassador, that such communication has taken place and can be found in certain obscurely written holy books, which one

⁷³ John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 3. On the influence of Newman’s earlier ideas on theological education at the University of Oxford, see Mark Chapman, ‘Newman and the Anglican Idea of a University’, *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 18/2 (2011), 212–27; Peter B. Nockles, ‘An Academic Counter-Revolution: Newman and Tractarian Oxford’s Idea of a University’, *HU* 10 (1991), 137–97; H. C. G. Matthews, ‘Noetics, Tractarians, and the Reform of the University of Oxford in the Nineteenth Century’, *HU* 9 (1990), 195–225; W. R. Ward, *Victorian Oxford* (London: Frank Cass, 1965), ch. 6; and Dwight A. Culler, *The Imperial Intellect: A Study of Newman’s Educational Ideal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).

⁷⁴ Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 40.

⁷⁵ Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 25.

must understand correctly in order to achieve salvation'. Academic theology 'must give up this claim to the sole knowledge of secrets and charms, explaining frankly and acknowledging openly that the will of God can be known without any special revelation and that those books are not sources of knowledge but only a vehicle of popular instruction'.⁷⁶

For Fichte, Old Testament studies, for instance, would be better off transplanted to a department that concentrated on the ancient Near East—without the church's credal and dogmatic constraints.⁷⁷ The field of church history would also 'take on a completely different form' (*eine ganz andere Gestalt*) if it would shrug off theological commitments and devote itself to the 'honest love of truth'.⁷⁸ In other words, theology as an academic discipline needed to jettison its practical elements concerned with 'life application', leaving only the 'scientific part'. This stipulation behaved like a gatekeeper, regulating admission to the modern university. 'Scientific' theology, if it desired entry into Fichte's academy, needed to 'acknowledge [its] dependence with due humility' on philosophy. 'Modesty is expected as soon as [theology] enters its sphere'.⁷⁹ 'In the academy, the scientific remainder of theology, which had perished as a priestly intermediary between God and man, would cast off its former nature entirely (*seine ganz bisherige Natur ausziehen*) and don a new one as a result of the change.'⁸⁰ Unless theology evolved in this manner, Fichte concluded, it had no quarter in an 'institution of *Wissenschaft*'.⁸¹

Fichte also implied that this new 'scientific' theology could 'fall within the province of history'. The 'history of the development of religious conceptions among people', he said, fostered insight into past stages in 'the development of the human

⁷⁶ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 154–5.

⁷⁷ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 161–2.

⁷⁸ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 162.

⁷⁹ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 157.

⁸⁰ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 161–2.

⁸¹ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 159.

spirit'.⁸² Critical enquiry into the practices of different religious groups, however conceived, represented the future of the scientific study of religion. This 'task is more comprehensive than theology has understood it, since one must consider the religious ideas of the so-called heathen, and the scientific academy will understand it in this comprehensive form'.⁸³ Though his notion of scientific theology's historicist agenda harmonized with arguments from Schelling and Schleiermacher, Fichte did not rely on any Christian theological reasoning for support.⁸⁴ Instead, he drew from post-Enlightenment neohumanism and an idealist 'historical teleology', setting great store on 'the development of the human spirit'. Fichte's final conception of historical theology 'entailed a thorough historicization of Christianity', which anticipated the rise of the comparative study of religion (*Religionswissenschaft*) in the late nineteenth century. Consequently, 'one should regard Fichte as among the first German scholars to lay the theoretical groundwork for an entirely different form' of scholarly enquiry, 'in which "religion", historically understood, threatened to displace "theology" as a leading intellectual category'.⁸⁵ Fichte's view clashed with more credal, apologetic stances on theological reflection. It also had partial precursors even among his contemporaries—especially in Schelling's already-encountered *Vorlesungen*. In 1799, Schleiermacher had likewise celebrated religion for the benefits it produced while surveying the 'progress . . . of different moments of humanity'. As he put it then: 'History in its most proper sense is the highest object of religion. It [history] begins and ends with religion'.⁸⁶

In terms of actual day-to-day operations at 'the new academy to be established' in Berlin, Fichte held that all instruction 'must begin with the

⁸² Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 161–2.

⁸³ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 162.

⁸⁴ On Fichte's religious background, see Anthony La Vopa, *Fichte: The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762–1799* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 45–79.

⁸⁵ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 165.

⁸⁶ Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion*, in *KGA* i/2. 232–3.

encyclopaedia of that subject, which must be the first lecture of every teacher appointed by us and which must be the first lecture attended by every student'. Professors 'who cannot or will not give such an encyclopaedia of their subject are not only useless to us but even destructive, because their influence [will] destroy the spirit of our institution at the very beginning'.⁸⁷ Production and use of idealist encyclopaedias in the university, for Fichte, would testify to the organic unity of knowledge.⁸⁸ As the university's first elected rector, Fichte resolved to put his proposal into action.⁸⁹

At roughly the same time that Fichte formulated the *Deduzierter Plan*, Schleiermacher composed the relatively conservative *Gelegentliche Gedanken*.⁹⁰ Yet, they did not read each other's texts until a number of years after the university's founding.⁹¹ This suggests a larger role for Schelling's ideas in Schleiermacher's thought than scholars have tended to ascribe.⁹² Schleiermacher's treatise first appeared anonymously, though his publisher Georg Reimer soon insisted that it carry Schleiermacher's own name in order to raise its public profile.⁹³ Like the other proposals, Schleiermacher's work evoked patriotic ardour. Launching a new university in Berlin at a time of profound German crisis, he held, would stand as a symbol of the 'inner unity' of the German nation to all the 'externally divided' German peoples spread across Europe.⁹⁴ Universities historically possessed both

⁸⁷ Fichte, 'Deduzierter Plan', 154, 205–7.

⁸⁸ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 119.

⁸⁹ Cf. Theodore Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism and Its Institutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 156–8; and Turnbull (ed.), *The Educational Theory of J. G. Fichte*, 262–5.

⁹⁰ Cf. Dirk Schmid, 'Historische Einführung', in *KGA* i/6. xiv–xxv; and Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 122–30.

⁹¹ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 124.

⁹² For this argument, see Zachary Purvis, 'Quiet War in Germany: Friedrich Schelling and Friedrich Schleiermacher', *JHI* (forthcoming). Cf. Crouter, *Schleiermacher*, 140–68, 207–25.

⁹³ Schleiermacher to Brinckmann, 1 March 1808, in *ASL* iv. 149.

⁹⁴ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 25.

‘essential’ and ‘accidental’ features; the new institution would ‘breath new life into their gothic forms’.⁹⁵

Schleiermacher positioned the university as a middle point between schools and scientific academies. The German university, he suggested, stands between both traditional and progressive schools (*Gymnasien*), on one side, and special research academies and learned societies (or French *écoles spéciales*), on the other side.⁹⁶

Appealing to the vocabulary of guilds, he reasoned, ‘the school [is like] the gathering together of master and apprentice, the university of master and journeymen, and the academy of the assembly of masters’.⁹⁷ Where schools are ‘gymnastic’, dedicated to ‘exercising intellectual powers for knowing’, scientific academies are places where experts pursue all fields of human knowledge ‘in a philosophical spirit’.⁹⁸

Universities pivoted between the two.

Schleiermacher’s discussion of the differences between the school and the university is particularly noteworthy. In the school, he said, ‘one moves from one particular to another, unconcerned about whether each generally fits into some whole. In contrast, at the university one is so concerned about this that one sets above all else, as the most necessary thing, the encyclopaedic [system] in every area, the general overview of the scope and cohesive structure of each area, and makes this the foundation of all instruction.’⁹⁹ Notably, given his prolonged attempts at setting down in print his own views on theological encyclopaedia, Schleiermacher remarked that the main products of the university were ‘textbooks (*Lehrbücher*), compendia, the aim of which is not to give an exhaustive or enriched account . . . but [takes] the higher view, a systematic account’. Each ‘presented the idea of the whole in the

⁹⁵ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 20, 85.

⁹⁶ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 30.

⁹⁷ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 31.

⁹⁸ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 33–5.

⁹⁹ Schleiermacher, ‘Gelegentliche Gedanken’, 36.

most comprehensive way, and the scope and internal connections in the clearest'.¹⁰⁰

This concept would resurface in his treatment of university theology.

Idealist notions of the organic unity of knowledge underpinned Schleiermacher's proposal. 'In the realm of knowledge', he wrote in one characteristic passage, 'everything fits together and interrelates' on account of the 'necessary inner unity of all the sciences (*Wissenschaften*). . . . All scientific endeavours pull together, tending toward unity'.¹⁰¹ The university 'has to do chiefly with the introduction of a process, with guardianship over [a student's] first development; and this is nothing less than a wholly new intellectual process of life' (*ein ganz neuer geistiger Lebensprozeß*). 'The essence of the university', he said, 'is to awaken the idea of *Wissenschaft* in the more noble youths . . . so that it will become second nature for them to contemplate everything from the viewpoint of *Wissenschaft*, to perceive nothing for itself alone but only in terms of the scientific connections most relevant to it, and in a broad, cohesive manner bringing it into a continual relation to the unity and totality of knowledge'.¹⁰²

Schleiermacher operated under the Aristotelian assumption that human beings desire science. Yet science 'cannot be brought into fruition and fully possessed by one person alone, but must be a communal work'. Properly speaking, *Wissenschaft* is the social pursuit of a group, commonly a state or nation, united by a common language. The state has a clear interest in the pursuit of knowledge. '[H]owever great or small the state might be, with whatever justification or not it may attempt to establish itself as an individual state, it can do so only through a quantity of information which so far as possible approaches totality'. States required massive

¹⁰⁰ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 36, 49–50.

¹⁰¹ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 21. See his lectures on 'dialectics', in *KGA* ii/10; and Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Dialektik (1811)* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986). Cf. Martin Rößler, *Schleiermachers Programm der Philosophischen Theologie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 20–44; and Hans-Joachim Birkner, *Schleiermachers christliche Sittenlehre im Zusammenhang seines philosophisch-theologischen Systems* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 30–87.

¹⁰² Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 35.

quantities of information for their administrative and legal operations. By the same token, however, states privilege their own interests in any given situation, despite what scientific research might require. '[T]he state works only for itself; historically it is completely self-seeking; thus it tends not to offer support to science except on its own terms.'¹⁰³ In short, the state 'all too easily fails to recognize the worth' of striving for 'scientific unity'.¹⁰⁴

Universities suffer from three intrusions of state power, Schleiermacher believed. First, the state views them 'as institutions in which the sciences are pursued not for their own sakes but for the sake of the state'. Second, the state 'misunderstands' and 'hinders' the 'natural tendency' of universities to 'shape themselves entirely according to the rules that science imposes'. Finally, the state fears that if it leaves universities to themselves, 'everything will soon wheel around in a circle of fruitless learning and teaching . . . the desire for practical affairs will be replaced by the pure, disinterested thirst for knowledge, and no one will want to be involved in civil affairs. For a long time now, the third seems to have been the principal reason why the state takes too much interest in these matters, as it does.'¹⁰⁵ Any new institution committed to the 'unity of knowledge' needed to navigate these dangers with skill. 'As for speculation', he continued, 'a term that we would always use for scientific activities that relate preponderantly to the unity and common form of knowing—the more clearly it is brought to notice the more the state tends to restrict its use'. The state settles for 'mere information' (*Kenntnisse*), rather than true science (*Wissenschaft*)—a course which 'true scientists' must oppose.¹⁰⁶ The most beneficial relationship between state and university would make room for academic freedom in research (*Lehrfreiheit*) and the freedom of students to learn (*Lernfreiheit*); in

¹⁰³ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 24.

¹⁰⁴ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 29.

¹⁰⁵ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 41.

¹⁰⁶ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 28–9.

other words, reasons abounded for the state to support the pursuit of *Wissenschaft*, without completely controlling it.

Philosophy stood at the centre of Schleiermacher's university: 'everything begins with philosophy, with pure speculation'. The philosophy faculty should assume first place (*die erste Stelle*), with the other faculties of practical science subject to it.¹⁰⁷ If Kant had wryly posed the question whether the servant (philosophy) should lead the mistress (theology), Schleiermacher openly accepted it.¹⁰⁸ The traditional order of the faculties, with theology at their head, gave the university a 'grotesque appearance' (*groteskes Ansehn*).¹⁰⁹ But 'even here', he asked, 'of what consequence is the ranking?' The philosophy faculty 'is still the first and, in fact, the lord (*Herrin*) of all the others because all members of the university must be grounded in it, no matter to which faculty they belong. This right it exercises almost everywhere upon students as soon as they come into a university; [the philosophy faculty] is the first to examine and receive them all, and this is a very praiseworthy and important custom. Only it appears that the custom has to be expanded if its significance is to be entirely realized. . . . All students must first of all be students of philosophy'.¹¹⁰

The philosophy faculty represented the rational, speculative realm of human knowledge. The other faculties, by contrast, entertained interests in social domains. Traditionally, Schleiermacher said, the church formed the theological faculty 'in order to preserve the wisdom of the Fathers, not to lose for the future what in the past had been achieved in discerning truth from error; to provide a historical basis, a sure and certain direction and a common spirit to the further development of doctrine and church'. Moreover, 'as the state came to be bound more and more closely with the

¹⁰⁷ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 55–6.

¹⁰⁸ Immanuel Kant, *The Conflict of the Faculties / Streit der Fakultäten*, trans. Mary J. Gregor (New York: Abaris Books, 1979), 45.

¹⁰⁹ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 53.

¹¹⁰ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 56.

church, it also had to sanction these institutions and place them under its care'.¹¹¹

Faculties of medicine and law had similar origins, formed by the respective needs to treat ailments of the human body and to adjudicate sociopolitical disputes.

Borrowing Schelling's language, the *Gelegentliche Gedanken* stated that the 'positive faculties each arose from the need to establish an indispensable praxis securely in theory and the tradition of knowledge'. The 'positive sciences' arose due to practical requirements.¹¹² Therefore, just as all university students must be students of philosophy, 'in the same way, all university teachers should also be rooted in the philosophy faculty'.¹¹³ In the positive faculties,

one can never be sure that, unless all teachers simultaneously possess their own worth and credentials in the field of pure science (*der reinen Wissenschaft*) and thus deserve a place there as teachers, the course of studies will not gradually and increasingly approach a mechanical tradition or perish in an entirely unscientific superficiality. Not only should it be policy to choose only such persons, but also that every teacher in these faculties, even if one is not simultaneously also a member of the philosophy faculty, should bear responsibility as a lecturer in one or another of its branches and from time to time give lectures from within the purely scientific domain, lectures that would stand in no direct relation whatsoever to one's own faculty. Only in this way could external security be given to maintaining the lively conjunction of these doctrines with true *Wissenschaft*, without which their existence in the university could not be justified at all. In fact, any teacher of law or theology surely deserves to be derided and excluded from the university who would feel no inner power and desire to accomplish something of one's own in the sphere of science, and with distinguished success, whether it be pure philosophy or ethics or philosophical consideration of history or philology.¹¹⁴

Not all theologians, of course, could become masters of disciplines other than their own, like the early modern *Polyhistor*s. But university theologians needed to negotiate the distance between their own specialities in fields like the Hebrew language or dogmatics and related non-theological fields like 'Oriental' studies and moral philosophy, respectively. In the modern world, Schleiermacher reckoned, theology had to shift some of its focus from ecclesial traditions to 'the spirit of

¹¹¹ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 54.

¹¹² Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 53.

¹¹³ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 57.

¹¹⁴ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 57.

Wissenschaft'. Yet this shift in orientation was not a turn entirely away from the church, but rather a combining of theology's ecclesial interests with scientific ones.¹¹⁵

On Christmas Day 1808, after sending off the manuscript of *Gelegentliche Gedanken* to his publisher, Schleiermacher wrote to his fiancée, Henriette von Willich: 'Science (*Wissenschaft*) and church, state, and domestic life—there is nothing further for a human in the world, and I would be among the few happy men, who had enjoyed everything. To be sure, it is only in this most recent time when people divide and separate everything that such a union of interests is rare; at other times every capable person was fearless in everything, and so it must also be, and our entire endeavour is that it will be so.'¹¹⁶

Another document from the same period provides further insight into Schleiermacher's views. In a short piece, 'Über die Einrichtung der theologischen Facultät', drafted in May 1810, Schleiermacher supplied a kind of blueprint for the organization of Berlin's theological faculty. To kick off the faculty he requested three professors: the first would lecture on exegesis and church history; the second, on exegesis and dogmatics; and the third, on church history and dogmatics. This arrangement would promote 'a stimulating spirit of rivalry among the teaching staff' and foster 'different ways of teaching these disciplines'.¹¹⁷ Each professor needed to move easily among theology's subfields. Schleiermacher did not petition for a dedicated chair of practical theology, though, because he thought that the other professors and local Berlin pastors should rotate through the position.¹¹⁸ He granted a version of the fourfold distinction of theology into biblical studies, church history, dogmatics, and practical theology that encouraged, for instance, chairs in biblical

¹¹⁵ Schleiermacher, 'Gelegentliche Gedanken', 52–68.

¹¹⁶ Schleiermacher to Henriette von Willich, 25 December 1808, in Heinrich Meisner (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermachers Briefwechsel mit seiner Braut* (2nd edn, Gotha: Perthes, 1919), 272.

¹¹⁷ Friedrich Schleiermacher, '25. Mai 1810. Professor Schleiermacher über die Einrichtung der theologischen Facultät', in Köpke, *Die Gründung*, 211–4.

¹¹⁸ Martin Redeker, *Schleiermacher: Life and Thought*, trans. John Wallhausser (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 98.

studies to hold specialized conversations with classicists and archaeologists while also continuing to speak meaningfully and critically with colleagues in systematic theology and ethics. Professors of theology in a modern university of science needed to interact with subjects outside of their own primary fields. This configuration did not arise, however, only because Schleiermacher was persuaded of the importance of cross-disciplinary teaching. He made his case with direct appeals to practices at the eighteenth-century universities of Halle and Göttingen, testifying to their enduring power.¹¹⁹

Furthermore, Schleiermacher resisted outsourcing theological subjects like church history to the philosophy faculty. Theology comprised its own ‘whole’, he said, a fully-functioning, organic ensemble of knowledge which philosophers must not dismember. Theology’s unity granted it a place in the broader ‘whole’ of the university, he stated, in an abridged version of his earlier argument. He brushed off critics of academic theology as ‘speaking surely in jest’. Relocating theology’s subfields within the philosophy faculty would only produce ‘incongruous aberrations’.¹²⁰ The ‘distinctly modern’ *Gelegentliche Gedanken*, as Max Lenz put it, and the 1810 blueprint evidenced the abiding potency of prior university reforms and new idealist perceptions of theological knowledge as an organic whole.¹²¹ As Daniel Fallon observed, ‘Schleiermacher’s model university structure became the basic organizational pattern for all German universities up to the present time.’¹²²

On 6 October 1810, students gathered at the specially dedicated building, originally the palace built for Prince Heinrich, brother of Friedrich the Great (r.1740–86), on the impressive *Unter den Linden* boulevard to attend the first lectures at the

¹¹⁹ Schleiermacher, ‘Über die Einrichtung der theologischen Facultät’, 211–12.

¹²⁰ Schleiermacher, ‘Über die Einrichtung der theologischen Facultät’, 211.

¹²¹ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 130.

¹²² Daniel Fallon, *The German University: A Heroic Ideal in Conflict with the Modern World* (Boulder, CO: Colorado Associated University Press, 1980), 36.

new university, which was initially called simply the University of Berlin.¹²³ A royal decree in 1828 changed the name to the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität. In 1949, located within the German Democratic Republic (GDR), its name was changed to Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, a title which continued after German reunification in 1990.¹²⁴ As the poet Clemens Brentano (1778–1842) put it in a celebratory cantata, the university stood as ‘a house of *Wissenschaft*’ and ‘a mountain for the German muses’ (*ein deutscher Musenberg*).¹²⁵ As Fichte said, it was ‘a new creation’.¹²⁶

Between 1810 and 1820, Berlin’s theological faculty counted over 1,200 students, roughly 15 per cent of all matriculated students at the university. During 1820–5, that figure grew to over 2,600 students; in 1830–5, it ballooned to over 5,000 students.¹²⁷ Berlin’s first theologians included Schleiermacher, W. M. L. de Wette, and Philipp Konrad Marheineke. In 1813, the faculty added the church historian August Neander.¹²⁸ The philosophy faculty, represented by Hegel after 1818, averaged roughly 21 per cent of the whole student body.¹²⁹ Schleiermacher also frequently gave philosophical lectures; in 1810, he was inducted into the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences.¹³⁰ The engaging theologians, the new university, and the revolutionizing concept of *Wissenschaft* proved magnetic. Berlin experienced an influx of young theological students, keen to learn from the collaborative work taking

¹²³ Cf. Klaus-Dietrich Gandert, *Vom Prinzenpalais zur Humboldt-Universität* (Berlin: Henschel, 1985).

¹²⁴ Weischedel (ed.), *Idee und Wirklichkeit*, i. xxiv.

¹²⁵ Clemens Brentano, ‘Universitati litterariae: Kantate auf den 15ten October 1810’ (Berlin, 1810), in HUB, Yt 16383:F8.

¹²⁶ Fichte to J. J. Griesbach, 4 October 1810, in Fichte, *J. G. Fichte-Gesamtausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ed. Reinhard Lauth et al. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1997), iii/6. 339.

¹²⁷ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, iii. 516–17.

¹²⁸ See Walter Elliger, *150 Jahre theologische Fakultät Berlin* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960), 11.

¹²⁹ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, iii. 517.

¹³⁰ On Schleiermacher as a lecturer in philosophy, see Hans-Joachim Birkner, ‘Schleiermacher als philosophischer Lehrer’, in Birkner, *Schleiermacher-Studien*, ed. Hermann Fischer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 237–50; and Dieter Burdorf and Reinold Schmücker (eds.), *Dialogische Wissenschaft: Perspektiven der Philosophie Schleiermachers* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998), 267–89. An index of Schleiermacher’s lectures appears in ‘Index lectionum quae auspiciis Regis Augustissimi Friderici Guilelmi Tertii in Universitate Litteraria Berolini constituta 1810–1832’, in NStUBG H. lit. pt. III. 38/1. Cf. Wolfgang Virmond (ed.), *Die Vorlesungen der Berliner Universität 1810–1834 nach dem deutschen und lateinischen Lektionskatalog sowie den Ministerialakten* (Berlin: Akademie, 2011).

place. The faculty also organized a research-driven theological seminar in 1812—partly as a result of Schleiermacher’s 1810 blueprint—whose scholarly origins are traceable to Göttingen’s 1738 seminar for classical philology, that ‘harbinger of the new academic order’.¹³¹

As Karl Schwarz (1812–85), who had studied theology in Berlin and Bonn, recalled:

In the 1820s and 1830s, the elite of the young theologians streamed [to Berlin] in order to receive . . . the consecration of science (*Weihe der Wissenschaft*), a stimulus for one’s whole life. And not just those who wanted to take their final theological examination, but older men in large numbers, those already ordained in the ministry, curates from Baden, from Switzerland, from Württemberg, tutors and those with doctorates from Tübingen; men who had laboured in their academic pursuits with zeal and distinction, full of respect before the names of Schleiermacher, Neander, Hegel, Marheineke, made their pilgrimage to Berlin in order to return to their native land with a richer knowledge. . . . It was, at that time, the golden age of our theology.¹³²

Not without reason, then, did Hans Frei pronounce: ‘the case of the University of Berlin is the most interesting in the history of modern academic theology’.¹³³

The new emphasis on science demanded precise knowledge of restricted areas. Curricular growth created fields and divisions of labour within the theological faculty previously unknown.¹³⁴ Some time before 1825, Johann Philipp Gabler (1753–1826), a professor at Jena, wrote: ‘Our own theological faculty has no professorships designated for particular fields apparently because no one could be considered a learned theologian (and every professor of theology should be learned) who did not keep the whole field of theology in view. For this reason no Protestant theologian in Germany covers only one discipline in his lectures. . . . [O]n the other

¹³¹ Köpke, *Die Gründung*, 239–40. Cf. Wilhelm Erben, ‘Die Entstehung der Universitäts-Seminare’, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 7 (1913), 1247–64; and William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 141–82. The quotation comes from Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 172.

¹³² Karl Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie* (4th edn, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1869), 56.

¹³³ Hans Frei, *Types of Christian Theology*, ed. George Hunsinger and William C. Placher (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 102.

¹³⁴ H. George Anderson, ‘Challenge and Change within German Protestant Theological Education during the Nineteenth Century’, *CH* 39/1 (1970), 36–48.

hand, every learned theologian has a major field, where he feels entirely at home, and therefore where he has distinguished himself and built a reputation in Germany. When a theological faculty has such noted teachers in every discipline, it becomes famous.’¹³⁵ Leipzig’s theological faculty, mindful of the discussions in Berlin, attempted to introduce comparable professorial roles in 1810. Tübingen’s Protestant theological faculty followed Leipzig in 1818, and Jena’s theologians enacted similar arrangements in 1890.¹³⁶

Over the course of the nineteenth century, Germany’s Protestant theological faculties established their disciplinary customs, in fits and starts, in view of the scholarly ideals and faculty plan at Berlin—an institution which one contemporary called the ‘new temple of Minerva’.¹³⁷ Their evolution received a particularly insightful analysis from Ignaz von Döllinger (1799–1890), professor of church history at Munich’s Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität and one of the most eminent Catholic theologians and historians in Europe. In *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt* (1867), Döllinger compared the exigencies facing Protestant and Catholic theologians in the modern academy to those facing the Church Fathers in the ancient world. Where the latter ‘understood their duty to Greek philosophy and science’, modern theologians found themselves confronted with an overwhelming dynamism. ‘Ours is a more difficult task’, he said, ‘because the material with which we deal is immeasurable, and is daily increasing. The whole history of humanity in all its departments—philology, antiquities, anthropology, the comparative history of

¹³⁵ Quoted in Karl Heussi, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Jena* (Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1954), 242–3. Cf. C. E. Carstens, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät der Christian-Albrechts-Universität in Kiel* (Kiel: Schmidt & Klaunig, 1874), 119.

¹³⁶ Anderson, ‘Challenge and Change’, 36–48. Cf. Heussi, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Jena*, 330; Otto Kirn, *Die Leipziger theologische Fakultät in fünf Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1909), 187; Georg Kaufmann, *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertjährigen Bestehens der Universität Breslau* (Breslau: Hirt, 1911), i. 8–11; Carl von Weizsäcker, *Lehrer und Unterricht an der evangelische theologischen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Tübingen: Fues, 1877), 128–9, 139, 141.

¹³⁷ Lenz, *Universität Berlin*, i. 288. See also Johannes Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas: Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 17–134.

religion, the science of law, philosophy and the history of philosophy—all these come before us with the demand that we should subdue them with the power of thought'.¹³⁸ The contemporary situation stemmed from the conditions placed on theology in Berlin's university debate. The modern theologian had to acquire proficiency in a daunting array of disciplines, exhibiting 'restless effort' and 'unwearied research'.¹³⁹ This Döllinger termed the inimitable 'German historical sense'; prowess in it seemed to accord especially well with the activities of German faculties of theology. 'The German historical sense finds rich nourishment in theology, which, as Christianity is a fact, a history, possesses a pre-eminently historical character, and accordingly requires to be investigated and constructed. Hence, too, Germany has become the classical land of theology, from whose treasures the efforts of other countries, like England and America, derive strength and sustenance.'¹⁴⁰

CONCLUSION

As the first unequivocally and self-consciously 'modern' university, the new university in Berlin formed the pattern for countless other institutions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The so-called 'Prussian model' or 'German model' achieved remarkable international success.¹⁴¹ Encyclopaedic lectures similarly proliferated. The University of Bonn, for instance—founded in 1818 as a westward expansion of the University of Berlin in Prussia's recently annexed

¹³⁸ J. J. Ignaz von Döllinger, *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt: Rectorats-Rede gehalten am 22. Dezember 1866* (Munich: Weiß, 1867), 55.

¹³⁹ Döllinger, *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt*, 37.

¹⁴⁰ Döllinger, *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt*, 44.

¹⁴¹ See R. C. Schwinges (ed.), *Humboldt International: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001); Christophe Charle, 'Patterns', and Edward Shils and John Roberts, 'The Diffusion of European Models Outside Europe', in *HUE* iii. 33–80, and 163–230, respectively.

Rhineland—inscribed encyclopaedic lectures into its statutes.¹⁴² Section 35 of Bonn's general statutes enshrined professorial specialization in the encyclopaedia of each of the higher faculties. Bonn's Protestant and Catholic theological faculties required particularly skilled professors to give the lectures in theological encyclopaedia each semester, or at least once a year.¹⁴³ A 'Plan of Academic Study of Protestant Theology' at Bonn from 1837 even restated tenets from Halle's *Anweisung*, allowing students to take a second advanced course on theological encyclopaedia in their final year of study.¹⁴⁴ And new iterations of Halle's *Anweisung* appeared again at the end of the century.¹⁴⁵

The University of Jena, to take another example, produced a twenty-page student guidebook in 1860 that further testified to the significance of these events. 'The encyclopaedia of a science (*Wissenschaft*) relates to the individual branches of the science', the guidebook stated, like a 'general map' (*Generalcharte*) of topography relates to specialized geographical maps of the same terrain (*Specialcharten*). This relation 'fittingly opens up the study of the individual branches', and facilitates an 'orientation across the whole'. Accordingly, the three-year study plan for theology students commenced with a lecture series on the 'encyclopaedia and methodology of the theological sciences'.¹⁴⁶

Schleiermacher's first professorial activities and the discourse surrounding Halle's *Anweisung* thus made their mark on the theological curriculum in a changing university context. The Halle period gave birth to Schleiermacher's ideas on the plan and rationale for the academic study of theology. He elaborated on these

¹⁴² 'Bonn, Universität', in *RGG* i. 1688–9.

¹⁴³ Koch (ed.), *Die preussischen Universitäten*, i. 197, 235.

¹⁴⁴ *Plan des akademischen Studiums der evangelischen Theologie, in Bezug auf Benutzung der Vorlesungen und Theilnahme an den Seminar-Uebungen auf der Universität Bonn vom 22. Oktober 1837* (Bonn, 1837). Cf. Koch (ed.), *Die preussischen Universitäten*, i. 239.

¹⁴⁵ *Anweisung für Studierende der Theologie auf der vereinigten Friedrichs-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* (Halle, 1891), in ULBSA, Gb 930 e 4° (1).

¹⁴⁶ *Akademische Studien-Pläne für die der Theologie, Jurisprudenz, Medicin, Cameral- und Naturwissenschaften, Mathematik, Pharmacie, Landwirthschaft, Philologie, und Pädagogik beflissenen* (Jena: Adolph Suckow, 1860), 3–4.

commitments in his memorandum on the new university in Berlin. As the proposals from Schelling, Humboldt, Steffens, Fichte, and Schleiermacher all demonstrate, the concept of 'encyclopaedic learning' became integral to the desire for a modern institution of science. It would be a little too strong to call the affair over Halle's *Anweisung* Schleiermacher's flashbulb moment, given his activities from the previous year. But the Halle years collectively, in hindsight, were anything but a mere perfunctory prelude to Schleiermacher's career in Berlin.

Chapter 7

Renewing Protestantism? Schleiermacher and University Theology

Schleiermacher was the lawgiver in theology . . . [and] his theological legislation [was] the *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1811).

Albrecht Ritschl, 1870

The establishment of the University of Berlin, a high-water mark in the Prussian Reform campaign, occurred during the Napoleonic Wars and between the two tumultuous, reactionary periods of the Wöllner years and the German Vormärz (1815–48), the latter inaugurated especially with the repressive Karlsbad Decrees (1819).¹ A ‘new age’ stood before the German nation, Fichte announced, for ‘time is taking giant strides with us more than with any other age since the history of the world began’.² Theology’s place in the ‘new age’—its ‘right to exist alongside other *Wissenschaften*’—was hardly without dispute.³ Claude Welch’s summary expressed well the tenor of theological enquiry: ‘At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the theological problem was, simply, “how is theology possible?” This was a question of both rationale and method, and included, at least implicitly, the question of whether

¹ See Ernst Rudolf Huber (ed.), *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789*, i (2nd edn, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990), 90 ff.

² Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1808), 16.

³ Claude Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), i. 5.

theology is possible at all'.⁴ As Leopold Zscharnack remarked at Berlin's centennial, theology then faced an 'Existenzfrage'.⁵

In *Über Religion und Theologie* (1815), the Old Testament scholar W. M. L. de Wette brought the unsettled theological mood into sharp relief: 'One feels the emptiness of the former life and the eternal validity and empowering and uplifting power of religious faith. Everyone longs and strives for a new, higher religious life. But the clarity of consciousness has not yet arrived, and the conflicting views and efforts are well known. Many want to return wholly to the old, others want to form something new. A solidly formed, unanimous theology eludes us, everything is still in chaos'.⁶

To coincide with the new university and theological faculty, Schleiermacher produced a slender volume on the essential unity, distinctive jurisdictions, and dynamic interrelations of theology's various subdisciplines, titled *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1811; 2nd edn, 1830).⁷ The work represented his programmatic statement on religion and pedagogical manifesto on the future of academic theology in the highly transitional, post-Enlightenment, post-revolutionary world. Notably, it appeared in English translation in 1850, antedating the English arrival of Schleiermacher's dogmatic text, *Der christliche Glaube* (1821–2; 2nd edn, 1830–1), commonly known as the *Glaubenslehre*, by nearly eighty years.⁸ As

⁴ Welch, *Protestant Thought*, i. 59.

⁵ Leopold Zscharnack, 'Das erste Jahrhundert der theologischen Fakultät Berlin', *Chronik der christlichen Welt* 20 (1910), 470.

⁶ W. M. L. de Wette, *Über die Religion und Theologie: Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815), 123–4.

⁷ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behufe einleitender Vorlesungen entworfen von F. Schleiermacher* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1811), in *KGA* i/6. 243–315. The full title of the second edition was *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behufe einleitender Vorlesungen: Entworfen von F. Schleiermacher. Zweite umgearbeitete Ausgabe* (Berlin: Reimer, 1830), in *KGA* i/6. 317–446. I have made my translations in consultation with Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology as a Field of Study: Revised Translation of the 1811 and 1830 Editions*, trans. Terrence N. Tice (3rd edn, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011); and Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Drawn up to Serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures*, trans. William Farrer (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1850). References here are to the 1830 edition unless otherwise noted.

⁸ The *Glaubenslehre* appeared in English in 1928. See Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855) stated, the *Kurze Darstellung* comprised ‘only a few sheets, but a whole world of new thoughts!’⁹ Even more than the *Glaubenslehre*, the *Kurze Darstellung* proved monumental in setting the trajectory for the theological enterprise in the modern university—attempting to renew Protestantism, pursue *Wissenschaft*, and claim the spirit of modernity.¹⁰

Though the work presented Schleiermacher’s vision for recasting theology as *Wissenschaft* in some of the more suggestive, trenchant, and, admittedly, conceptually thorny passages in his scholarly corpus, the rich soil in which it grew remains neglected. In this chapter, I range over the institutional locus of the work, the salient features of its publication history, and the historically-focused programme of theology that it advanced. Finally, I comment briefly on its legacy, with reference to related student notes, the opinions of contemporary observers and later analysts, and the reception it enjoyed across Europe. In short, with the *Kurze Darstellung*, Schleiermacher launched the project of modern theology.

A SCHOLAR AND A MANIFESTO

Prior to his role in the founding of the University of Berlin, Schleiermacher’s reputation rested on his ‘Romantic’ texts, the magisterial *Über die Religion* (1799), *Monologen* (1800), and *Weihnachtsfeier* (1806). The first brought him the most notoriety, captivating the imaginations of many, including several aspiring theologians. Philipp Marheineke read the five speeches while still a student at Erlangen (1803–5) and used the occasion to make himself known to Schleiermacher. Introducing himself by letter, Marheineke confessed that he now felt ‘fully conscious religiously’ for the first time in his life. ‘And with whom one has become acquainted

⁹ Friedrich Lücke, ‘Erinnerung an Dr. Friedrich Schleiermacher’, *TSK* 7 (1834), 772.

¹⁰ Schleiermacher, ‘Vorrede’, *Kurze Darstellung* (1811), 247.

in such times as a prophet of divine revelation', he declared, 'how should I not be allowed to say to you that I love you with my whole heart?'¹¹ Another enthusiastic young student and, like Marheineke, future colleague at Berlin, had a similar reaction to the speeches during his first semester at Halle in 1806, only a few months after his conversion from Judaism to Christianity and change of name from David Mendel to August Neander.¹² The orthodox Lutheran Claus Harms offered a moving account when he said that he counted the afternoon in which he first read the speeches while a student at the University of Kiel in 1801 as 'the hour in which my higher life was born'.¹³

Schleiermacher's early texts, activities with the Schlegels and other literary figures, attendance at the Berlin salon of Henriette Herz and the covert *Mittwochsgesellschaft*, and sermons at Berlin's Trinity Church (*Dreifaltigkeitskirche*) all helped to establish his persona in the Prussian capital.¹⁴ Though Schleiermacher was already recognized as a brilliant Romantic thinker, his years in Halle marked him as a promising academic according to more customary professorial standards. A young Ludwig Börne, who had studied under Schleiermacher in Halle, recalled fondly that Schleiermacher 'taught theology as Socrates would have taught it had he been a Christian'.¹⁵ When the French army routed Prussian forces in Jena in 1806, Hegel proclaimed, 'It is not difficult to see that our time is a time of birth and transition to a new period. Spirit has broken with the world as it hitherto existed and with the old ways of thinking, and is about to submerge all this into the past; it is at work giving

¹¹ Marheineke to Schleiermacher, 9 August 1805, in *ASL* iv. 115–17.

¹² Kurt-Victor Selge, 'Neander und Schleiermacher', in Günter Meckenstock (ed.), *Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 33–50; Kurt-Victor Selge, 'August Neander: A Baptized Jew of Hamburg of the Time of Emancipation and Restoration as the First Berlin Church Historian, 1813–1850', *New Athenaeum/Neues Athenaeum* 3 (1992), 83–126. Cf. Otto Krabbe, *August Neander: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Charakteristik* (Hamburg: Rauhen, 1852), 22.

¹³ Claus Harms, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Kiel: Akademische Buchhandlung, 1851), 67–8.

¹⁴ Cf. Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Geselligkeit: Friedrich Schleiermacher in Berlin 1796–1802* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).

¹⁵ Ludwig Börne, *Sämtliche Schriften*, i, ed. Inge Rippmann and Peter Rippmann (Düsseldorf: Joseph Melzer, 1964), 598.

itself a new form.’¹⁶ Schleiermacher’s move to Berlin at the end of 1807 also marked a new beginning and the chance to realize his scholarly potential.

On the eve of the University of Berlin’s founding, Schleiermacher wrote to his wife Henriette von Willich, ‘you will see me at work upon a little book this summer already—a little academic handbook’.¹⁷ This was the same work mentioned so often in his correspondence, the ‘aphoristic compendium’ derived from his lectures on theological encyclopaedia at Halle. And little and aphoristic it was: the first edition came in a concise ninety-two pages. The 1810 Leipzig book fair catalogue advertised it as *Darstellung des theolog. Studiums: Zum Behufe einl. Vorlesungen entworfen*. The following year’s catalogue amended the entry to include the word *Kurze* (brief) at the beginning of the title.¹⁸ As a university professor and academic theologian, Schleiermacher was still an *Anfänger*—a beginner or neophyte—but his role in the founding of Berlin’s new university had begun to change all that. He took great pains to ensure that the ‘little academic handbook’, long in gestation, would signal his professional arrival. At the end of 1809, he declared that once his post at the new university was finalized, ‘I would be able . . . to set down in writing my complete theological viewpoint in a few short instructional manuals (*Lehrbüchern*), and I hope, thereby, to found a theological school for building up and renewing Protestantism, which can no longer continue as it is’.¹⁹

Accordingly, the title page of the *Kurze Darstellung* introduced Schleiermacher in superlative, near pretentious terms, far beyond any other self-description or publisher’s advertisement for his works either before or after the book’s appearance:

¹⁶ G. W. F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (1807), in Hegel, *Werke in 20 Bänden*, ed. Eva Moldenhauer and Karl Markus Michel (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969–71), iii. 18.

¹⁷ Schleiermacher to Henriette von Willich, 28 March 1809, in *ASL* ii. 242.

¹⁸ *Allgemeines Verzeichnis der Bücher, welche in der Frankfurter und Leipziger Ostermesse des 1811 Jahres entweder ganz neu gedruckt* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1811), 149.

¹⁹ Schleiermacher to Karl Gustav von Brinckmann, 17 December 1809, in *ASL* iv. 172.

F. Schleiermacher, Doctor of Theology and Official Full Professor at the University of Berlin, Protestant Reformed Preacher at Trinity Church in Berlin, Full Member of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences and Correspondent of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences.²⁰

The point could not be missed: in his first publication at the University of Berlin, he presented a full list of credentials to establish his scholarly legitimacy as the new chair of the theological faculty at the first modern university. He wanted it to succeed where Halle's *Anweisung* had fallen short. In 1869, on the 100th anniversary of Schleiermacher's birth, August Twesten (1789–1876) confirmed to the Berlin community, 'Schleiermacher was above all a man of the university'.²¹ Adolf von Harnack similarly championed his illustrious Berlin predecessor in a monumental essay, 'Über die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultäten' (1919). As he studied the history of the Prussian Academy of Sciences, Harnack wrote, he perceived that Schleiermacher's labours at the universities of Halle and Berlin had epochal significance: 'Without exaggeration one may say that the internal reconstruction of the human sciences, and the reconstruction of the . . . German universities, were essentially the service of this professor of theology'.²²

PUBLISHING A UNIVERSITY TEXT

Like many of Schleiermacher's other publications, the *Kurze Darstellung* appeared under the imprint of Georg Reimer's Realschulbuchhandlung. By 1811, Schleiermacher had enjoyed a close friendship and business partnership with Reimer

²⁰ 'F. Schleiermacher, der Gottesgelahrtheit Doctor und öffentl. ord. Lehrer an der Universität zu Berlin, evang. ref. Prediger an der Dreifaltigkeitskirche daselbst, ordentl. Mitglied der Königl. Preuß. und corresp. der Königl. Bairischen Akademie der Wissenschaften'. Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung* (1811), 245. Schleiermacher's *Sämmtliche Werke* (1834–64), a selection of his works spearheaded by his former student Ludwig Jonas, reproduced only the second edition of the *Kurze Darstellung*, which did not include the description from the 1811 title page. Scholz's 1910 critical edition also omitted it.

²¹ August Twesten, *Zur Erinnerung an Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher: Vortrag gehalten in der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin am 21. November 1868* (Berlin: Herz, 1869), 33.

²² Adolf von Harnack, 'Die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultäten', *PJ* 175 (1919), 365. Cf. Harnack, *Geschichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 3 vols (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1900).

for over a decade.²³ Early on Reimer had taken to publishing nearly all of Schleiermacher's wide ranging texts: a first collection of sermons (1801), *Kritik der Moral* (1803), five volumes of Plato translations (1804–10), *Über die Religion* (1799; 2nd edn, 1806), and others. If the choice of publisher seemed obvious, it nevertheless made sense and proved consequential for additional reasons. Though Georg Andreas Reimer (1776–1842) would come to be known as 'the publisher of the Romantics' for his house list of illustrious names including Novalis, Kleist, Tieck, and Grimm, he positioned his enterprise strongly across all academic disciplines.²⁴ Fichte began working with Reimer in 1800, enhancing the name of the press.²⁵ In 1808, Reimer bolstered his reputation as a leading academic publisher when he reached an agreement to produce the first German and Latin volumes of *Museum der Altertumswissenschaft*, a path-breaking journal co-edited by F. A. Wolf and Philipp Buttmann.²⁶ A number of Reimer's authors held chairs at Berlin's new university: Schleiermacher in theology, Fichte in philosophy, C. W. Hufeland in medicine, Wolf and August Boeckh in classics, and B. G. Niebuhr in history. Introductory (and, for students, compulsory) lectures on the encyclopaedia of a given discipline played a formative role in the early life of the university, and so too did their accompanying textbooks.²⁷ Even before the official opening of the university, many of its first professors received special permission to hold preliminary lectures; encyclopaedic

²³ Doris Reimer, "‘Fahre fort mich zu lieben.’" Zum Beginn der Freundschaft und Verlagsbeziehung von Schleiermacher und Georg Andreas Reimer—mit Blick auf die spätere Zeit', in Arndt (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Geselligkeit*, 93–119.

²⁴ See Doris Reimer, *Passion & Kalkül: Der Verleger Georg Andreas Reimer (1776–1842)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), and Anne-Katrin Ziesack, 'Entrepreneurial Spirit and Liberal Values: The Publisher Georg Reimer', in Ziesack (ed.), *Walter de Gruyter Publishers: 1749–1999*, trans. Rhodes Barrett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 1–53.

²⁵ Johann Gottlieb Fichte to Johann Friedrich Cotta, 16 August 1800, in Fichte, *J. G. Fichte-Gesamtausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, iii/4, ed. Reinhard Lauth et al. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1973), 286.

²⁶ 'Verlagsvertrag', in SBB-PK, Dep. 42 de Gruyter, R1, Wolf, Friedrich August.

²⁷ Theodore Ziolkowski, *Clio the Romantic Muse: Historicizing the Faculties in Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 26.

lectures, including Schleiermacher's in theology, featured prominently.²⁸ Courting Berlin's professors constituted a strategic move for Reimer, as the city's academic community provided 'the most important impetus' for the success of the press.²⁹

Two textbooks from Reimer's catalogue at the time, both published a few years before the *Kurze Darstellung* and found in Schleiermacher's library, hold relevance for understanding the cross-disciplinary context of Schleiermacher's work—without, I note, any direct lines of influence or dependency: Henrich Steffens's *Grundzüge der philosophischen Naturwissenschaft* (1806) and Wolf's *Darstellung des Alterthums-Wissenschaft* (1807).³⁰ In Nietzsche's estimation, Wolf 'freed his profession from the bonds of theology'.³¹ Wolf also lectured often on the encyclopaedia of ancient literature. After the University of Halle shut down, he found himself in Berlin without any regular academic responsibilities. Inspired by overtures from Goethe, he used the time to revise his lecture notes into a definitive treatise.³² He published the resulting work as a stand-alone piece in the new *Museum der Altertumswissenschaft*.³³ During this interim period, he also offered public lectures in Berlin on the encyclopaedia of antiquity.

Wolf's treatise summarized his experiences as a classicist and introduced 'the scientific study of humanity', the discipline for which he had coined the term

²⁸ On the preliminary lectures, see R. Köpke, *Die Gründung der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Berlin: Schade, 1860), 141; and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 'Studenten, Studium und Lehre', in Rüdiger vom Bruch and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden 1810–2010* (Berlin: Akademie, 2012), i. 209–67.

²⁹ Ziesack, 'Entrepreneurial Spirit', 22.

³⁰ Henrich Steffens, *Grundzüge der philosophischen Naturwissenschaft* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1806); and Friedrich August Wolf, 'Darstellung des Alterthums-Wissenschaft nach Begriff, Umfang, Zweck, und Werth', *Museum der Alterthums-Wissenschaft* 1 (1807), 1–145, in Wolf, *Kleine Schriften in Lateinischer und Deutscher Sprache*, ed. G. Bernhardt (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1869), ii. 808–95. Cf. Günter Meckenstock (ed.), *Schleiermachers Bibliothek: Bearbeitung des faksimilierten Rauschen Auktionskatalogs und Hauptbücher des Verlages G. Reimer* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), 276, 296.

³¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, 'Wir Philologen' (1875), in Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. Giorgi Colli and Mazzinno Mantarini (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), viii. 68.

³² Wilhelm Körte, *Leben und Studien, Friedrich August Wolf's, des Philologen* (Essen: Bädcker, 1833), i. 350–4, ii. 10–14.

³³ Cf. Anthony Grafton, 'Prolegomena to Friedrich August Wolf', *JWCI* 44 (1981), 101–29; and Jay Bolter, 'Friedrich August Wolf and the Scientific Study of Antiquity', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 21 (1980), 83–99.

Altertumswissenschaft. He desired to place *Altertumswissenschaft* among the ‘all-dominating sciences of our day’, and to that end, defended three main theses.³⁴ First, the study of classics should be a professional activity and not simply a leisurely pursuit for the antiquarian-minded. Second, it should be seen as an exact and rigorous *Wissenschaft*, with the goal, third, of attaining empirical knowledge of human nature. Wolf compared *Altertumswissenschaft* to the natural sciences when discussing its methods, precision, and rules. He made the case that knowledge gained in classical studies was still worth having, however dated—or difficult—it might appear. To follow the evolution of ‘Greek spirit’ and discern the ‘organically developed, significant national culture, founded on the study of ancient remains’, the student had to master twenty-four fields, ranging from grammar and textual criticism to epigraphy, art history, and mythology.³⁵ When he lectured on philological encyclopaedia, he recommended a similar list of twenty fields necessary for understanding the ancient world.³⁶

Wolf’s views reflected, in part, tenets of post-Kantian idealism, but hearkened back even more to the previous century and the developments at Germany’s reform universities. In Anthony Grafton’s summary, ‘Many historians would readily admit that Wolf drew facts and techniques from traditional humanist scholarship. Few would admit that ideals like these, so similar to those of Fichte and Schelling, could have come from any 18th-century tradition of learning’. Wolf’s modern science, with the ‘*Darstellung* as its manifesto, owed more of its techniques and its ideology than it was willing to admit to the historical scholarship of 18th-century Göttingen and Halle’.³⁷

³⁴ Wolf, *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 860.

³⁵ Wolf, *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 894–5.

³⁶ Friedrich August Wolf, ‘Kollege (Nachschriften Friedrich Karl Köpke)’, 106, in SBB-PK, Ms. germ. oct. 1107, seit 1967.

³⁷ Anthony Grafton, ‘Man muß aus der Gegenwart herausteigen’: History, Tradition, and Traditions of Historical Thought in F. A. Wolf, in Hans Erich Bödeker et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte*:

In contrast to Wolf, whose style was clear and elegant, Steffens wrote in a dense fashion. His *Grundzüge* attempted a philosophy of nature based on Schelling's 'absolute', developed through a series of unexplained precepts—in form, then, not unlike Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung*. In an earlier work, Steffens had laid out the requirements for the ideal philosopher-scientist, much like Schleiermacher would do for the ideal theologian. 'Whomever nature allows to discover her harmony within himself', Steffens proclaimed, 'bears a whole infinite world in his inner being. . . . He is the most individual creation—and the most sacred priest of nature' (*der geheiligste Priester der Natur*).³⁸ The texts by Wolf and Steffens both held pedagogical and speculative/theoretical—or 'prophetic', one might say—interests in their respective subjects. Instructions for students (more apparent with Wolf) appeared alongside theses on the current and future states of the field. Comparison with these works shows the multiple senses in which Schleiermacher wrote in an established genre and in a crucial, if changing, institutional context. Though Schleiermacher did not use the common title of 'theological encyclopaedia', the name under which he offered his lectures, it was not the first time that he had styled one of his compositions a 'brief outline' of a topic, and, furthermore, as the case with Wolf demonstrates, Schleiermacher's title itself was far from novel.³⁹ By 1811, he was intimately familiar with the genre, and he held in his possession—in addition to the textbooks by Nösselt and Planck—a copy of the second edition (1784) of Samuel Mursinna's encyclopaedia.⁴⁰

Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 427–9. Cf. Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), 214–46.

³⁸ Henrich Steffens, *Beyträge zur inneren Naturgeschichte der Erde* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Craz, 1801), 317.

³⁹ Cf. Schleiermacher, 'Kurze Darstellung des spinozistischen Systems' (1793–4), in *KGA* i/1. 563–82.

⁴⁰ Meckenstock (ed.), *Schleiermachers Bibliothek*, 234.

PHILOSOPHICAL, HISTORICAL,
AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

‘I have always found it extremely difficult to conduct academic lectures by following the outline of someone else’s textbook.’ With these words, Schleiermacher began the preface to the first edition of the long-awaited *Kurze Darstellung*. When the book finally did appear in 1811, he divulged, ‘it seems rather excessive to publish at large what is merely prepared for the use of my students, [but] I console myself with the thought that . . . these few pages . . . contain my entire present outlook on theological study’.⁴¹ This declaration acquires greater meaning when viewed in light of the winding path in Halle through which Schleiermacher’s ideas travelled. While Nösselt and Planck alluded to an exchange of scholarly ideals—the move from the broad, voluminous intellectual culture of *Gelehrsamkeit* to the deep, rigorous, systematizing mood of *Wissenschaft*—Schleiermacher brought the point to its fullest expression.

Though most works in the genre tended toward the fourfold pattern of exegesis, history, dogmatics, and practical theology, Schleiermacher organized the theological sciences according to an idiosyncratic, threefold scheme: ‘The whole of theology is composed of this trilogy: philosophical, historical, and practical theology.’⁴² He treated these subdisciplines over the course of 338 extremely dense, evocative ‘paragraphs’ or short sections. If the highly compressed style found its fair share of critics for being notoriously difficult to comprehend, it nevertheless pleased Schleiermacher, particularly when compared with his later *Glaubenslehre*. When toiling over the first draft of his dogmatics, Schleiermacher wrote, ‘Every time I see

⁴¹ Schleiermacher, ‘Vorrede’, *Kurze Darstellung* (1811), 247.

⁴² Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §31, 337.

this book [the *Glaubenslehre*], I sigh at its bulk'.⁴³ The encyclopaedia, in a sense, represented a kind of substructure for the *Glaubenslehre*, which shot up from it like a towering skyscraper—'admired and feared', but perhaps causing itself problems with its size.⁴⁴ In the first critical edition of the *Kurze Darstellung*, from 1910, the text filled only 131 pages—even with editorial comments—still surprising brevity not only for the eventual author of the unremittingly elaborate *Glaubenslehre*, but also for a classic contribution to a genre known for multivolume works.⁴⁵ Planck's verbose textbook, for instance, was more than ten times the length of Schleiermacher's, which eschewed the usual historical preface.⁴⁶

Schleiermacher's suggestive definition of theology in the first paragraph set the tone for the remainder of the work: 'Theology is a positive science (*positive Wissenschaft*), whose parts join into a cohesive whole only through their common relation to a distinct mode of faith, a particular way of being conscious of God. Thus, the various parts of Christian theology belong together only by virtue of their relation to Christianity.'⁴⁷ Language of 'God-consciousness' (*Gottesbewusstsein*) appeared only in the 1830 edition, bringing the vocabulary in line with the famous designations employed throughout the *Glaubenslehre* for Christianity's experiential core.⁴⁸ By design, Schleiermacher produced the final revised editions of his three renowned works—*Über die Religion*, the *Glaubenslehre*, and the *Kurze Darstellung*—at more or less the same time in 1830–1, in order that they might stand together. The

⁴³ Schleiermacher to Twisten, 7 September 1822, in C. F. Georg Heinrici (ed.), *D. August Twisten nach Tagebüchern und Briefen* (Berlin: Hertz, 1889), 377.

⁴⁴ Cf. Philip Schaff, *Saint Augustin, Melancthon, Neander: Three Biographies* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885), 135.

⁴⁵ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf Einleitender Vorlesungen*, ed. Heinrich Scholz (Leipzig: Deichert, 1910; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982). Cf. John E. Thiel, 'Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Schleiermacher's Theological Encyclopedia: Doctrinal Development and Theological Creativity', *HJ* 25/2 (1984), 145.

⁴⁶ Cf. Hans-Joachim Birkner, 'Schleiermachers "Kurze Darstellung" als theologisches Reformprogramm', in Birkner, *Schleiermacher-Studien*, ed. Hermann Fischer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 285–305.

⁴⁷ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §1, 325.

⁴⁸ Cf. Schleiermacher to Joachim Christian Gaß, 8 May 1830, in W. Gaß (ed.), *Fr. Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel mit J. Chr. Gaß* (Berlin: Reimer, 1852), 222–4.

most noteworthy feature of the definition, however, involves the technical phrase ‘positive science’. With his use of the term, Schleiermacher borrowed directly from Schelling’s discussion of the higher faculties.⁴⁹

A ‘positive science’, Schleiermacher expounded, ‘is a gathering of scientific components that belong together not because they form a constituent part of the organization of the sciences, as though by some necessity arising out of the notion of science itself, but only insofar as they are necessary for carrying out a practical task’.⁵⁰ As he had conceded earlier, theology does not possess the same intrinsic academic legitimacy as philosophy, which pursued ‘primal knowledge’, in Schelling’s terms. Without a vital connection to the ecclesiastical community—the church—knowledge of Christian theology ‘ceases to be theological and devolves to those sciences to which it belongs according to its varied content’.⁵¹ Biblical studies might as well be undertaken entirely within philological or archaeological disciplines if divorced from ‘church leadership’ (*Kirchenleitung*). Without a link between university theology and the church, theology’s other fields would just as well be outsourced to disciplines like linguistics, psychology, or ‘secular’ history, depending on those with which they most closely aligned.⁵²

Church leadership, then, served as the goal of all theological study. But a focus on practical theology alone could not grant the theologian a seat in the modern university. Though academic theology’s coherency would disintegrate without the practical purpose of church government, the theologian must, nevertheless, become a *Wissenschaftler*. In paragraph nine of the work, Schleiermacher famously declared: ‘If one should imagine both a religious interest and a scientific spirit united in the

⁴⁹ Zachary Purvis, ‘Quiet War in Germany: Friedrich Schelling and Friedrich Schleiermacher’, *JHI* (forthcoming). Cf. Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 242–50.

⁵⁰ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §1, 326.

⁵¹ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §5, 328.

⁵² Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §6, 328.

highest degree and with the finest balance for the purpose of theoretical and practical activity alike, that would be the idea of the “prince of the church” (*Kirchenfürsten*).⁵³

In his lectures, he purported to find the expression ‘prince of the church’ in ‘old books’ from the late medieval and Reformation eras, which supposedly employed the designation *princeps ecclesiae* for ‘men like Luther and Zwingli’.⁵⁴

Schleiermacher’s declaration warrants several considerations. First, he did not intend this combination to function as a ‘clericalizing’ principle. Some critics made this charge already in 1812, and one might get a similar impression from more recent appraisals of Schleiermacher as the author of the ‘clerical paradigm’ in theological education.⁵⁵ According to Schleiermacher’s earlier memorandum on the university, theologians needed ‘to be rooted’ in the philosophy faculty and the study of pure science (*Wissenschaft*). Mere church leadership did not grant access to the modern academy. In other words, no matter how difficult it might be to determine the relationship between the ‘religious interest’ and the ‘scientific spirit’ (*wissenschaftlichen Geist*), Schleiermacher ‘invested science with a predominantly active role and the church with a passive one: the church was presented as the needy recipient of scientific tutelage, whereas science appears as autonomous and self-justifying’.⁵⁶ Second, Schleiermacher did, nonetheless, grant practical theology a special place in his scheme. In the 1811 edition, he stated plainly: ‘Practical theology is the crown of theological study.’⁵⁷ In order to be a true theologian and not only a *Wissenschaftler*, the young student of theology needed to put his training in the service

⁵³ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §9, 329.

⁵⁴ Carl Clemen, ‘Schleiermachers Vorlesung über theologische Enzyklopädie’, *TSK* 98 (1905), 230–1.

⁵⁵ ‘Theologische Enzyklopädie’, *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* 102–3 (27–8 April 1812), 809–22. This anonymous essay reviewed both Schleiermacher’s *Kurze Darstellung* and Johann Ernst Christian Schmidt’s *Theologische Enzyklopädie* (Giessen: Heyer, 1811). See also Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 87.

⁵⁶ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 205.

⁵⁷ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung* (1811), §26, 253.

of the church, desiring its edification and furthering its mission.⁵⁸ The purpose of theology determined theology's definition.

It is not too much to claim, I suggest, that Schleiermacher's entire programme turned on striking the right balance between traditional Christianity and modern culture, between the 'ecclesial' and the 'scientific'. In his open letters to Friedrich Lücke from 1829, Schleiermacher revealed that he sought 'to create an eternal covenant between the living Christian faith and an independent and freely working science, a covenant by the terms of which science is not hindered and faith not excluded'.⁵⁹ In this way, he adopted the main features of Schelling's model of the positive sciences in the university and, as shall become clear, the speculative-historical construction of Christian theology. If the outworking of this dignified union resisted simplification, its innovative importance was abundantly clear: Schleiermacher claimed, as Goethe's Faust had uttered in another context, that it was possible 'for two hearts to beat in one breast'. The sections in the *Kurze Darstellung* on philosophical and historical theology expanded on this and introduced the primary concepts for modern theological education and liberal Protestant thought generally.⁶⁰ Schleiermacher would teach his course on theological encyclopaedia over eleven times, instructing over 600 students.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §§11–13, 330–1.

⁵⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre an Herrn Dr Lücke, zwei Sendschreiben', in *KGA* i/10, 351–2; Eng. trans. in Schleiermacher, *On the Glaubenslehre: Two Letters to Dr. Lücke*, trans. James Duke and Francis Fiorenza (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981). On subsequent interpretive debates over Schleiermacher's 'eternal covenant', see, e.g., Andrew C. Dole, *Schleiermacher on Religion and the Natural Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 137–75; Brent W. Sockness, *Against False Apologetics: Wilhelm Hermann and Ernst Troeltsch in Conflict* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 199–218; and Gerhard Spiegler, *The Eternal Covenant: Schleiermacher's Experiment in Cultural Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

⁶⁰ Welch, *Protestant Thought*, i, 69.

⁶¹ Cf. Dirk Schmid, 'Historische Einführung', in *KGA* i/6, xxxvi–xxxviii. There are few extant student notes (*Nachschriften*) from these lectures. For the oldest, from 1816–17, see See Ludwig Jonas, 'Theologische Encyclopaedie nach den Vorlesungen des Herrn Dr. Schleiermacher, Wintersemester 1816/17', in BBAW, Nachlass Schleiermacher 547/1. For two versions from 1827, see Stolpe, 'Theologische Encyklopädie nach den Vorlesungen des Herrn Prof. Dr. Fr. Schleiermacher, von E. Stolpe, theol. stud., Berlin, im Sommersemester 1827', in SBB-PK, Dep. 42a Schleiermacher-Archiv, K4, M23, C8, Nachschrift Stolpe, 163–243; and Brodtkorb, 'Anleitung zum Studium der Kirchengeschichte und Dogmatik von Dr. Schleiermacher, Berlin, Sommer 1827', in SBB-PK, Ms.

Philosophical theology had the task of defining ‘the distinctive nature of Christianity’.⁶² As the first branch of study, it promoted a particular kind of philosophy of religion in which one compared the empirical nature of a given expression of Christianity with a near-Platonic ‘ideal’ conception of Christianity. Accomplishing this task required a ‘critical’ stance toward, on one hand, speculation or rational deduction regarding ‘the general concept of a religious community or a community or faith’, and, on the other hand, historical investigation into the ‘plurality of ecclesial communities claiming to be “Christian”’.⁶³ The critical theologian needed to stand ‘above Christianity’, seemingly to preserve a sense of dispassionate engagement with the object of study.⁶⁴ Perhaps with this notion in mind, August Twisten commented that while Schleiermacher assumed a standpoint ‘above’ the Christian consciousness, he meant to stand ‘in’ it.⁶⁵

Philosophical theology, according to Schleiermacher, was a special application of the broader domain of ethics—or the human sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*), as opposed to physics, or the natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*)—which he called ‘the science of the principles of history’. Ethics, he said, ‘can present the manner in which a historical whole has come into being [but] only in a general way’.⁶⁶ The theologian or ethicist needed to identify historical ‘deviations’ from the pure idea under consideration. In theology specifically, this meant discerning ‘diseased’ forms of Christianity and the

germ. oct. 670, Kollegnachschriften von Vorlesungen Schleiermachers und Neanders, Berlin SS 1827, Nachschrift Karl W. F. L. Brodtkorb, 2–37. For 1831/32, see D. F. Strauss, *Friedrich Schleiermacher Theologische Enzyklopädie (1831/32): Nachschrift David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. Walter Sachs (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 1987); an anonymous, more complete set, ‘Theol. Encyclopädie in Vorlesungen über die kurze Darst. des theol. Studiums von Fr. Schleiermacher’, in SBB-PK, Dep. 42a Schleiermacher-Archiv, K4, M22, C7, 1–6; and the anonymous fragment, ‘Theolog. Enzyklopädie (Vorlesungen-Nachschrift), 1831/32’, in SBB-PK, Nachlass 481, Schleiermacher-Sammlung. Editors of the *KGA* have planned an eventual critical edition of these notes.

⁶² Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §32, 338.

⁶³ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §§32–6, 338–40.

⁶⁴ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §33, 338–9.

⁶⁵ Welch, *Protestant Thought*, i. 271 n. 3.

⁶⁶ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §35, 339.

appropriate paths leading toward greater approximation of Christianity's ideal form. 'The true way to seek out the nature of religion [and] theology is the historical', recorded Ludwig Jonas's 1816–17 class notes.⁶⁷ Through critical enquiry and extensive reflection, the philosophical theologian could locate the true 'essence' (*Wesen*) of Christianity, a view approaching Harnack's later *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1900), a consummate text of modern liberal Protestantism.⁶⁸

As Schleiermacher put it elsewhere, in order to reach a proper conception of the Christian church, one needed to 'sufficiently maintain the balance between the historical and the speculative'.⁶⁹ This function operated through two complementary means: apologetics, which looked outward to understand the religious community's historical origins; and polemics, which looked inward to analyze abnormalities within the church. At every point, the contingencies of history had to inform and appropriately 'manage' a rational perspective on religion. The historically-animated use of philosophical theology ran counter to the rational religion espoused by Kant. Philosophical theology constantly presupposed the material of historical theology, Schleiermacher said, in order to 'lay a foundation for both historical and practical theology'.⁷⁰ Though he never wrote a dedicated work of philosophical theology as he defined it, both Schleiermacher's speeches and the majority of the introduction to his *Glaubenslehre* fit the category.⁷¹

Where did this leave historical theology, the second branch? While formally recognizing the *telos* of theological study in church practice, Schleiermacher placed a pronounced emphasis on theology's historical character. 'Historical theology', he insisted in the 1811 edition, 'is the actual corpus of the whole of theological study

⁶⁷ Jonas, 'Theologische Encyclopaedie', 3fr.

⁶⁸ Adolf von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1999).

⁶⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube* (2nd edn, 1830–1), in *KGA* i/13.1. §2, 17–18.

⁷⁰ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §38, 340; §65, 350.

⁷¹ Richard Crouter, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Between Enlightenment and Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 212–13. Cf. Martin Rößler, *Schleiermachers Programm der philosophischen Theologie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994).

and in its own way contains within it both of the other parts'.⁷² Historical theology thus earned the lion's share of attention. Schleiermacher placed under its rubric a vast array of topics, from Old and New Testament hermeneutics to church statistics.⁷³ '[H]istorical knowledge', he said, 'is first and foremost, the indispensable condition of all intelligent effort toward the further cultivation of Christianity'.⁷⁴ In a radical move, Schleiermacher also assigned dogmatics under historical theology, subdividing the latter into three proper subfields of exegesis, church history, and dogmatics.⁷⁵ Each subfield, moreover, came loaded with multiple parts. By 'exegesis', he meant all those components through which one might gain an understanding of 'primitive Christianity' or the 'first Christian community'.⁷⁶ The canon of Scripture, textual criticism, the biblical languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic, hermeneutics, ancient philology, and 'Jewish and Christian Antiquities' all flowed into exegesis. 'Church history', in turn, studied 'the total development of Christianity since its establishment as a historical phenomenon'.⁷⁷ While acknowledging that the study of the Scriptures in the context of Judaism and early Christianity fell into the subfield of church history, the special status accorded to the biblical writings as 'capable of contributing the original, consequently for all times normative, presentation of Christianity', offered an adequate rationale for treating biblical studies in its own category.⁷⁸ Church history, then, included questions about the periodization of Christianity and the historical life and doctrine of the church in any given geographical location or past point in time.

'The present', in Schleiermacher's formulation, 'can be understood only as a result of the past'. In fact, 'historical knowledge of the present moment of history

⁷² Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung* (1811), §36, 254.

⁷³ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §§69–256, 353–416.

⁷⁴ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §70, 353.

⁷⁵ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §85, 358–9.

⁷⁶ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §88, 360.

⁷⁷ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §149, 380.

⁷⁸ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §103, 365.

stands in the most direct relation to church leadership, since it is that out of which future movements are to be developed'.⁷⁹ History opens the way for understanding dogma and for the ability of the future religious leader 'to exercise his own discretion in church leadership'.⁸⁰ Fittingly, Schleiermacher defined dogmatics as 'the knowledge of doctrine now valid (*geltenden*) in the Protestant church'.⁸¹ The act of deciding doctrinal validity was a dialectical one, sensitive to history and animated by the poles of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, which would always remain an ideal that could be approximated but never attained.⁸² Dogma, in this sense, did not represent any absolute phenomenon, but contained within it 'the dialectical element'.⁸³ Orthodoxy reflected doctrinal fidelity to the expressions of Christian faith which the traditions of the church produced up to the present moment. Heterodoxy did not refer to deviations from the church's proper expression of Christianity; that, Schleiermacher designated heresy. Instead, the heterodox element in doctrine allowed for 'conscious and free mobility', capturing the present determination of Christian faith in its historical progression. Doctrine encompassed all three elements—orthodox, heterodox, dialectical. Furthermore, doctrine must subject itself to current notions of science, principally modern historical consciousness. '[T]he development of doctrine (*Entwicklung der Lehre*) is determined by the entire state of science and especially by prevailing philosophical views', Schleiermacher confirmed.⁸⁴ He stressed the progress and development of doctrine in a groundbreaking manner, rivalling the later, notorious discussion in John Henry

⁷⁹ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §82, 357.

⁸⁰ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §100, 364.

⁸¹ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §195, 393–4.

⁸² Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §§203–8, 398–400. Cf. Thiel, 'Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy', 142–57.

⁸³ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §214, 402.

⁸⁴ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §167, 385–6.

Newman's *Essay on the Development of Doctrine* (1845).⁸⁵ Schleiermacher left little doubt that historical understanding must permeate and, indeed, regulate not only dogmatics, but all branches of theological study. Where philosophical theology relied on a 'historical-critical' perspective, practical theology relied on the 'results of the past'. Similarly, he stated, 'Historical criticism is the all-pervasive and indispensable organ for the work of historical theology, as it is for the entire field of historical studies'.⁸⁶

The open letters to Lücke revealed more about history and the relation of the scientific and ecclesial aspects of theology and the church, making reference to the *Kurze Darstellung*.⁸⁷ 'There are certainly many theologians in our great church fellowship who have devoted themselves to their profession before they themselves had experienced much Christian piety in their own lives', Schleiermacher observed. 'That I consider this to be something defective can be learned by anyone who has glanced at my *Encyklopädie* even once'.⁸⁸ As a positive science, theology found its fulfilment in the church, but received its animus from its historically-minded scientific quality.⁸⁹ 'During the time our students pursue their theological education, the pure scientific content (*rein wissenschaftliche Gehalt*) of theology should not be slighted. We, especially, are called upon to plant and nurture this seed wherever possible'.⁹⁰ He continued forcefully: 'There are those who can hack away at science with a sword, fence themselves in with weapons at hand to withstand the assaults of sound research and behind this fence establish as binding a church doctrine that appears to everyone outside as an unreal ghost to which they must pay homage if

⁸⁵ John Henry Newman, *An Essay Concerning the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Toovey, 1845).

⁸⁶ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §102, 364.

⁸⁷ Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre', 307–94.

⁸⁸ Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre', 318.

⁸⁹ Cf. Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §248, 412; §258, 417.

⁹⁰ Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre', 343. Cf. Schleiermacher, *Pädagogik: Die Theorie der Erziehung von 1820/21 in einer Nachschrift*, ed. Christiane Ehrhardt and Wolfgang Virmond (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

they want to receive a proper burial. Those persons might not allow themselves to be disturbed by the developments in the realm of science. But we cannot do that and do not want that. Therefore, *we must make do with history as it develops*.⁹¹

The *Kurze Darstellung*, as a progressive, unifying encyclopaedia of the theological sciences, stood out as a declaration that theology could meet the challenges posed by the scientific and cultural conditions of modernity in the institutional setting of the university. As Schleiermacher famously asked with rhetorical flair: 'Is the knot of history to be unravelled by identifying Christianity with barbarism and science with unbelief?'⁹²

A 'SCIENTIFIC' AND 'HISTORICIST' LEGACY

Readers frequently picked up on the *Kurze Darstellung*'s pacesetting character.⁹³

Schleiermacher is 'the Abelard of the nineteenth century' who built a 'new theological house of studies', announced one Erlangen professor.⁹⁴ 'The whole scheme is wrong; but nevertheless, the book is full of interesting suggestions. Schleiermacher [is] the Origen of German Protestantism, neither orthodox nor heretical, but independent, original, emancipating, and stimulating in different directions', Philip Schaff noted.⁹⁵ David Friedrich Strauss, who enrolled in Schleiermacher's lectures on theological encyclopaedia in the winter of 1831, likened

⁹¹ Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre', 345 (emphasis added).

⁹² Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre', 347.

⁹³ See one of the first reviews of the text, published anonymously but composed by the Heidelberg professor of theology Friedrich Heinrich Christian Schwarz (1766–1837), review of *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* by Schleiermacher and *Theologische Encyclopädie* by Schmidt, *Heidelbergische Jahrbücher der Litteratur* 5 (1812), 513–35. For other reviews, see Schmid, 'Historische Einführung', xlvii–lxxvii; and Alfred Eckert, *Einführung in die Prinzipien und Methoden der evangelischen Theologie* (Leipzig: Strübing, 1909), i. 23–51.

⁹⁴ Gerhard von Zezschwitz, *Der Entwicklungsgang der Theologie als Wissenschaft insbesondere der Praktiken* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1867), 19–20.

⁹⁵ Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical, including Encyclopaedia, Methodology, and Bibliography; A Manual for Students* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), 13.

his attempts at taking notes in the course to ‘photographing a dancer in full motion’.⁹⁶ The subjection of dogmatics to history in Schleiermacher’s system attracted much of the attention.

An impetus toward historical criticism and doctrinal development—toward increased historical consciousness generally—characterized the work. This bearing struck a chord with Schleiermacher’s students and others forced to wrestle with his ideas throughout the modern age. While enrolled in Schleiermacher’s course, a 21-year-old Twesten set down in his diary on 21 January 1811: ‘Schleiermacher places dogmatics under the historical sciences and comprehends it under . . . the knowledge of the present doctrinal condition of Christianity. At first this seems strange, but it is correct, because suppose someone wanted to stick solely with the Bible and construct a system from it; but wouldn’t this system also be a product of his current education, and thus of the time in which he lived?’⁹⁷ Strauss’s 1831 notes read, ‘in such a one who would devote himself to theological studies, the historical consciousness (*das geschichtliche Bewußtseyn*) must be particularly lively’.⁹⁸ Ernst Troeltsch painstakingly studied part two of Schleiermacher’s text, on historical theology.⁹⁹ Karl Barth’s personal copy of Schleiermacher’s work—text carefully underlined, margins crowded with notations, and pages forced out by his own erratic commentary in the form of numerous paper scraps covered with pen and pencil scrawls—follows a similar pattern.¹⁰⁰ As Barth taught through the portion of the *Kurze Darstellung* concerned with historical theology in the winter of 1923, he observed: ‘the primacy of historians in theology, or theological historicism is [here] . . . established firmly and solidly and

⁹⁶ D. F. Strauss, *Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesus von Geschichte* (Berlin: Duncker, 1865), 8.

⁹⁷ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 118.

⁹⁸ Strauss, *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, 69.

⁹⁹ Hans-Joachim Birkner, ‘Ernst Troeltschs Marginalien zu Schleiermachers “Kurze Darstellung”’, *Mitteilungen der Ernst-Troeltsch-Gesellschaft* 6 (1991), 8–12.

¹⁰⁰ Barth’s copy of the 1910 Scholz edition is in KBAB, R9T3B21.

definitely'.¹⁰¹ That historical focus has likewise courted attention from recent scholars as the interpretive 'linchpin' to the work as a whole.¹⁰² In John Thiel's summary, the work 'elevated the historical dimension of theology to a level of importance previously unknown in the history of theological education'.¹⁰³

The diary and letters of Twesten, successor to Schleiermacher's chair upon the latter's death in 1834, provide a vibrant picture of Schleiermacher's lectures on theological encyclopaedia in 1810–11, meriting brief discussion. On 5 November 1810, Twesten noted that he heard Schleiermacher's first lectures on the subject and was enthralled instantly. 'Would that I had such an encyclopaedia of theology at the beginning of my academic career! Now it should serve to correct all my views'. Schleiermacher's proposal to examine 'the historical' with an energetic 'scientific spirit' mesmerized him.¹⁰⁴ Traces of Schelling's project, as well as Gaß's comments when he first heard of Schleiermacher's plans for the encyclopaedia at Halle, emerge in these observations.

Though Twesten found himself captivated by Schleiermacher, he was not afraid to disagree or diverge at points from his professor.¹⁰⁵ He resembled Schelling's student confronted with a 'chaos' of opportunities. Two days before Christmas, Twesten confessed that when he conversed with his instructors, he wanted nothing more than to be a philologist, or to be like Kant, or to be a physiologist, depending on the specialty of the one with whom he spoke. 'I am happy to do anything, and so come to nothing!'¹⁰⁶ Fichte, he said, was perhaps a greater thinker than Schleiermacher, but Schleiermacher possessed more brilliance.¹⁰⁷ He found himself

¹⁰¹ Karl Barth, *The Theology of Schleiermacher: Lectures at Göttingen: Winter Semester 1923/24*, ed. Dietrich Ritschl, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 152.

¹⁰² Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 205; Ziolkowski, *Clio the Romantic Muse*, 88–94.

¹⁰³ Thiel, *Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy*, 142.

¹⁰⁴ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 51.

¹⁰⁵ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 79–80.

¹⁰⁶ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 93.

¹⁰⁷ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 135–6.

conflicted when Schleiermacher changed the time of his 1811 lectures on dialectics to the same hour at which Fichte lectured on the *Wissenschaftslehre*.¹⁰⁸ Eventually, he concluded that Fichte was ‘cold as ice. . . . His philosophy gives to life a tremendous grandeur, but this grandeur is nightmarish’ (*schauerlich*). Twesten came to find inspiration instead in what he called Schleiermacher’s ‘historical outlook’.¹⁰⁹

On 18 December 1810, Twesten observed that in Schleiermacher’s system, the two subdisciplines of philosophical and historical theology reinforced one another: ‘The right insight into historical theology presupposes the philosophical, and this could not be without the historical’. One must ‘always continue to investigate calmly [and] historically . . . with a philosophical spirit’.¹¹⁰ But what of history’s conditional nature? A passage from Troeltsch’s seminal work on the ‘absoluteness of Christianity’ enlarged on that theme. ‘Schleiermacher exhibits the attempt of German idealism’, Troeltsch wrote, ‘to overcome this historical relativity by a way other than that of historical rationalism, namely, by ontological speculation concerning history—speculation that, through the reflection on the very multiplicity of history, leads to knowledge of the unitary ground of all life’.¹¹¹ Twesten’s future reputation as Schleiermacher’s epigone in this area would confirm his agreement. By the spring of 1811, Twesten had been persuaded ‘with heart and soul’ to pursue theology on account of Schleiermacher’s theological encyclopaedia.¹¹² He found a complementary conception of university theology in Schleiermacher’s *Gelegentliche Gedanken*, which he read at the same time.¹¹³ During Twesten’s own tenure as professor of theology at the universities of Kiel and Berlin, he, like Gaß in Breslau,

¹⁰⁸ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 157–8. Cf. Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Dialektik (1811)* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986); and Schleiermacher, *Dialectic, or, The Art of Doing Philosophy*, trans. Terrence N. Tice (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

¹⁰⁹ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 88, 116, 163–4.

¹¹⁰ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 89.

¹¹¹ Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1902), 24–5.

¹¹² Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 154.

¹¹³ Heinrici (ed.), *Twesten*, 196.

regularly assigned the *Kurze Darstellung* to his many students and followed Schleiermacher's outline closely in his own numerous lectures on theological encyclopaedia.¹¹⁴ Few other professors assigned the text due to the success of Hagenbach's, as I observe in Chapter 9.

Friedrich Lücke, a leading early nineteenth-century theology professor at Bonn, also championed Schleiermacher's 'little academic handbook' in terms that resonated with Schelling and idealist conceptions of science.¹¹⁵ His regular appeals to Schleiermacher paralleled a host of other overtures by the nineteenth-century 'mediating theologians' (*Vermittlungstheologen*). Striking at times a nationalist tone, Lücke stated, 'Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology . . . as a science is a purely German necessity and production, involved in the very nature of academic studies as pursued in Germany'. The 'labours' of others—he mentioned Nösselt, Kleuker, and Planck by name—failed to achieve the 'magnificent edifice' that Schleiermacher reared 'with artistic genius'. Theology in the *Kurze Darstellung* appeared for the first time 'as an organic whole . . . taking up, separating, connecting, arranging . . . the religious and the scientific, the practical and the theoretical, the positive and the philosophical'. Lücke deemed it 'a theology of the future . . . a truly prophetic work', echoing the assessments of others.¹¹⁶ In 1827, Lücke even attempted to persuade the future Tractarian leader of the Church of England and Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford's Christ Church, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–82), to translate the work into English, or at least to create his own version based on it, 'for the honour of our German churches [abroad]'.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., Twesten's lecture notes from 1820, 1829, 1841, and 1844, in Twesten, 'Theolog. Encyclopädie.—Bibliologie', in SBB-PK, Nachlass Twesten, K1. Cf. Gaß to Schleiermacher, 16 November 1822, in W. Gaß (ed.), *Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel*, 195.

¹¹⁵ Alf Christophersen, *Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), i. 33–4, 46–7.

¹¹⁶ Lücke, 'Erinnerungen an Schleiermacher', 772–5. Cf. Carl Immanuel Nitzsch, *Ad theologiam practicam feliciter excolendam observationes* (Bonn, 1831), 1–2.

¹¹⁷ Friedrich Lücke to Edward Bouverie Pusey, 22 February 1827, in PHL, 'Fr. Lücke to E. B. P. 1827–1830'.

Pusey declined, but that did not prohibit his engagement with Schleiermacher. In fact, he had met Schleiermacher and read the *Kurze Darstellung* during a second trip to Berlin from June 1826 to June 1827.¹¹⁸ Pusey examined the text in *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character Lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany* (1828). The *Historical Enquiry* offered a gentle critique of ‘German rationalism’ that also sought to persuade a sceptical English audience of the value of German university theology. Though Pusey’s ties to some German theologians, like F. A. G. Tholuck, have emerged in recent years, his esteem for the *Kurze Darstellung* has frequently been overlooked.¹¹⁹ Indeed, editors of Henry Liddon’s authoritative four-volume *Life of Pusey* (1894) after Liddon’s death surgically removed sections of the manuscript in part to downplay Pusey’s German connections and present a more coherently Anglo-Catholic image of him.¹²⁰ Schleiermacher’s encyclopaedia, Pusey exclaimed, is ‘a work, which, with a few great defects, is full of important principles and comprehensive views, and which will form a new era in theology whenever the principles which it furnishes for the cultivation of the several theological sciences shall be acted upon’.¹²¹ Like Lücke, Pusey commended it as the proposal which would usher in theology’s future.

If Schleiermacher’s slender volume heralded a new era for the leader of the Oxford Movement, it occasioned an even more dramatic turning point for the

¹¹⁸ Albrecht Geck, ‘The Concept of History in E. B. Pusey’s First Enquiry into German Theology and Its Background’, *JTS* 38/2 (1987), 394.

¹¹⁹ On relations between the Oxford Movement and theology on the continent, see Stewart J. Brown and Peter B. Nockles (eds.), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830–1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Cf. Albrecht Geck (ed.), *Autorität und Glaube: Edward Bouverie Pusey und Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck in Briefwechsel (1825–1865)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

¹²⁰ K. E. Macnab, ‘Editing Liddon: From Biography to Hagiography?’ in Rowan Strong and Carol Engelhardt Herringer (eds.), *Edward Bouverie Pusey and the Oxford Movement* (London: Anthem, 2012), 31–48. Cf. Henry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 vols (London: Longmans, 1894).

¹²¹ Edward Bouverie Pusey, *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character Lately Predominant in the Theology in Germany*, 2 vols (London: Rivington, 1828–30), i. 114–15. Cf. David Forrester, *Young Doctor Pusey: A Study in Development* (London: Mowbray, 1989), 46. For various reasons outside of the scope here, Pusey in his later years distanced himself from his *Historical Enquiry*. See Ieuan Ellis, ‘Schleiermacher in Britain’, *SJT* 33 (1980), 417–52.

Catholic Tübingen School. Johann Sebastian Drey (1777–1854), Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838), and their student Franz Anton Staudenmaier (1800–56)—primary members of the trailblazing school—turned repeatedly to Schleiermacher’s book.¹²² In the same year that Drey and several colleagues in Tübingen’s Catholic theological faculty founded the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Drey published a theological encyclopaedia. Titled *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie* (1819), the work aimed to foster the development of modern Catholic theology in Germany—to accomplish for Catholicism, in other words, what the *Kurze Darstellung* did for modern Protestantism.¹²³ Drey mentioned Schleiermacher by name explicitly five times in the work, but made numerous allusions to him when discussing dogmatics, historical theology, and doctrinal development, among other themes, demonstrating his conscious adaptations of Schleiermacher’s text.¹²⁴ He continued to define many of his views in relation to Schleiermacher—positively and negatively—in his later *Apologetik* (1838–47).¹²⁵ Fifteen years after Drey’s encyclopaedia appeared, Staudenmaier published his own expanded version, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften als System der gesamten Theologie* (1834; 2nd edn, 1840).¹²⁶

¹²² See, e.g., Bradford E. Hinze, ‘Johann Sebastian Drey and Friedrich Schleiermacher on Theology and Its Subject Matter’, in Michael Kessler and Ottmar Fuchs (eds.), *Theologie als Instanz der Moderne: Beiträge und Studien zu Johann Sebastian Drey und zur Katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 53–76; Bradford E. Hinze, ‘Johann Sebastian Drey’s Critique of Schleiermacher’s Theology’, *HJ* 38/1 (1996), 1–23; Bradford E. Hinze, *Narrating History, Developing Doctrine: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Johann Sebastian Drey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 83–189; and William E. McConville, ‘Theology and Encyclopedia: A Study in the Thought of Franz Anton Staudenmaier’, Ph.D. diss. (Vanderbilt University, 1983). On the Catholic Tübingen School generally, see Rudolf Reinhardt, ‘Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät Tübingen im ersten Jahrhundert ihres Bestehens’, in Reinhardt (ed.), *Tübinger Theologen und ihre Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), 1–42; J. T. Burtchaell, ‘Drey, Möhler and the Catholic School at Tübingen’, in Ninian Smart et al. (eds.), *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), ii. 111–39; and Josef Gieselmann, *Die Katholische Tübinger Schule* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1964).

¹²³ Johann Sebastian Drey, *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System* (Tübingen: Heinrich Laupp, 1819); Eng. trans. in Drey, *Brief Introduction to the Study of Theology, with Reference to the Scientific Standpoint and the Catholic System*, trans. Michael J. Himes (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1994).

¹²⁴ Drey, *Kurze Einleitung*, xxxiii, §84, §165, §170, §383.

¹²⁵ Johann Sebastian Drey, *Die Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christenthums in seiner Erscheinung*, 3 vols (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1838–47).

¹²⁶ Franz Anton Staudenmaier, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften als System der gesamten Theologie*, 2 vols (2nd edn, Mainz: Kupferberg, 1840).

Both, along with related texts by Bonn's Heinrich Klee (1800–40) and Munich's Alois Buchner (1783–1869), testified to the legacy of Schleiermacher's approach even among select Catholic theologians.¹²⁷

These assessments further buttressed Ritschl's conclusion that Schleiermacher in his *Kurze Darstellung* became the 'lawgiver' in modern theology, determining theology's *modus operandi* and overall identity so formidably that any deviations from the text stood out like flagrant transgressions of law.¹²⁸ So too did the judgement of one of Germany's most accomplished theologians of the 1920s, Emanuel Hirsch. Schleiermacher's 'small work is the only significant attempt', Hirsch said, 'to bring the whole organism of all the theological sciences' into a 'systematic, sophisticated connection', with 'a clear and simple representation of its fundamental views'.¹²⁹

Schleiermacher's 'legislation' inscribed him firmly and indelibly at the top of the index of modern university theology. Now 'Doctor and Full Professor', he fixed his scholarly reputation to the short academic treatise at which he had plodded away for over half a decade. Even a two-volume book on German universities produced for the 1893 Chicago world fair, commissioned to illustrate 'the progress of science' in German scholarship on the world stage, invoked Schleiermacher's encyclopaedia.¹³⁰ Hermann Hering, then rector of the University of Halle, called the *Kurze Darstellung* 'scientific leaven' (*wissenschaftlicher Sauerteig*), the ingredient that would preoccupy and influence scholars long after other ideas and trends

¹²⁷ Heinrich Klee, *Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1832); and Alois Buchner, *Encyclopaedie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Sulzbach: Seidel, 1837).

¹²⁸ Albrecht Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (3rd edn, Bonn: Marcus, 1888–9), i. 487.

¹²⁹ Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeine Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1949–54; 5th edn, 1975), v. 348. Hirsch's later political activities in the 1930s and 1940s did not colour this assessment. Cf. Wolfgang Trillhass, 'Emanuel Hirsch in Göttingen', *ZTK* 81 (1984), 220–40.

¹³⁰ Wilhelm Lexis (ed.), *Die deutschen Universitäten: Für die Universitätsausstellung in Chicago 1893; unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Universitätslehrer* (Berlin: Asher, 1893), i. 208, 218.

disappeared from view.¹³¹ Schleiermacher's classic, if slightly ambivalent, project to unite the 'scientific' and the 'ecclesial' cast a shadow of influence from which subsequent generations into the twentieth century could hardly escape.

CONCLUSION

As Barth put it, 'The first place in the history of the theology of the most recent times belongs and will always belong to Schleiermacher, and he has no rival.'¹³² Though perhaps a bit of hyperbole on the part of Schleiermacher's foremost detractor and devotee, Schleiermacher's scheme undoubtedly transformed nineteenth-century Protestantism and helped create the conditions for liberal or cultural Protestantism (*Kulturprotestantismus*).¹³³ The ascendant *Kulturprotestantismus*, first launched with Schleiermacher, would become the 'civil-religious foundation' of the German Empire.¹³⁴ Reflecting on the previous 'half century of theological *Wissenschaft*', Troeltsch credited Schleiermacher with inaugurating 'the great programme of all scientific theology'.¹³⁵ In many respects, Schleiermacher's programme grew out of the European-wide crisis for the modern university and university theology. Where the *Gelegentliche Gedanken* investigated theology's relevance for a scientific university, the *Kurze Darstellung* indicated what kind of discipline modern academic theology

¹³¹ Hermann Hering, 'Praktische Theologie', in Lexis (ed.), *Die deutschen Universitäten*, i. 219.

¹³² Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*, trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden (rev. edn, London: SCM, 2001), 411.

¹³³ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Kulturprotestantismus: Zur Begriffsgeschichte einer theologiepolitischen Chiffre', *ABG* 28 (1984), 214–68.

¹³⁴ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Protestantische Theologie in der Gesellschaft der Kaiserreichs', in Graf (ed.), *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1993), ii. 16. Cf. Gordon Rupp, *Culture-Protestantism: German Liberal Theology at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

¹³⁵ Ernst Troeltsch, 'Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theologischen Wissenschaft', *ZWT* 51 (1908), 225.

should be. Even Schleiermacher's discussion of church statistics reflected key institutional transformations in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹³⁶

Much of the unity of pre-Enlightenment theological education had roots in an understanding of theology as a *habitus* or *scientia practica*, combining piety and learning. The *Kurze Darstellung* was a watershed in the literature, incorporating a new sense of science—understood primarily in historical and critical terms—directly into the definition of theology. Schleiermacher's 'prince of the church' would conjoin 'both a religious interest and scientific spirit in the highest degree'. Schleiermacher's class lectures on theological encyclopaedia made the same points with explicit reference to Schelling, advocating Schelling's position on the positive sciences and highlighting their shared concern for the speculative and the historical in theological enquiry.¹³⁷ By promoting a scientific theology that would bring together speculative and historical tendencies for the practical benefit of the church, the *Kurze Darstellung* became a seminal mediator for historicism in university theology. One notes Arnaldo Momigliano's explicit inclusion of Schleiermacher in his list of ostensibly non-theological historians—Humboldt, Boeckh, Ranke, Gervinius, and Droysen—who carried forward Schelling's historical outlook.¹³⁸

Schleiermacher's model of the university and of theological study, then, bore the marks of Schelling's influence, and in turn, gave rise to a pronounced focus on history in theological reflection. The *Kurze Darstellung* became so successful in part because it held together the theory and practice of theology in the institutional setting of the modern scientific university. And yet, the dual interests in theology—

¹³⁶ Simon Gerber, 'Schleiermacher und die Kirchenkunde des 19. Jahrhundert', *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 11/2 (2004), 183–214. Cf. Johan van der Zande, 'Statistik and History in the German Enlightenment', *JHI* 71/3 (2010), 411–32; and Gabriella Valera, 'Statistik, Staatengeschichte, Geschichte im 18. Jahrhundert', in Bödeker et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte*, 119–43.

¹³⁷ Cf. Jonas, 'Theologische Encyclopaedie', 2fr, 133fv.

¹³⁸ Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography', *JWCI* 9 (1946), 161–2. See also Jörn Rüsen, 'Historische Methode und religiöser Sinn—Vorüberlegungen zu einer Dialektik der Rationalisierung des historischen Denkens in der Moderne', in Wolfgang Küttler et al. (eds.), *Geschichtsdiskurs*, ii (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994), 351.

speculation and history—did not always sit easily. Theological encyclopaedia would take strikingly divergent paths from the 1830s, in the ‘Hegelian’ movement and that of mediating theology. Testifying to the complex character of the period, Hagenbach maintained that ‘the whole of theology is indebted to Schleiermacher’s little book. But all are not Schleiermachers. He, like all reforming spirits, closed an old, and at the same time opened a new, era’.¹³⁹ Or, as he put it elsewhere, Schleiermacher was a ‘second Socrates’.¹⁴⁰ Such transitional judgements invite investigation.

¹³⁹ K. R. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (9th edn, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1874), 4.

¹⁴⁰ K. R. Hagenbach, ‘Der zweite Sokrates’, *Gedichte* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1846), ii. 305.

Chapter 8

The Speculative Trajectory

This, gentlemen, is speculative philosophy, as far as I have come in my elaboration of it. Consider it as a beginning of philosophizing, which you will continue. We are standing in an important epoch, a fermentation where spirit (*Geist*) has made a leap and moved beyond its previous form to assume a new one. The entire body of earlier ideas, concepts, the boundaries of the world, are dissolved and, like a dream vision, collapse upon themselves. Spirit is preparing to emerge anew. It is the principal task of a philosophy to welcome its appearance and to acknowledge it, while others, impotently resisting, cling to the past. . . . But philosophy, recognizing it as the Eternal, must pay tribute to it.

G. W. F. Hegel, 1806

Hegel's first biographer wrote in 1844: 'It was fortunate for Berlin that the Hegelian element with its thorough and compartmentalized systematics and its insistence on method stood in the way of the Schleiermacher element with its versatile flexibility. Yet it was also good fortune for Hegel and his school that Schleiermacher's scholarship, spirit, wit, presence, and popular power did not let it grow up too quickly and made it take shape gradually.'¹ A crucial point of difference—though certainly not the only one—lay in the meaning ascribed to *Wissenschaft* itself. Though Hegel and his followers shared certain idealist views with Schleiermacher, when they called their work 'scientific' they tended to mean that it was expressly philosophical or speculative in nature. True speculation in theology, Hegel claimed, focused on the idea of God as revealed through history and made actual in the unfolding of historical events and philosophical comprehension. This view diverged sharply from

¹ Karl Rosenkranz, *G. W. F. Hegels Leben* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1844; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971), 327.

Schleiermacher's statements on the historical character of theological reflection. 'In contemplating this [Christian] religion', Hegel pronounced, 'we do not set to work historically after the manner of the spirit, which begins with the external, but start from the concept' (*Begriff*).² He denounced those who approached theological study with 'historical-critical' minds.³

If modern theology in Germany—and modern thought generally—exhibited a dominant trend toward 'becoming historical', marking out the nineteenth century as a celebrated 'age of retrospection', this multifaceted outcome was not inevitable.⁴ For Hegel's sympathizers, Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung* represented a false start for theological study, particularly for defining dogmatics as a component of historical theology.⁵ In the first half of the nineteenth century, especially in the 1830s and 1840s, a broadly Hegelian group of theologians aimed to challenge the work of Schleiermacher, and so, they hoped, alter the entire shape and character of university theology in Germany. This chapter examines the constructions of theological encyclopaedia produced by this 'speculative trajectory'.⁶ I concentrate on the schemes of four rather influential figures, who, to varying degrees, championed views of speculative theology: Carl Daub (1765–1836), Philipp Marheineke (1780–1846), Karl Rosenkranz (1805–79), and David Friedrich Strauss (1808–74). Through their intellectual experiments, plots, and strategies, the speculative trajectory essentially

² G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion II*, in Hegel, *Werke in 20 Bänden*, ed. Eva Moldenhauer and Karl Markus Michel (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), xvii. 202. Cf. Hegel, *Werke*, xviii. 100.

³ Hegel, *Werke*, xvii. 307–8.

⁴ John E. Toews, *Becoming Historical: Cultural Reformation and Public Memory in Early Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 96.

⁵ Cf. Brian Gerrish, *Continuing the Reformation: Essays on Modern Religious Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 170–2.

⁶ For a look at non-Hegelian speculative theologians, see George Pattison, *Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Nineteenth Century: The Paradox and the 'Point of Contact'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 30–56. Cf. Otto Pfleiderer, *The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and its Progress in Great Britain since 1825*, trans. J. Frederick Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1890), 131–53; and Michael Murrmann-Kahl, 'Spekulative Theologie', in *TRE* xxxi. 641–9.

lost sight of the pedagogical focus that theological encyclopaedia had maintained since its institutionalization in the middle of the eighteenth century.

BETWEEN SCHELLING AND HEGEL: CARL DAUB

Schleiermacher's and Hegel's disagreements contributed greatly to the advance of the speculative trajectory. Before commenting on their discord, though, one should consider Carl Daub, the so-called 'crown of the theological faculty' in Heidelberg, who began to refine the speculative path before the controversies involving the two professors in Berlin.⁷ Daub was born in Kassel and studied at the University of Marburg, where he later became a lecturer. He was briefly a professor of theology at Hanau, and in 1795, received a full appointment to the theological faculty at Heidelberg, where he influenced a number of young philosophers and theologians. As the university's rector, he helped orchestrate Hegel's move to Heidelberg in 1816.⁸ One of his dedicated students, Friedrich August Rauch, would go on to have an impressive career as the founding president of Marshall College in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.⁹ Rauch's *Psychology* (1840) was one the first books published in America to propound Hegel's system of thought.¹⁰ After Rauch's untimely death in 1841, his successor John Williamson Nevin carried on pieces of the legacy inherited from Heidelberg.¹¹ Others upon whom Daub made a lasting impression include Theodor Lehmus (1777–1837), Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–72), and Marheineke, the

⁷ The description comes from Jakob Burckhardt, Sr, quoted in Werner Kaegi, *Jacob Burckhardt: Eine Biographie* (Basel: Schwabe, 1947–82), i. 131.

⁸ Terry Pinkard, *Hegel: A Biography* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 363–4. On Daub's biography, see Falk Wagner, *Die vergessene spekulative Theologie: Zur Erinnerung an Carl Daub anlässlich seines 150. Todesjahres* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1987).

⁹ See Howard J. B. Ziegler, *Frederick Augustus Rauch: American Hegelian* (Lancaster, PA: Franklin and Marshall College, 1957).

¹⁰ Friedrich A. Rauch, *Psychology; Or a View of the Human Soul, Including Anthropology* (New York: Dodd, 1840). Cf. William H. Goetzmann, *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York: Knopf, 1973), 3–18.

¹¹ D. G. Hart, *John Williamson Nevin: High-Church Calvinist* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005), 76 ff.

latter undertaking editorial duties in the publication of a seven-volume edition of Daub's lectures.¹²

Daub's early works exhibit a deep-seated commitment to Kant.¹³ But by the time he began an editorial collaboration in 1805 with his close friend, the philologist Friedrich Creuzer, he had been swept up in a wave of enthusiasm for the young Schelling. The new philosophical allegiance emanated from his 1806 essay, 'Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie', in the second volume of his and Creuzer's journal, *Studien*.¹⁴ He restated the arguments of the late eighteenth-century Jena professors—Schiller, Fichte, and Schelling—against students who viewed three years of study in the university only as an easy path to employment, but with a new application to the church. 'He who devotes himself to the church', he said, 'and to that end studies theology, will miss his aim, if he simply desires a church office that he may have life, sustenance, comforts, ease, honour; for while he considers the office as a means, and himself or the gratification of his desires as an end, he can never become a church officer, but must remain a hireling.'¹⁵

Daub also hoped to expand on Schelling's ideas on theological study. He was thoroughly acquainted with Schelling's *Vorlesungen*—seen in his occasional lifting of Schelling's phrases from the first lecture—and believed that Schelling could help elucidate theology's relation to other university disciplines and the broader

¹² Ludwig Feuerbach, *Gesammelte Werke*, x, ed. Werner Schuffenhauer (3rd edn, Berlin: Akademie, 1990), 151–80. Cf. Warren Breckman, *Marx, the Young Hegelians, and the Origins of Radical Social Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 92–3. For Marheineke's edition of the lectures, see D. Carl Daub's *philosophische und theologische Vorlesungen*, ed. Philipp Marheineke and Theodor Wilhelm Dittenberger, 7 vols in 8 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1838–44).

¹³ Carl Daub, *Predigten nach kantischen Grundsätzen* (Königsberg, 1794); Daub, *Lehrbuch der Katechetik: Zum Behuf seiner Vorlesungen* (Frankfurt am Main: Hermann, 1801).

¹⁴ Carl Daub, 'Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie im Verhältniß zum akademischen Studium beider: Fragment einer Einleitung in die letztere', in Carl Daub and Friedrich Creuzer (eds.), *Studien*, ii (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1806), 1–69. On Creuzer, see George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 121–50.

¹⁵ Daub, 'Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie', 67.

‘organism’ of human knowledge.¹⁶ As late as 1872, the American Presbyterian Charles Hodge asserted without qualification that Daub’s theology ‘is nothing more than the philosophy of Schelling’.¹⁷ Though Daub offered more suggestions than definitive conclusions, he also delivered an important early argument for understanding theology as *Wissenschaft*.

Like Schelling, Daub conceived of theology as an academic discipline in terms of an overarching ‘whole’. That which is ‘properly theological’, he said, ‘is not fragmentary and rhapsodic . . . but a systemic and speculative knowledge’, encompassing historical, psychological, and exegetical features, among others. There is a ‘repetition of the whole in the parts’ of theology, ‘as the leaf from a tree is a representation of the tree, on and in which it lives’. To rightly understand that repetition, Daub wrote, theology stood in need of a new ‘intellectual organization’, as opposed to a mere ‘material’ one. Again he made his case with analogies drawn from nature. A worm, he reasoned, understands the ‘material organization’ of a tree, but cannot behold its ‘spirit’ and the order of its parts, because it only knows one part of a tree at a time and can never comprehend the ‘unity’ of the tree as it inches along.¹⁸ Five years before Schleiermacher published the *Kurze Darstellung*, Daub called for a fresh approach in which theology’s ‘collected parts determine each other and are determined through the whole’. In Daub’s view, once something attains an ‘intellectual’ organization, it becomes a science (*Wissenschaft*). After the monumental changes to the study of theology and the waning of the older ideal of *Gelehrsamkeit* occasioned by Herder, Nösselt, Planck, and Schelling, theology, too, belonged in the pantheon of *wissenschaftliche* university disciplines.¹⁹

¹⁶ Daub, ‘Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie’, 7–9.

¹⁷ Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1872–3), i. 6.

¹⁸ Daub, ‘Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie’, 4–5.

¹⁹ Daub, ‘Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie’, 10–11.

No less a committed Hegelian than Rosenkranz, Hegel's loudest advocate, described Daub as the original title-holder to the 'speculative movement'. Daub is 'the father of the speculative theology of Protestantism today', Rosenkranz wrote in the late 1830s.²⁰ It had become an 'unfortunate cliché', he continued, to call Daub 'the Talleyrand of German philosophy', defecting from Kant's 'revolution' in order to enlist as one of the 'many marshals of speculation' in Schelling's empire, only to swap allegiances again for Hegel's triumphant 'restoration', roused by Hegel's furnishing through his *Logik* the so-called 'Magna Carta' of the new philosophy and through his *Enzyklopädie* the organization of all philosophical knowledge.²¹ But Daub, he countered, was no opportunistic Talleyrand, justifying each desertion as a way of trading up in political capital. He became the opposite of the guileful French diplomat, ever the model of consistency because he never left the path of 'true philosophy', no matter what contradictions that seemed to present. 'Precisely because of this', Rosenkranz concluded, Daub became speculative Protestantism's 'great theologian'.²²

Daub's 1806 essay did not substantially advance an 'intellectual' organization of academic theology beyond its initial call for one and its clear definition of theology as *Wissenschaft*, though it did enjoy a sizeable readership in the widely circulated *Studien*. Daub's interests in other works from the period drifted from fashioning an overall theological system to reinterpreting various theological and philosophical topics in Hegelian terms.²³ Turning to the nature of Christianity, he wrote that the Christian religion is 'of the spirit' (*Geist*), and *Geist* was both the 'essence and certainty of absolute truth'. Christianity, must, therefore, 'understand and reveal

²⁰ Karl Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung an Karl Daub* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1837), 2.

²¹ Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung*, 3.

²² Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung*, 4.

²³ See Carl Daub, *Einleitung in das Studium der christlichen Dogmatik aus dem Standpunkte der Religion* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1810). Cf. Ehrhard Pfeiffer, *Karl Daub und die Krisis der spekulative Theologie* (Leipzig: Edelman, 1943); and Wilhelm Hermann, *Die speculative Theologie in ihrer Entwicklung durch Daub* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1847).

itself from within', for the 'concept' (*Begriff*) of the Christian religion 'coincides with the true concept of *Geist*, and *Geist* knows itself as the truth . . . [and] the knowledge of the people of God is thus the knowledge of God in the people themselves'. Daub was not a 'servile follower' of the 'dry letters' of the Bible, claimed Rosenkranz, but one who attempted to reconcile his view of Christianity and absolute *Geist* with the biblical testimony.²⁴

For these reasons, condemnations of Schleiermacher's system began to find their way into the works of Daub and his colleagues. According to a tale told by Rosenkranz—of perhaps questionable historical authenticity—Schleiermacher once entered Daub's Heidelberg lecture hall wrapped in a grey travelling coat, and retreated to a dark corner in the back of the room. Daub, by then a follower of Hegel, finished a discussion of Arianism. When Schleiermacher greeted him after the lecture concluded, Daub laughed heartily and said to him that he should be glad he did not notice Schleiermacher enter, otherwise he would have pointed out to the class the share in the heresy that Schleiermacher, like Schelling, deserved.²⁵

SYSTEM-BUILDING AFTER HEGEL:

ROSENKRANZ AND MARHEINEKE

The rift between Hegel and Schleiermacher cast a shadow over Germany's theological schools in the mid-nineteenth century. Though many facets of their feud are well established, others are less so.²⁶ The persistence of their polemics played an

²⁴ Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung*, 7–8.

²⁵ Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung*, 14–15. See also Cyril O'Reagan, 'The Trinity in Kant, Hegel, and Schelling', in Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 254–66.

²⁶ Richard Crouter, 'Hegel and Schleiermacher at Berlin: A Many-Sided Debate', *JAAR* 48 (1980), 19–43. Cf. Pinkard, *Hegel*, 445–7; John E. Toews, *Hegelianism: The Path toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805–1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 49–67; and Jeffrey Hoover, 'The Origin of the Conflict between Hegel and Schleiermacher at Berlin', *Owl of Minerva* 20 (1988), 69–79.

important role in the direction of theological encyclopaedia in the 1830s, especially in the origins of Rosenkranz's encyclopaedia, which emerged as the main challenger to Schleiermacher's text. Though even public altercations between Hegel and Schleiermacher began much earlier, various disagreements between the two came to a head in 1822, when Hegel agreed to write the preface to a new book on the philosophy of religion by his former student at Heidelberg, H. F. W. Hinrichs (1794–1861).²⁷ Hegel took the opportunity to denigrate Schleiermacher's familiar formulation of religion in the 1799 speeches as 'neither thinking nor acting, but intuition and feeling', or, as he tried to clarify in his *Glaubenslehre*, 'the feeling of absolute dependence'.²⁸ Not pulling any punches, the preface quickly established itself as the *locus classicus* of the Hegelian critique of Schleiermacher's misunderstood 'theology of feeling' (*Gefühlstheologie*). Hegel remarked acerbically: 'If religion grounds itself in a person only on the basis of feeling, then such a feeling would have no other determination than that of a feeling of dependence, and so a dog would be the best Christian. . . . A dog even has feelings of salvation when its hunger is satisfied by a bone.'²⁹ He charged Schleiermacher with failing to ground religion in or relate it properly to the transcendent; his critique was one of human 'subjectivism'. He ridiculed Schleiermacher's statements in the preface, and the fact that he left the author of the statements unnamed did nothing to mitigate the blow. Schleiermacher, in turn, parried the attack in his own way, accusing Hegel of being only a 'castrated Fichte', of championing atheism, and of 'confusing Satan with almighty God'.³⁰

²⁷ Hermann Friedrich Wilhelm Hinrichs, *Die Religion im innern Verhältnisse zur Wissenschaft* (Heidelberg: Neue akademische Buchhandlung, 1822). Cf. Hegel, 'Vorrede zu Hinrichs Religionsphilosophie', in Hegel, *Werke*, ii, 42–67.

²⁸ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion* (1799), in *KGA* i/2; Eng. trans. in Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, ed. and trans. Richard Crouter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 22. Cf. Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube* (2nd edn, 1830–1), in *KGA* i/13.1. §4, 32.

²⁹ Hegel, 'Vorrede', 68. See also Kipton E. Jensen, 'The Principle of Protestantism: On Hegel's (Mis)Reading of Schleiermacher's Speeches', *JAAR* 71 (2003), 405–22.

³⁰ Günther Nicolini (ed.), *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1970), 227.

The verbal assaults resurfaced in Hegelian textbooks. The success of Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung* in the midst of the Schleiermacher-Hegel rivalry, no small part of which could be chalked up to academic politics, motivated Rosenkranz to reassert Hegel's critique. At stake, he believed, was university theology's precise scientific content.

Rosenkranz's upbringing occurred within a community of French-speaking Calvinists who had emigrated to Prussia in the eighteenth century. While a student at Berlin, he showed little interest in Hegelian thought, though he warmed considerably to Hegelianism in later years. After completing his studies, he obtained a lectureship at Halle before receiving a professorship in Berlin, where he eventually became friends with Hegel, even attending Hegel's birthday celebration just weeks before Hegel's death. In 1833, he became *Professor Ordinarius* of Philosophy at the University of Königsberg, holding the chair once occupied by Immanuel Kant. When he published his autobiography in 1873, he divided his life into two periods: the first twenty-eight years, characterized as a time of gradual delivery from the 'labyrinthine mazes of Romanticism' that culminated in his Hegelian conversion at the height of his creative intellectual development; and the rest of his life, in which he refined his new perspective.³¹ For his conciliatory efforts between Hegelians on the right—like Marheineke—and those on the left—like Feuerbach and Strauss—contemporaries viewed Rosenkranz as the main representative of the Hegelian 'centre', attempting to make allowances for Hegel's notoriously complicated views and for the ostensibly contradictory directions taken by Hegel's followers.³²

Rosenkranz's *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (1831; 2nd edn, 1845) contained the most significant and systematic account of 'theological

³¹ Karl Rosenkranz, *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg* (Berlin: Heimann, 1873), viii.

³² D. F. Strauss, *Streitschriften zur Verteidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1837), 94–126.

Hegelianism' in the 1830s and 1840s, attempting to validate the compatibility of Hegel's thought with Christianity.³³ Hegel had first published his *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften* in 1817, thus setting the standard for all later philosophical encyclopaedias. A 'new epoch . . . has dawned in the realm of *Wissenschaft* just as it has in politics', Hegel professed. The 'new epoch' required an 'objective', comprehensive treatment of knowledge. 'Philosophy', Hegel maintained, 'is essentially encyclopaedic, that is, encompassing or encircling. In distinguishing as well as connecting its own self-distinctions, the whole is both the necessity of its parts as well as its own freedom. The truth can only exist as such a totality systematically developed; only the whole is the truth'.³⁴ His encyclopaedia of philosophy, 'the system of knowledge, naturally of conceptual knowledge (*begrifflichen Wissens*), and so tantamount to a system of the sciences', footslogged after that goal.³⁵

Hegel's intellectual expedition drew on *Wissenschaft*-thinking and the changes wrought in the aftermath of the French Revolution. These factors also supported Rosenkranz's approach. What Hegel did in philosophy with his *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, Rosenkranz attempted in theology. In fact, Rosenkranz's work became the most prominent theological encyclopaedia of the nineteenth century penned from an explicitly Hegelian perspective, only challenged faintly by Richard Rothe's posthumous *Theologische Encyclopädie* (1880).³⁶

³³ Karl Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (1831; 2nd edn, Halle: Schwetschke, 1845). Unless otherwise noted, references are to the second edition.

³⁴ Hegel produced three versions of his *Enzyklopädie*: 1817, 1827, and 1830, in Hegel, *Werke*, xvii–x, respectively. The quotation comes from 1817 in Hegel, *Werke*, xviii. 12–13; Eng. trans. (modified) in Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of Logic: Part I of the Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, trans. F. R. Geraets et al. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991), 203. Cf. Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, trans. Gustav Emil Mueller (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), 54–75.

³⁵ M. Kronenberg, *Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus* (Munich: Beck, 1912), ii. 764.

³⁶ Richard Rothe, *Theologische Encyclopädie, aus seinem Nachlasse*, ed. H. Ruppelius (Wittenberg: Koelling, 1880). For Rothe's own admission of Hegel's influence, see Rothe, *Theologische Encyclopädie*, 33. Rothe, though, was not the same kind of 'Hegelian' as Rosenkranz. Cf. August Dorner, *Grundriss der Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Berlin: Reimer, 1901), 102; and Richard Rothe, *Theologische Ethik* (2nd edn, Wittenberg: Koelling, 1867), i. 1, 48–9, 53.

In his youth, Rosenkranz had lamented ‘encyclopaedism’ (*Encyklopädismus*) as ‘the symptom’ that a less than modest ‘penchant for excellence betrayed’. As a young student, he devoured Sulzer’s survey of the sciences and all other compendia in reach promising partial or comprehensive coverage of all human knowledge. He displayed Klügel’s encyclopaedia of the sciences, a Christmas gift from his father in 1821, like a resplendent ‘treasure’ on his bookshelf.³⁷ He had listened to Marheineke’s lectures on theological encyclopaedia in Berlin, though they did not make a very memorable impression on him. Instead, his own extended rumination on Schleiermacher—processed through newly acquired Hegelian categories—provided the immediate occasion for indulging his ‘penchant for excellence’. When Schleiermacher published the second edition of the *Glaubenslehre*, Rosenkranz embarked on a near pathological campaign of hammering away at the achievement. Over the course of 1830–1, Rosenkranz rolled out a fourteen-part review of the *Glaubenslehre*, adding simultaneously multi-part reviews of the open letters between Schleiermacher and the Breslau theologians Daniel von Cölln and David Schulz on the relevance of the historic confessions to the contemporary church.³⁸ This prompted him to sharpen his thoughts, redressing the errors of Schleiermacher’s system in his own constructive account of university theology.³⁹ Textbooks (*Lehrbücher*)—if not reviews—Rosenkranz believed, ‘should always be drafted with brevity’, as in ‘the excellent way’ in which Schleiermacher had composed the first edition of the *Kurze Darstellung*.⁴⁰

³⁷ Rosenkranz, *Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 116–17. Cf. Georg Simon Klügel, *Encyclopädie, oder zusammenhängender Vortrag der gemeinnützigsten, insbesondere aus der Betrachtung der Natur und des Menschen gesammelten Kenntnisse*, 7 vols (3rd edn, Berlin: Nicolai, 1806–17).

³⁸ Karl Rosenkranz, ‘Schleiermacher: Der christliche Glaube . . . Erster Band’, *JWK* 106–111 (1830), 841–8, 849–56, 857–9, 865–72, 873–80, 881–7; Rosenkranz, ‘Schleiermacher: Der christliche Glaube . . . Zweiter Band’, *JWK* 103–6, 116–19 (1831), 824, 825–32, 833–40, 841–3, 924–8, 929–36, 937–44, 945–52. On the open letters, see *JWK* 49–51 (1831), 388–92, 393–8, and 401–8. Cf. Daniel von Cölln and David Schulz, *Ueber theologische Lehrfreiheit auf den evangelischen Universitäten und deren Beschränkung durch symbolische Bücher* (Breslau: Gosohorsky, 1830); and *KGA* i/10. 395–426.

³⁹ Rosenkranz, *Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 441.

⁴⁰ Rosenkranz, *Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 230.

At age 68, Rosenkranz wrote, 'I marvel now at my age and at such audacity, but back then it seemed to me entirely natural and necessary. If I had lost myself in an idea, every external consideration disappeared for me.' The originality of his work, he claimed, resided in the attempt to 'present theology as an organic whole' and not merely as a list of the 'individual disciplines, as they used to do, discussing methodological and literary-historical' questions. For pedagogical purposes, he confessed that his model was 'very clumsy', even if it retained a certain 'freshness and frankness in its era'. With the completion of a dialectical system of Christianity, he said, even pietists like 'Tholuck could now read in black and white what I was thinking about modern Protestantism, because I had taken it as the motivating creed in my book'.⁴¹ He had rewritten the development of the history of dogma as the 'true opposition' of Schleiermacher's historical-philosophical system and Kant's enlightened, reason-bound religion.⁴²

Seeking to develop the Hegelian reconciliation between religious faith and philosophical knowledge, Rosenkranz carried out a polemic on two fronts. First, he argued that the bombardment of 'critical rationalists of the Enlightenment' against Christianity damaged only a certain representation (*Vorstellung*) of the Christian faith, not its absolute content (*Begriff*). Second, he contended that Romantic thinkers like Schleiermacher developed Christianity upon an inherently unstable foundation.⁴³ Besides Hegel's critique of 'the feeling of absolute dependence', Rosenkranz's own abandonment of Romanticism spurred on his broadsides. He determined that his *Encyklopädie* should counter the influence of Schleiermacher's own, especially Schleiermacher's formulation of theology's speculative-historical interests.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Rosenkranz, *Magdeburg bis Königsberg*, 442.

⁴² Rosenkranz, *Erinnerung*, 8.

⁴³ Toews, *Hegelianism*, 163.

⁴⁴ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, 1–4.

In an opening statement, Rosenkranz pronounced: 'Theology (on this one is not in dispute) is the *Wissenschaft* of religion'. *Wissenschaft* makes 'inevitable the demand to its system. It must lead to the truth of its contents'.⁴⁵ The dialectic at work in theology, as well as philosophy, he maintained, is not different from its object or content; it is the content itself, the dialectic which it has in itself, that makes it self-propelling. Once theologians or philosophers—for both, according to him, labour at the same task—'comply with the concept of theology as science' (*Theologie als Wissenschaft*), they 'cannot do without the dialectic'. Indeed, 'from concept (*Begriff*) to concept (*Begriff*), from the simplest to the most profound element, gradually, they must spread their organic connection' and account for the 'self-movement' of absolute Christianity.⁴⁶ 'The Christian religion, as that of the spirit' (*Geist*), he continued, 'has revealed not only lessons of truth for the common consciousness, as the Oriental religions; not only a philosophy . . . [of] popular thinking, as in the ancient world; but a *Wissenschaft* of teaching, a theology'. By means of the dialectic, or speculative theology, which he alternately termed 'the philosophy of the completion of knowledge', absolute *Wissenschaft* reveals and rationally unfolds itself.⁴⁷

Rosenkranz arranged his theological system into three subdisciplines, providing a Hegelian take on Schleiermacher's threefold pattern.⁴⁸ The first, 'speculative theology', involved appropriating and developing the Hegelian notion of the Idea or Spirit (*Geist*) of absolute religion or Christianity, without recourse to any historical data or empirical content of the Christian faith. 'Speculative theology is the science of religion in and of itself', he wrote, 'the evolution of simple and eternal

⁴⁵ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, vii.

⁴⁶ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, viii.

⁴⁷ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, ix–x.

⁴⁸ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, xviii–xix.

concepts that are contained in the relation of God to man and man to God'.⁴⁹ The other subdisciplines included historical theology and practical theology. Decidedly, however, he reserved pride of place in the curriculum for speculative thought.⁵⁰

What Rosenkranz had in mind for reshaping the nature of theology and the kind of questions it should ask was unmistakable from even a passing glance at the table of contents. Speculative theology comprised two overarching parts: dogmatics and ethics. In the first edition, the topics treated under dogmatics included: the doctrine of God ('absolute substantiality' [*Substantialität*], 'absolute causality', 'absolute personality'); the doctrine of the world; and the doctrine of religion (anthropology, Christology, the church). Ethics discussed law (the 'good'), sin ('evil'), and freedom. His second major division, historical theology, counted more or less a standard array of topics, with two obvious exceptions. In the first place, Rosenkranz placed exegesis under historical theology, which Schleiermacher had likewise done, somewhat idiosyncratically. In the second place, he appended a survey of 'the dogmatic history of the church', which he divided into three successive periods: 'analytic knowledge', 'synthetic knowledge', and 'systematic knowledge'.⁵¹

Then, as now, the periodization of history functioned as a lightning rod for a vehement war of words. What the French historian Jacques Revel has referred to as 'the play of scales' (*jeux d'échelles*), haunted church historians, theologians, and philosophers throughout the nineteenth century as well.⁵² The medieval mystic Joachim of Fiore's three-stage process of development reverberated in Hegel's

⁴⁹ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, ix–x.

⁵⁰ On this move, see Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 410–11.

⁵¹ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, xxiii–xxviii.

⁵² Jacques Revel, *Jeux d'échelles: la micro-analyse à l'expérience* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996). On recent debates about religious 'modernity' and periodization, see Kathleen David, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 77–95.

philosophy of history.⁵³ Rosenkranz's contemporary, Auguste Comte (1798–1857), constructed his fundamental theses of historical evolution, his so-called 'law of the three phases' of history, in which humanity passed through a pre-modern 'theological' age dependent upon supernatural explanations of natural phenomena, a 'metaphysical' age in which philosophical enquiry affixed itself to such emerging concepts as basic human rights, and a final 'positive' or 'scientific' phase, dominated by 'Positivism' and the application of the methodology of the sciences to all spheres of human thought.⁵⁴ As Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825) put it, 'The philosophers of the eighteenth century made an *Encyclopédie* to overthrow the theological and feudal system. The philosophers of the nineteenth century should also make an *Encyclopédie* to bring into being the industrial and scientific system.'⁵⁵

For Rosenkranz, history of dogma was no 'catalogue of random opinions', but like any other history with 'spiritual elements', followed a clear 'process with a certain result'. The ancient Greek church represented the analytic stage of development, culminating in the establishment of Christian dogma. The medieval and early modern Roman church moved beyond assertions of dogmatic propositions to reflect on the relationships among the individual terms of each dogma. This synthetic stage of development reached its peak in 'a more or less happy aggregate of multiple dogmas and the evidence for each'. Only with Protestantism did philosophers and theologians sculpt the 'aggregate' of dogma into a systematic whole. Protestantism 'goes beyond the ideals' of synthetic and analytic knowledge, in order to arrive at 'a systematic knowing, whose soul is the self-moving concept'. Greek analysis overemphasized particular dogmas, a tendency which the Roman synthesis of 'rigour and precision in the logical design' of dogma overcorrected.

⁵³ Cyril O'Regan, *The Heterodox Hegel* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994), 70, 320.

⁵⁴ Auguste Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive*, ed. Michel Serres et al., 2 vols (new edn, Paris: Hermann, 1975).

⁵⁵ Henri de Saint-Simon, *Oeuvres complètes de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, x (2nd edn, Paris: Dentu, 1867), 104–5.

Protestantism would eventually ‘raise’ (*aufheben*) these tensions to a new ‘organic unity’ through the ‘self-development of *Wissenschaft* . . . [and] reconcile the long strife of theology and philosophy’.⁵⁶

Rosenkranz followed the method of Marheineke in his attempts to re-establish a Hegelian understanding of religion and ‘demonstrate the truth of the basic Christian doctrines by describing them as Moments in the logical explication of the idea of the union of God and man in absolute spirit’.⁵⁷ Marheineke, Schleiermacher’s colleague at the University of Berlin and Trinity Church, became an enthusiastic disciple of Hegel after the latter joined Berlin’s philosophy faculty in 1818. His newfound affection displayed traits similar to a conversion experience, paralleling his earlier enthusiasm for Schleiermacher. He first published his magnum opus, *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik*, in 1819, the fruit of years of study under the sway of Schleiermacher and, in particular, the philosophy of Schelling. With the second edition, however, he modified the title to reflect the bonds he had forged with Hegelian idealism.⁵⁸ The second edition also carried a new dedication to Daub. Where many like Leopold von Ranke ‘shed [their] Hegelian skin’ in their middle ages, as Lord Acton remarked, Marheineke only grew into his own.⁵⁹

Marheineke soon acquired the reputation of being a ‘theologian of the concept’ (*Begriffstheologe*), disseminating Hegel’s ideas in the classroom and in print, causing further unrest with Schleiermacher.⁶⁰ He appropriated Hegel’s distinction between representation (*Vorstellung*) and concept (*Begriff*), applying these to the

⁵⁶ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, 256–9. Cf. Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie* (1831), 248–50.

⁵⁷ Toews, *Hegelianism*, 164.

⁵⁸ Philipp Marheineke, *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1819); Marheineke, *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft* (2nd edn, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1827). See also Marheineke, *D. Philipp Marheineke’s theologische Vorlesungen*, ed. C. Stephan Matthies and Wilhelm Vatke, i (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1847). Cf. Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*, trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden (rev. edn, London: SCM, 2001), 477–84.

⁵⁹ Lord Acton, ‘German Schools of History’, *EHR* 1 (1886), 17.

⁶⁰ Karl Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1856), 54. Cf. Marheineke, *Einleitung in die öffentlichen Vorlesungen über die Bedeutung der hegelschen Philosophie in der christlichen Theologie* (Berlin: Enslin, 1842).

historical and dogmatic aspects of Christian theology, respectively. As John Toews related, Hegel and Marheineke described Christianity—‘the dynamic unification of the divine and human in history—as “presented” or “revealed” in the form of concrete images, historical narratives, or doctrinal statements about supernatural beings and transcendent relationships. These images, historical narratives, and statements were now defined as “representations” of the absolute in the form of the particular’.⁶¹

Marheineke employed Hegel’s understanding of these representations as ‘objectifications of the dynamic self-developing unity of spirit, not as factual descriptions of external supernatural events or transcendent beings’.⁶² This distinction bolstered the defence that Rosenkranz mounted against ‘critical rationalists’. Such Enlightenment critiques touched upon a representation (*Vorstellung*) of traditional Christian belief, but could not reach Christianity’s absolute concept (*Begriff*). Marheineke gave this very point its clearest expression in *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft* (1827): the ‘truths of Scripture and the church are deeper’ than their representations, he said; ‘they are speculative and have their origin in absolute knowledge. The task of *Wissenschaft* is thus to explore them in a speculative manner’.⁶³ By means of speculative reasoning, Rosenkranz likewise asserted, Christianity might break through ‘the difficult division of theological and philosophical knowledge’. The result, he claimed, would be the ‘reconciliation of philosophy with theology’ and the proper intervention of Christian truth in the modern world.⁶⁴

Rosenkranz drew from common elements in the literature, including the notion of theology as science. Speculative theology, however, reigned over historical

⁶¹ Toews, *Hegelianism*, 148.

⁶² Toews, *Hegelianism*, 148.

⁶³ Marheineke, *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft*, 60.

⁶⁴ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, xi, xiii.

theology—a new twist in the history of philosophy’s usurping of theology’s ‘royal’ honour. ‘The totality of world history remains shut off from understanding without the key of a fully developed world view, which history is unable to produce by its own means’, Rosenkranz said.⁶⁵

It is intriguing in this light to consider Marheineke’s own lectures on theological encyclopaedia delivered in Berlin from November 1832 to March 1833.⁶⁶ Marheineke first lectured on the topic at Erlangen in 1805.⁶⁷ His statements reveal the novelty in Rosenkranz’s speculative system. Class notes (*Nachschriften*) from Rudolf Köpke (1813–70)—a first-year theology student who would eventually forego a future in theology for a career in history and become a prominent member of the so-called ‘Ranke school’, authoring an important study on the founding of the University of Berlin—offer an incisive glimpse into Marheineke’s programme.⁶⁸ Köpke seemingly demonstrated his mastery of the material with a carefully constructed, if abbreviated, outline of the course appended to the end of his notes.⁶⁹

A brief theoretical and historical overview occupied the first few lectures, which Marheineke tended to address along ‘external’, ‘internal’, and ‘objective’ lines of enquiry.⁷⁰ Like most works of theological encyclopaedia, Marheineke’s historical survey concentrated on the pedagogical literature of early modern Protestantism, discussing Erasmus, Hyperius, and Calov, among others.⁷¹ Once past introductory matters, he divided the material into two major sections: theological encyclopaedia in general, and in particular, a default move since J. S. Pütter’s landmark work at Göttingen in the 1750s and Samuel Mursinna’s volume from 1764. The first section

⁶⁵ Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie*, ix–x.

⁶⁶ Rudolf Köpke, ‘Philipp K. Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie, Kolleg Berlin 1832/33, Nachschrift Rudolf Köpke’, in SBB-PK, Ms. germ. qu. 2162.

⁶⁷ See *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* 78 (1805), 625.

⁶⁸ On Köpke, see ADB xvi. 673–75. Cf. Köpke, *Die Gründung der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Berlin: Schade, 1860).

⁶⁹ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 203fv–209fr.

⁷⁰ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 203fv–205fv.

⁷¹ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 9fr.

discussed ‘The Concept of the Christian Religion, of Theology, and of their Relation’ and then ‘Theology as a System of Sciences’ (*Wissenschaften*).⁷² The second section took up the individual branches of theological study.⁷³

Perhaps most surprising, Marheineke bypassed Rosenkranz and Schleiermacher in reverting to the fourfold pattern of biblical theology, historical theology, systematic theology—which Köpke recorded at times as ‘scientific theology’ (*wissenschaftliche Theologie*), pointing to a possible identification of theology’s scientific principles solely with its systematic, speculative focus—and practical theology.⁷⁴ The list of individual fields within each branch also exhibited conservative features. Biblical theology included the study of the canon, textual criticism, and hermeneutics. Historical theology discussed the history of the church, the history of dogma, and symbolics. ‘Scientific theology’, his focal interest, covered ethics and then dogmatics. Lastly, practical theology ranged over church government, liturgy, catechesis, homiletics, and pastoral concerns.⁷⁵ One should not necessarily make a one-to-one identification of Köpke’s notes with Marheineke’s views, but in terms of how they represent the form and structure of theological encyclopaedia, they are nevertheless revealing. For all his commitment to Hegelian ideas and his reputation as both a cold, uncompromising ‘theologian of the concept’ and a ‘great personal enemy’ of Schleiermacher, Marheineke still mostly followed convention.⁷⁶ In a word, he approached the genre in a rather traditional manner, all the more so when one views him in his immediate context. This only points up the innovations of Rosenkranz and Strauss.

⁷² The sections begin at Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 10fv, and 41fr, respectively.

⁷³ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 83fv ff.

⁷⁴ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 208fv.

⁷⁵ Köpke, ‘Marheineke: Theologische Encyklopädie’, 203fv–209fr.

⁷⁶ Cf. Max Lenz, *Geschichte der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1910–18), i. 613; and Robert M. Bigler, *The Politics of German Protestantism: The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815–1848* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), 36.

STRAUSS, HISTORY, AND EXEGESIS

David Friedrich Strauss, born the same year as Darwin, scandalized Europe in 1835 with the publication of *Das Leben Jesu*.⁷⁷ Among nineteenth-century German Protestant theologians in university posts, Strauss was hardly the most popular. The firestorm surrounding his short-lived appointment to Zurich's faculty in 1839 led, in fact, to the overthrow of Zurich's cantonal government by the rural population of the canton.⁷⁸ But his success with the educated bourgeois public was nearly unequalled. Friedrich Nietzsche, once a fan of Strauss's work, ultimately lamented the direction Strauss had taken as the path of a 'cultural philistine' (*Bildungsphilister*) and Strauss's reception as a telltale sign of a society afflicted with a deep cultural malaise.⁷⁹ Strauss corroborated a more positive version of this account of his popularity, writing in 1872: 'I am a Bourgeois (*ein Bürgerlicher*), and I am proud to be one.'⁸⁰ Spectators abroad offered trenchant criticism on this point. The negative verdict on Strauss rendered by the *British Quarterly Review* across the English Channel, typical in its furore, opposed the identity Strauss claimed for himself as that of a destructive malcontent at odds with the characteristics of a respectable theologian. Referencing the recent English translation of *Das Leben Jesu*, it judged the net result of the work 'such a fantastic system of speculation as that of Hegel', equal in comparison 'to

⁷⁷ D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Osiander, 1835–6). For reactions to the book, see Marilyn Chapin Massey, *Christ Unmasked: The Meaning of the 'Life of Jesus' in German Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1983); Williamson, *Longing for Myth in Germany*, 151–79; and Erik Linstrum, 'Strauss's Life of Jesus: Publication and the Politics of the German Public Sphere', *JHI* 71/4 (2010), 593–616. See also Horton Harris, *David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, *Kritik und Pseudo-Spekulation: David Friedrich Strauss als Dogmatiker im Kontext der positionellen Theologie seiner Zeit* (Munich: Kaiser, 1982); and Jean-Marie Paul, *D. F. Strauss (1801–1874) et son époque* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1982).

⁷⁸ Cf. Marc Lerner, 'Popular Sovereignty in the Zürichputsch', *A Laboratory of Liberty: The Transformation of Political Culture in Republican Switzerland, 1750–1848* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 221–61.

⁷⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche, 'David Strauss der Bekenner und der Schriftsteller', *Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen I*, in Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzinno Mantarini (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), i. 165. The first *Untimely Meditation* (1873) turned on Strauss's latest work, *Der alte und der neue Glaube: Ein Bekenntniß* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1872).

⁸⁰ Strauss, *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, 273.

nothing else than some ice-palace, vast, glittering, and strangely compacted, but cold, unsubstantial, baseless, and useless' and ill-suited to piety. It continued sarcastically: "‘Learned Germany’ has been indulging itself in writing infidelity for the last half-century without altogether suspecting it [and] Dr. Strauss has done them the benefit of showing them [i.e., the theologians of “Learned Germany”] to themselves."⁸¹

Before making his controversial mark by reducing to the status of myth the dogma that Jesus of Nazareth was God incarnate, Strauss had already cast his lot into an animated debate among the prominent theologians of so-called ‘Learned Germany’, less about the nuances of New Testament Christology and more about the nature of theology itself. His earliest published writing after his 1831 dissertation, and his self-attested ‘oldest theological work’, was a lengthy review of Rosenkranz’s *Encyklopädie* (1831).⁸² It appeared in three instalments in May 1832 in the important Hegelian venue, the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. Enthusiasts considered the review imaginative in scope and ambition, while critics looked down on it as wandering and unsteady.⁸³

The Hegelian *Jahrbücher* represented the primary mouthpiece for the dissemination and analysis of Hegelian ideas. Hegel, Marheineke, Eduard Gans—Marx’s teacher—and some dozen colleagues had founded the *Societät für wissenschaftliche Kritik* in 1826, one goal of which was to edit and publish the yearbook; another was to exclude Schleiermacher from membership in retaliation for Schleiermacher’s obstruction of Hegel’s entrance into the Prussian Academy of Sciences. Hegel and his partners originally conceived of the yearbook as a potential

⁸¹ ‘The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined. By Dr. David Friedrich Strauss’, *British Quarterly Review* 5 (1847), 206–64. Cf. D. F. Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, trans. George Eliot (London: Chapman, 1846).

⁸² D. F. Strauss, ‘Vorwort’, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken: Eine Sammlung zerstreuter Aufsätze aus den Gebieten der Theologie, Anthropologie und Aesthetik* (1839; 2nd edn, Leipzig: Wigand, 1844), iv. Cf. Gotthold Müller, *Identität und Immanenz: Zur Genese der Theologie von David Friedrich Strauss* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1968), 50–82.

⁸³ D. F. Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie und der theologischen Wissenschaften (1831)’, *JWK* 92–4 (1832), 729–36, 737–44, 745–8, in Strauss, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, 213–34. References here correspond to *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*.

official institution of the Prussian state in order to lend authority to the reviews they would publish. In the end, they kept it under their own control to avoid the predicaments that would arise with the state operating as its governing body. Still, they struck against the practice in Berlin, and indeed, in many European centres of literary and scientific criticism, of publishing anonymous reviews, which they disparaged as ‘the bandit regime’ (*Banditenwesen*). The society even considered enacting a policy that would require reading aloud every review in the most recent issue of the yearbook at each society meeting.⁸⁴ In 1834, Feuerbach exclaimed that the yearbook was ‘one of the most prestigious, if not the most prestigious, scientific institutions of the time’.⁸⁵ Strauss’s review thus marked his entry into ‘Hegel’s court’ (*Hegel-Hof*), the name by which the *Societät* was popularly known.

Strauss’s make-up and the context in which he threw pen to paper in umbrage over Rosenkranz’s book added fire to his review. Born in Ludwigsburg to a merchant family, he grew out of the same cradle of Swabian pietism as Hegel, Hölderlin, and Schelling. In 1821, he began his secondary studies at Blaubeuren (near Ulm), whose faculty at the time included Ferdinand Christian Baur. In 1827, he enrolled at the University of Tübingen, where Baur had taken a post in 1826. A kind of mystical Romanticism flourished among his classmates. As Friedrich Theodor Vischer put it, they sought ‘the beautiful [in] the mystical and miraculous, in the musical echoes of inarticulate infinite feelings and the dissolution of all solid forms of the visible world in the delirium of the imagination’.⁸⁶ During Strauss’s third year of study at Tübingen, Baur directed his attention to Schleiermacher. Already enkindled to Romanticism through readings of Jacob Böhme, Franz von

⁸⁴ Eduard Gans, ‘Die Stiftung der Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik’, *Rückblicke auf Personen und Zustände* (Berlin: Veit, 1836), 215–56.

⁸⁵ Feuerbach to Kapp, 16 May 1834, in August Kapp (ed.), *Briefwechsel zwischen Ludwig Feuerbach und Christian Kapp, 1832 bis 1848* (Leipzig: Wiegand, 1876), 49.

⁸⁶ Friedrich Theodor Vischer, ‘Dr. Strauss und die Wirtemberger’ (1838), in Vischer, *Kritische Gänge* (Tübingen: Fues 1844), i. 92.

Baader, and Schelling, Strauss and a group of like-minded friends poured over Schleiermacher's writings under Baur's tutelage. As Strauss scrutinized Schleiermacher's emerging system, he began to see the mediating position between philosophy and theology as a 'halfway house' in which the claims of traditional Christianity, historical criticism, and intellectual rigour coalesced in an ambivalent, dubious scheme. Inspired by what he read to take philosophical criticism seriously, he soon concluded that the philosophical acuity he found was itself deficient. For Strauss and his friends at Tübingen, rather than personifying the 'eternal peace between philosophy and theology' that would 'assuage us scientifically' (*wissenschaftlich*), Schleiermacher symbolized 'a precarious armistice, and we found ourselves advised to look ahead to the war'.⁸⁷

During his last two years at Tübingen, Strauss also embarked on a thorough study of Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (1807), subscribed to the *Jahrbücher*, and plodded through Hegel's *Logik*. In November 1830, he laughed with his friend Christian Märklin that he could now transform 'Being into Nothing, and Nothing back into Being', like a 'skilful alchemist'.⁸⁸ A brief stint as a country pastor left him unsatisfied, and he decided in 1831 to study theology and philosophy in Berlin with Hegel. Writing to Märklin in May 1831, Strauss proposed that they spend the next academic year in the Prussian capital in order to 'be initiated in the mysteries of *Wissenschaft*'.⁸⁹

Shortly after Strauss's arrival in Berlin, and less than one week after his only personal visit with Hegel, the philosopher died. On 15 November 1831, the day after Hegel's death, Strauss had his first meeting with Schleiermacher. Yet 'the great Schleiermacher was insignificant to me at that moment,' Strauss recalled, when

⁸⁷ D. F. Strauss, *Christian Märklin: Ein Lebens- und Charakterbild aus der Gegenwart* (Mannheim: Bassermann, 1851), 53.

⁸⁸ Strauss to Märklin, 12–22 November 1830, in Eduard Zeller (ed.), *Ausgewählte Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss* (Bonn: Strauss, 1895), 2.

⁸⁹ Strauss to Märklin, 31 May 1831, in Zeller (ed.), *Briefen*, 7.

measured in the light of such a loss. Mourning that loss—and the hard truth that his own opportunity to hear Hegel explain directly how to relate his philosophy to Christian theology had evaporated before his eyes—Strauss nonetheless listened intently that semester to Marheineke lecture on the history of dogma, Karl Ludwig Michelet on Hegel's encyclopaedia of philosophy, and Schleiermacher on theological encyclopaedia. He took extensive notes in Schleiermacher's course. Because Schleiermacher seemed to rehearse his lectures ahead of time and then deliver them extemporaneously, Strauss reported, it was no easy feat to keep up with him.⁹⁰

Evidently, Strauss wrote the review of Rosenkranz's book while Schleiermacher's course was still ongoing or only a few weeks at most after its conclusion: the last lecture was held on 31 March 1832 and the review appeared in May.⁹¹ On 11 March, Strauss wrote that he had just finished reading both Rosenkranz's *Encyklopädie* and *Die Naturreligion* (1831). He deemed them 'hastily assembled works that handled Hegel's ideas rather carelessly'. 'The man [Rosenkranz] writes too much', he protested, 'and this is also the opinion of those who know him.'⁹² In spite of this—or perhaps because of it—Strauss began his review with a scrupulous engagement with the ideas he had just taken down from the head of Berlin's theological faculty.

Rather than letting the ideal of 'theology as *Wissenschaft* determine the needs of theological study', Strauss decided, Schleiermacher had relied upon a reference point outside of purely scientific concerns. This was the very same criticism that Schleiermacher had levied against Schelling during their 'quiet war'. Schelling allowed the interests of the state to lead him astray in his model of the university, the

⁹⁰ Strauss to Märklin, 15 November 1831, in Zeller (ed.), *Briefen*, 8–10.

⁹¹ Cf. Carl Clemen, 'Schleiermachers Vorlesung über theologische Enzyklopädie', *TSK* 78 (1905), 226–45.

⁹² Strauss to Georgi, 11 March 1832, in Heinrich Maier (ed.), *Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss an L. Georgi* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), 6. Cf. Karl Rosenkranz, *Die Naturreligion: Ein philosophisch-historischer Versuch* (Iserlohn: Langeweiche, 1831).

critique ran, and now Strauss censured Schleiermacher for subjecting the science of theology to external constraints. Despite a pioneering attempt ‘to put an end to the very routine juxtaposition of disciplines in the existing encyclopaedias, and derive everything from a basic idea’ (*Grundgedanken*), Schleiermacher let the practical, non-scientific requirements of the Christian church colour the entire venture. Where Hegel—and by implication, now Rosenkranz—implemented a purely scientific method and concomitant organizational scheme in philosophy and religion, Schleiermacher’s approach in theology came up short. Schleiermacher’s ‘basic idea’ was church leadership (*Kirchenleitung*), but it should have been the ‘immanent concept of the Christian religion and theology’. The *Kurze Darstellung*, Strauss reasoned, only pretended to follow the ‘true organism’ of science. What resulted was simply ‘an aggregate of the theological sciences’, albeit one ‘cleverly arranged’.⁹³

As a label, ‘aggregate’ had a substantial pedigree. Semler saw the introduction of historical criticism as the way to overcome pious repetitions and ‘aggregates’ of antiquated relevance. A. W. Schlegel chose the term to stigmatize the general and special encyclopaedic traditions before the nineteenth century and the dawn of modernity. In place of piling up lengthy excerpts and lists of books, Schlegel advocated for an organic approach that would account for the increasingly varied branches of human knowledge. When Strauss used the term, he meant that Schleiermacher had arrested the development of modern theology. Though Schleiermacher inaugurated a turning point in the literature of theological encyclopaedia by incorporating the neohumanist, historicist, and idealist sources of *Wissenschaft* directly into the definition of theology, at root he had only proposed an ‘aggregation method of a higher order’.⁹⁴

⁹³ Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie’, 214–16.

⁹⁴ Graf, *Kritik und Pseudo-Spekulation*, 161.

Strauss elaborated on these points in an 1839 essay on the importance of Daub and Schleiermacher for modern theology. In that discussion, he scrutinized the notion that theology, along with law and medicine, was a kind of ‘hybrid’ or ‘mixed’ discipline, sitting uneasily on the fence that partitioned science for its own sake and science for the practical needs of humanity. In Strauss’s view of Schleiermacher’s *Kurze Darstellung*: ‘The whole thing stands as a symmetrical building before us, with nice and cosy individual rooms (*einzelner Gemächer nett und wohnlich*), whose floor plan (*Grundriß*) is yet so simple that we overlook each room in its relation to the whole. Leadership of the Christian church is the final goal, through which all the individual parts of theological knowledge, as so many means to this end, are held together in a single unit—so much had Schleiermacher been naturalized (*eingebürgert*) into the land of positive Christianity since the *Reden über die Religion*.’⁹⁵

Imagining Schleiermacher’s work as a building captured the relation of the ‘whole’ and the ‘parts’ of theology over which Schleiermacher had brooded at least since his first days in Halle. Strauss also proved perceptive on the specific point of ‘positive Christianity’. In the fifth and final speech in the *Reden*, Schleiermacher had sided firmly with the Romantics and idealists by rejecting the rational, ‘natural religion’ of the Enlightenment. Comparative study of all historical ‘positive’ religions, Schleiermacher suggested, would eventually expose Christianity as the ‘religion of religions’.⁹⁶

Strauss next turned squarely to the main thrust of Schleiermacher’s programme, theology’s scientific character, under the conditions of historicism and idealism, and according to the church’s demand for appropriately trained leaders.

⁹⁵ D. F. Strauss, ‘Schleiermacher und Daub in ihrer Bedeutung für die Theologie unserer Zeit’, in Strauss, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*, 48–9.

⁹⁶ Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion*, in *KGA* i/2. 296–7, 325.

‘Those two elements, the interest for the guidance of the church and the interest required for scientific knowledge, considered together in the highest degree and with the greatest possible balance, give the ideal of the church’, he repeated. ‘But the balance is removed in the theologian in whom the scientific interest predominates, and in the clergyman in whom the ecclesial interest predominates’.⁹⁷

Schleiermacher, Strauss said, failed to consider that these two concerns could be—or, he argued, in fact were—countervailing forces in the life of the ‘prince of the church’. Schleiermacher refused to ‘extend the razor edge of his critical acumen’ to the historical narratives of Christianity, ‘out of fear of destroying the last historical grounds for the traditional faith’.⁹⁸ Strauss eventually disparaged the thought that ‘scientific’ theology could keep these forces from breaking apart. Strauss and later critics like Albert Schweitzer would belittle Schleiermacher’s 1832 lectures on the life of Jesus for perpetuating ‘a Christ of faith and a Jesus of history’. Schweitzer even concluded: ‘Nowhere indeed is it more clear that the great dialectician [Schleiermacher] had not really a historical mind than precisely in his treatment of the history of Jesus.’⁹⁹

After the lengthy interposition, the primary theme of the review came into focus. Rosenkranz’s monograph, Strauss said, represented above all the ‘scientific creed (*wissenschaftliche Glaubensbekenntniß*) of a young philosopher and theologian’.¹⁰⁰ This claim cemented the already dominant practice of identifying a work of theological encyclopaedia as the embodiment of a particular thinker and the manifesto of a particular school. Theological encyclopaedia as both a method and a genre had become an exercise in self-identification. Yet Strauss’s first complaint

⁹⁷ Strauss, ‘Schleiermacher und Daub’, 49.

⁹⁸ Toews, *Hegelianism*, 279.

⁹⁹ D. F. Strauss, *Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesu der Geschichte* (Berlin: Duncker, 1865); Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study about its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, trans. W. Montgomery and F. C. Burkitt (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910), 62.

¹⁰⁰ Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie’, 215.

against Rosenkranz rested with the book's apparatus. Though Rosenkranz included an extended preface before the table of contents, he did not use it to convey some of the usual items found in a work that might do double-duty as polemical treatise and introductory textbook. The first pages left the reader unsure of the direction and plan of the book as a whole. Critically, in Strauss's eyes, Rosenkranz failed to inform of the three-part division of theology into speculative, historical, and practical branches, respectively—one of the book's distinguishing features—until the thirty-fourth and final page of the preface. All of this amounted to a 'tumultuous' beginning.¹⁰¹

The second and main complaint hit at the heart of Rosenkranz's system. Strauss rejected emphatically the proposition that speculative theology deserved the first place in theology, the seat at which enquiry began and the rule which controlled, or prism which refracted, the other branches. It was evident for all to see, Strauss reported, that Rosenkranz, after Hegel, wanted to raise speculation to new levels in response to the 'deep humiliation' that speculative dogmatics had suffered under Schleiermacher. Where Hegel gave speculation a new lease on life, Schleiermacher 'degraded it', subjugating philosophical speculation to historical enquiry: 'the queen of theology was put on a level with . . . [the] maid, to be considered alongside ecclesiastical statistics, under the rubric of historical theology'.¹⁰² Yet Rosenkranz's own order left 'nothing theological, but only philosophy'.¹⁰³ Rosenkranz committed a fundamental error in the way he conceived the relationship of speculative and historical theology. 'Speculative theology is not related to the historical simply in the fashion of essence to appearance, but as the concept (*Begriff*) to being (*Sein*) and appearance, and therefore essentially presupposes being and appearance.'¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Strauss, 'Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie', 216.

¹⁰² Strauss, 'Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie', 216–17. Cf. Strauss, 'Schleiermacher und Daub', 50–2.

¹⁰³ Strauss, 'Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie', 221. See also Jörg F. Sandberger, *David Friedrich Strauss als theologischer Hegelianer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 58–66.

¹⁰⁴ Strauss, 'Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie', 224.

In other words, Strauss explained, the order of theology must begin with exegesis and church history. In support, he said, ‘the beginning in science is not the highest, but the lowest, not the richest, but the poorest’.¹⁰⁵ This was not a circuitous manoeuvre to raise the speculative and philosophical components even higher than Rosenkranz had; exegetical and historical studies could operate without a speculative or philosophical basis.¹⁰⁶ The opposite, however, was not true. Seemingly a minor point, Strauss’s reorganization of theology as a scientific discipline freed theology of the commitment to interpret the ‘parts’ in light of the ‘whole’ and the ‘whole’ in light of the ‘parts’—at least as this had been defined by Planck, Schelling, Daub, and Schleiermacher. This called into doubt the ‘organic’ conception of scientific knowledge on which Schleiermacher had depended. Separating himself from both Rosenkranz and Schleiermacher, then, Strauss fortified his case by appealing to the origins of Christianity. ‘The theological encyclopaedia begins with the immediate, with Christianity’ as it originated and was then ‘documented in the New Testament as a supplement to the Old Testament’, that is, with ‘biblical or exegetical theology’.¹⁰⁷

In Strauss’s view, proper exegesis unfettered the biblical narratives from the weight of ‘actual’ and ‘non-mythical’ history. He doubtless saw that this would entail subversive consequences for traditional and ecclesiastical interpretations of biblical texts. Once the biblical narratives had been torn apart, the speculative approach restored them according to their proper philosophical ‘content’. The building blocks of Strauss’s interpretation of the gospels in *Das Leben Jesu* already appeared here.

Strauss’s notes on Schleiermacher’s 1831–2 course in Berlin fill out the context in which he made his separation from Rosenkranz and Schleiermacher. One

¹⁰⁵ Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie’, 217.

¹⁰⁶ Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie’, 218.

¹⁰⁷ Strauss, ‘Rosenkranz: Encyklopädie’, 233.

of the recurrent themes in the notes is the question of dogmatic theology's relation to the disciplines of philosophy and history; this question also stood at the centre of Strauss's review. 'Dogmatics', Strauss recorded in his notes, designates 'the interconnected presentation of doctrine . . . at any give time'. The term 'dogmatics' is preferable to 'systematics'. The latter 'rightly emphasizes that doctrine is not to be set forth as a mere aggregate of individual propositions', but 'conceals, to the detriment of the subject, not only the historical character of the discipline, but also its aim in relation to church leadership; and numerous misinterpretations are bound to arise as a result'. As the lectures demonstrated, one of the more common 'misinterpretations' that Schleiermacher attempted to correct was the historical orientation of dogmatics. Strauss noted, 'One may thereby think that dogmatics is purely historical and the dogmaticians only express factual matters that have nothing to do with conviction. But if we return to the initial insight, this objection drops away, since no one would be a theologian except by virtue of his conviction about Christianity.' Every generation must write its own dogmatic theology, Schleiermacher professed, but that did not mean that the result should consist of the 'private convictions' of the theologian, which might yield a 'beautiful book, but not be dogmatics'.¹⁰⁸

Anonymous student notes from one of Strauss's classmates in the same ninety-member class from 1831–2 lend more detail. Some have said, the notes recorded, that 'dogmatics presents only the knowledge of doctrine given in the present situation, so it is historical. Accordingly, the dogmatician expresses sheer facts and does not speak out of individual conviction. However, if we go back to our starting point, the one who would be a theologian will be so only by virtue of one's conviction to Christianity. . . . The same thing is true here. The conviction is

¹⁰⁸ D. F. Strauss, *Friedrich Schleiermacher Theologische Enzyklopädie (1831/32): Nachschrift David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. Walter Sachs (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 1987), 99.

presupposed. There is no such thing as Christian doctrine for anyone except by virtue of conviction.’¹⁰⁹ Making way for conviction, however, did not allow for abstracting the discipline from its historical roots. ‘Even though dogmatics calls for one’s own conviction, it still should not be taken apart from the connection with historical theology and presented as systematic theology, for an ambiguity arises in this expression, namely that dogmatics has been placed under the direction of philosophy in a different manner than has been done here, where the organization, juxtaposition, [and] terminology have to be justified dialectically.’ There is ‘nothing of philosophical content in dogmatics, but what there is of philosophy in it is only the dialectical justification of the arrangement of the whole in its organization and further in its individual formulae’.¹¹⁰ For Schleiermacher, ‘a correct use of philosophy runs through the treatment of all the theological disciplines’, but a wrong use of philosophy is ‘the death of exegesis and the death of history’.¹¹¹ Strauss’s order purported to neutralize any lingering reliance in exegesis and church history on old philosophical foundations. While composing his review, Strauss also concocted plans to write his life of Jesus and a ‘preparatory work’ for his ‘greater dogmatic plan’, the eventual *Christliche Glaubenslehre*. A third project, the composition of his own ‘outline of an encyclopaedia of the theological sciences’, which would have set his disagreements with Schleiermacher and Rosenkranz into sharp relief, never saw the light of day.¹¹²

One of the most important features of the controversy was that Strauss did not ask any substantive practical questions of Rosenkranz. Rather than trying to hold together dual interests, as Schleiermacher had attempted, Strauss sloughed off the long-running concern for pedagogy and the welfare of underprepared students

¹⁰⁹ ‘Theolog. Enzyklopädie (Vorlesungen-Nachschrift), 1831/32’, 95–7, in SBB-PK, Nachlass 481, Schleiermacher-Sammlung.

¹¹⁰ Strauss, *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, 243.

¹¹¹ Strauss, *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, 244.

¹¹² Strauss to Märklin, 6 February 1932, in Sandberger, *Strauss als theologischer Hegelianer*, 192–9.

that had been hallmarks of the literature. Discontent with the nature of theology itself and disagreement over the dialectical system overwhelmed practical and ecclesial utility. Strauss wanted to change the relation between theology and science, and thereby inaugurate a new system. In 1840–1, he published his main systematic work, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*. The subtitle pledged to describe the doctrine of the Christian faith ‘in its historical development and its struggle with modern science’.¹¹³

In Jörg Sandberger’s characterization, Strauss’s combination of speculative philosophy and historical criticism stuck out as a foreign element in Hegel’s theological ‘school’. ‘For an orthodox Hegelian,’ Sandberger observed, ‘it must have appeared that Strauss had in fact linked two completely heterogeneous methods that could not be reconciled in their tasks or objectives of understanding.’¹¹⁴ His divergence from Hegelian theological ‘orthodoxy’ did not go unnoticed, but lent additional ammunition for theology’s historicization. Rosenkranz attempted a partial response to Strauss’s critique in his own multi-part review of another work of theological encyclopaedia, this time by the Catholic Tübingen thinker Franz Anton Staudenmaier, which only raised the profile of theological historicism.¹¹⁵

CONCLUSION

Johann Gustav Droysen remarked in late 1831 that with Hegel’s death, the cultural world underpinning his philosophy began to wane.¹¹⁶ Daub, Marheineke, and Rosenkranz, the leading lights of the speculative trajectory, placed an ‘overwhelming

¹¹³ D. F. Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Osiander, 1840–1).

¹¹⁴ Sandberger, *Strauss als theologischer Hegelianer*, 155.

¹¹⁵ Karl Rosenkranz, ‘Staudenmaier: Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften’, *JWK* 61–3 (1835), 489–96, 497–500, 505–8. Cf. Franz Anton Staudenmaier, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften als System der gesammten Theologie* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1834).

¹¹⁶ Johann Gustav Droysen to Ludwig Moser, 29 November 1831, in Nicolin (ed.), *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen*, 490. Cf. Rudolf Haym, *Hegel und seine Zeit: Vorlesungen über die Entstehung und Entwicklung, Wesen und Wert der hegel’schen Philosophie* (Berlin: Gaertner, 1857), 445–54.

emphasis on the identity of the content rather than on the difference of form' between Christianity and Hegelian philosophy, and so, argued Toews, undressed Hegel's philosophy of religion of 'most of its critical, dynamic, historical qualities'.¹¹⁷ Despite the 'loss of power', as it were, they presented a formidable challenge to the historicizing impulse in academic theology that Schleiermacher had set in motion. Rosenkranz had resolved any ambiguities left by Schleiermacher in favour of speculation. For his part, Strauss cut Schleiermacher's famous 'knot' of history and religious belief in a way that privileged history—but history understood as (or dubiously aspiring to be) the 'non-mythical' exegetical interpretation of Christianity. Both struck at Schleiermacher's 'prince of the church' while attempting to set Hegelian boundary markers. After Strauss's review, Rosenkranz's system of Christianity-as-speculative philosophy appeared to possess a few hairline fractures, marks of eroding authority and influence. Eventually, it would carry the stigma of being 'unscientific'.

In 1824, Baur insisted that history remained deaf and dumb without philosophy.¹¹⁸ The famed historian Jacob Burckhardt, who first studied theology in Basel under de Wette and Hagenbach, would later opine that 'the philosophy of history is a centaur'.¹¹⁹ Where Baur at the time sympathized with speculative thinkers, Burckhardt clearly did not. In the interim between the two remarks, Hegelian philosophical dogmatism in theology encountered a significant opponent in the form of 'mediating theology' (*Vermittlungstheologie*). The dominant textbook of theological encyclopaedia in the modern period, and one of the principal works defining and defending mediating thought, belonged to Hagenbach—to whom,

¹¹⁷ Toews, *Hegelianism*, 151.

¹¹⁸ F. C. Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie oder die Naturreligion des Alterthums* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1824–5), i. xi.

¹¹⁹ Jacob Burckhardt, *Über das Studium der Geschichte: Der Text der 'Weltgeschichtlichen Betrachtungen' nach den Handschriften*, ed. Peter Ganz (Munich: Beck, 1982), 225.

Marheineke claimed, the ‘new philosophy of the concept is foreign’.¹²⁰ In the next chapter, the nature of Hagenbach’s appropriation of Schleiermacher—over against Rosenkranz—in his own enduring theological encyclopaedia takes centre stage.

¹²⁰ Philipp Marheineke, ‘Hagenbach: Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften’, *JWK* 75 (1834), 625–6.

Chapter 9

The Preceptor of Modern Theology: Hagenbach and the Mediating School

We can only really know something, when we know how it has developed.

K. R. Hagenbach, 1833

In an 1849 celebratory address, W. M. L. de Wette declared that one of his colleagues in Basel's theological faculty had long been 'touched by the spirit of Schleiermacher, the restorer of German theology'. For de Wette, this entailed no small honour.¹ By then, the foundations of Schleiermacher's reputation had been set in place, and seemed to survive attacks from the speculative thinkers. Just one day after Schleiermacher's death, August Neander affirmed that from him, 'a new period in the history of the church' would commence.² As Karl Barth would say, Schleiermacher loomed as the 'great Niagara Falls' of the modern theological world.³

It might surprise some, then, that de Wette—one of the first theologians alongside Schleiermacher at the founding of the University of Berlin—gave this commendation to the church historian and native of Basel, Karl Rudolf Hagenbach (1801–74). Basel, the 'pious, patrician city on the Rhine', as it was generally known,

¹ Cf. W. M. L. de Wette, 'Festrede des Herrn Professor de Wette bei Anlaß der akademischen Feierlichkeit zu Ehren der HH. Prof. Hagenbach, Stähelin und Brömmel', *Literarische Beilage zum Intelligenz-Blatt der Stadt Basel* 8 (24 February 1849), 32, in StaBS PA 838a B31.

² Quoted in Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*, trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden (rev. edn, London: SCM, 2001), 41.

³ Karl Barth, 'Brunners Schleiermacherbuch', *Zwischen den Zeiten* 8 (1924), 62.

struck a different profile than Berlin, the so-called ‘Athens on the Spree’.⁴ Upon passing through ‘pious Basel’ in 1841, Friedrich Engels decried it as ‘such a barren town, full of frock-coats and cocked hats, philistines and patricians and Methodists’.⁵ The Basel philologist J. J. Bachofen (1815–78), a member of the wealthy merchant elite who in practice controlled the city, nevertheless spoke critically of the ‘boring factory town’ and the way of life of the local citizenry—‘our Basel philistines’ (*unsern Basler Kummertürken*).⁶ Reinforcing the perception of Basel’s intellectual isolation, the Prussian nationalist historian Heinrich von Treitschke christened the Swiss-German university town as the ‘sulking corner’ (*Schmollwinkel*) of Europe.⁷

For de Wette, Hagenbach represented the city’s bright spot.⁸ ‘My whole theological heart fills with joy’, he said, ‘when I turn to our excellent Hagenbach’.⁹ At the time of de Wette’s speech, Hagenbach had taught church history at the University of Basel for twenty-five years; he would continue to do so for another twenty-five. Jacob Burckhardt, the pioneer of cultural and art history, praised Hagenbach as a model church historian and cited him as instrumental in the initial ‘historicist turn’ in his own thought.¹⁰ Jena’s professor of church history, Karl von Hase (1800–1900), remarked that Hagenbach wrote history with a ‘delicate, poetic

⁴ On Basel’s nineteenth-century cultural and intellectual life, see Lionel Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). On the cultural image of the University of Berlin, see Hannah Lotte Lund, ‘Die Universität in der Stadt 1810–1840: Geselligkeit—Kultur—Politik’, in Rüdiger vom Bruch and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden 1810–2010* (Berlin: Akademie, 2012), i. 325–80.

⁵ Friedrich Engels, ‘Wanderings in Lombardy’, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975–2004), ii. 170–1.

⁶ Bachofen to Heinrich Meyer-Ochsner, 16 December 1864, in Bachofen, *Gesammelte Werke*, x, ed. Karl Meuli (Basel: Schwabe, 1967), 336, 184–5, 342.

⁷ Heinrich von Treitschke to Franz Overbeck, 28 October 1873, in Treitschke, *Briefe*, iii, ed. Max Cornicelius (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1917), 378.

⁸ John W. Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 191–265.

⁹ De Wette, ‘Festrede’, 32.

¹⁰ See Arnold von Salis, ‘Zum hundertsten Geburtstag Jakob Burckhardt: Erinnerungen eines alten Schülers’, *BJB* (1918), 288; and Werner Kaegi, ‘Jacob Burckhardt als Student bei Hagenbach und De Wette’, *ThZ* 1 (1945), 120–44.

breath'.¹¹ One year after Hagenbach's death, commentators hailed him as 'the most popular ecclesiastical historian . . . in the German language'.¹²

Hagenbach acquired that standing largely through his popular textbooks on the history of the church. But the 'spirit of Schleiermacher' arguably touched his *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* most of all. No other work of theological encyclopaedia in the history of the literature approximates its success. Between 1833 and 1889 it went through twelve editions, and was translated into multiple languages.¹³ Georg Heinrici (1844–1915), who produced his own theological encyclopaedia at the end of the century, referred to Hagenbach's text simply as 'the work which long remained the standard'.¹⁴ The *Encyklopädie* thus makes for an invaluable resource in the history of modern theology and theological pedagogy, warranting close attention.

This chapter examines the contours of Hagenbach's work as he developed Schleiermacher's ideas for the next generation of students. Hagenbach sought to clarify the ambiguities in Schleiermacher's programme, I argue, and mediated a form of theological historicism to his many readers. In this way, he established the pedagogical and theoretical footings for 'mediating theology' (*Vermittlungstheologie*)—the nineteenth-century centrist 'school' inclined to harmonize differences among Protestant groups and resolve tensions between liberalism and orthodoxy, speculation and history. He also quelled the growth of speculative theology. Hagenbach's encyclopaedia served, in these senses, as the epitome of the modern project of theology as science after Schleiermacher.

¹¹ Karl von Hase, *Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen*, iii/1, ed. G. Krüger (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1891), 9.

¹² John F. Hurst, *Life and Literature in the Fatherland* (New York: Scribner, 1875), 184.

¹³ The Old Testament scholar Emil Kautsch and the systematic theologian Max Reischle edited the posthumous editions of 1880, 1884, and 1889. Unless otherwise noted, references here are to the last edition before Hagenbach's death: Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (9th edn, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1874).

¹⁴ C. F. Georg Heinrici, 'Encyclopaedia, Theological', in *NSH* iv. 127.

A THEOLOGY TRULY SCIENTIFIC?

Hagenbach possessed a unique identity as both an insider and outsider to German theology, to some extent mirroring the geography and disposition of Basel itself: located on the crossroads of three countries (*das Dreiländereck*); a member of the Old Swiss Confederation since 1501 but regarded by its inhabitants until late in the nineteenth century as a near autonomous city-republic operating within the Confederation; many citizens even spoke of ‘going to Switzerland’ when departing for one of the other Swiss cantons.¹⁵ As a Swiss church historian and prominent member of Basel’s Reformed church, he held a deep interest in the peculiar cultural makeup of his *Vaterstadt*. Basel’s well-known thinkers of the era, from philologist Bachofen and historian Burckhardt to theologian Franz Overbeck and philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, cultivated an attitude of independence, aloofness, even occasionally derision, toward Berlin, Prussia, and the perceived German intellectual establishment. They comprised a notable ‘oppositional current’.¹⁶ This ‘dissenting’ tradition, whose origins traced partly to Basel’s long-established conservative and pietist communities, made its appearance in Hagenbach’s thought, too, even if he had considerably greater sympathy and fondness for ‘German’ ideas.¹⁷ It would be a mistake to assign him wholesale to either sphere.

After an early encounter with *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie* and other texts from Herder, Hagenbach decided to study theology at the local university. ‘I understood it as my sacred mission in life’, he recalled, ‘to bring into harmony the eternal truths of salvation—as given to us and set down in Scripture—with the needs

¹⁵ Thomas A. Brady, Jr, *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire, 1450–1550* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 57–72; Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt*, 6.

¹⁶ Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt*, 439.

¹⁷ Cf. Andreas Urs Sommer, ‘Die Ambivalenz der “Vermittlung”’: Karl Rudolf Hagenbach (1801–1874)’, in Sommer (ed.), *Im Spannungsfeld von Gott und Welt: Beiträge zu Geschichte und Gegenwart des Frey-Gymnasiums in Basel 1747–1997* (Basel: Schwabe, 1997), 91–110.

of humanity and a free, noble, intellectual formation (*Geistesbildung*), independent as much as possible from human prejudices'.¹⁸ Not long after beginning his studies, he became dissatisfied with Basel: 'A poor ossification, which held down the spirit of scientific life and aspirations, made itself everywhere strongly and painfully felt'.¹⁹ He began to contemplate studying elsewhere, though his feelings for his hometown would warm significantly later in life. Hagenbach himself branded the University of Basel in the first two decades of the 1800s as 'half dead and half alive'.²⁰ Consequently, he set his sights upon the German states and their 'modern' universities. He felt acutely the sentiment expressed by Theodor, the protagonist in de Wette's 'theological novel', *Theodor*: '[I desire] . . . a theology truly scientific, and, at the same time, adapted to warm and inspire the soul'.²¹

In 1820, Hagenbach made the choice to continue his education in Bonn at the two-year old Rhein-Universität, a westward expansion of the University of Berlin. He spent two semesters there studying under J. K. L. Gieseler and Friedrich Lücke. At the end of the academic year, Lücke bade him farewell with two simple directives: 'You must [go] to Berlin! You must hear Schleiermacher!'²² In 1821, he did just that, attracted by the presence of both Neander and Schleiermacher. After two years of intensive study there, he returned to his hometown. His time in Germany proved more important for his future theological work than he could have realized. In 1850, a contributor to *The Princeton Review* stated admiringly that Hagenbach had long been recognized by many 'as a writer of comprehensive views and unusual sprightliness. This, rather than what the Germans love to call depth, is at the bottom of his

¹⁸ K. R. Hagenbach, 'Warum wähle ich das Studium der Theologie', in StaBS PA 838a B42.

¹⁹ Christoph Friedrich Eppler, *Karl Rudolf Hagenbach: Eine Friedensgestalt aus der streitenden Kirche der Gegenwart* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1875), 11–12.

²⁰ K. R. Hagenbach, *Die Kirchengeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts aus dem Standpunkte des evangelischen Protestantismus betrachtet* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1848–9), ii. 419.

²¹ W. M. L. de Wette, *Theodore; or the Skeptic's Conversion*, trans. James F. Clarke (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, 1841), i. xxviii.

²² K. R. Hagenbach, 'Autobiographie', 178, in StaBS, PA 838a B1.

popularity. Yet he *is* a German'.²³ Seven years later, Philip Schaff also puzzled over Hagenbach's Swiss-German background, insisting that though Hagenbach spent all but a few years of his life in his native Basel, he was sufficiently 'German by education' to merit universal attention. His textbooks, Schaff noted, 'by their simple, clear vivacity, and freedom from technical pedantry, commend themselves even to English taste'.²⁴

Hagenbach soon began to teach church history at the *Pädagogium*, a newly established educational institution distinct to Basel that served as a post-*Gymnasium* preparatory college for the university, and as a 'finishing school' for the sons of Basel's businessmen who would not be attending university but rather take up the family business—students similar to Thomas Buddenbrook in Thomas Mann's famous novel.²⁵ That same year Hagenbach received a call to join de Wette on Basel's theological faculty. In 1824, he became *außerordentlicher Professor*, and in 1829, *ordentlicher Professor* of Church History. The pair transformed Switzerland's oldest university, founded by the humanist pope Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pius II) in 1460, into a leading centre of rigorous, critical, theological *Wissenschaft*. Through their efforts, the university would go on to attract such distinguished scholars as Burckhardt (1818–97), Overbeck (1837–1905), Nietzsche (1844–1900), Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), Barth (1886–1968), and Karl Jaspers (1883–1969).²⁶

De Wette had only arrived in Basel one year before Hagenbach returned from Berlin. In 1819, de Wette had been dismissed from his post at the University of Berlin and expelled from Prussia for ostensibly defending the actions of Karl Sand,

²³ 'Die Kirchengeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts by Hagenbach', *The Princeton Review* 22/3 (1850), 437 (emphasis added).

²⁴ Philip Schaff, *Germany; Its Universities, Theology, and Religion* (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857), 407; Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1853), 107.

²⁵ UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Frey-Gryn Mscr VIII 1.

²⁶ See Andreas Staehelin, *Geschichte der Universität Basel 1818–1835* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1959), 27–41; Thomas Albert Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism: W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 110–36; and Albert Teichmann, *Die Universität Basel in den fünfzig Jahren seit ihrer Reorganisation im Jahre 1835* (Basel: Reinhardt, 1885), 42–3.

the infamous murderer of the playwright August von Kotzebue, by writing a consoling letter to Sand's mother.²⁷ He sought asylum in Basel, where, after considerable debate, he received a call to the theological faculty in 1822.²⁸ By the end of the year, he had commenced with an ambitious attempt to reform Basel's theological curriculum. On 16 December 1822, he wrote a memorandum for restructuring and expanding the programme of study for theology students. He proposed a new four-year curriculum, in which each student would spend a concentrated year studying exegesis, church history, dogmatics, and practical theology, respectively.²⁹ Overhauling what he considered to be the abject state of historical studies was a central component of the proposal. He designed three new mandatory courses for first- and second-year students: 'History and Antiquity of the Hebrews', 'Church History' (*Kirchengeschichte*), and 'History of Dogma' (*Dogmengeschichte*). The most important plank called for a dedicated professor, or at least lecturer, of church history, the position that Hagenbach eventually filled. This was hardly a new emphasis for de Wette. In his virtuoso *Über Religion und Theologie* (1815), he had insisted: 'If it is true that our religious culture (*Bildung*) rests on history, then our theology must certainly be historical'.³⁰ Hagenbach brought the same focus to his courses in symbolics, New Testament grammar and exegesis, homiletics, catechesis, and liturgy, though he specialized in church history, history of dogma, and theological encyclopaedia and methodology.³¹

The curricular reform programme involved reanimating the various fields of study with the methods, aims, and rhetoric of *Wissenschaft*. In fact, Hagenbach later

²⁷ See George S. Williamson, 'What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789–1819', *JMH* 72/4 (2000), 890–943.

²⁸ Ernst Jenny, 'Wie de Wette nach Basel kam', *BJB* 41 (1941), 51–78.

²⁹ W. M. L. de Wette, 'Protokoll der Theologischen Fakultät; bei den Akten der Theologischen Fakultät liegt der Entwurf eines solchen, vier Jahre umfassenden Lehrprogrammes', in StaBS O 2a Protokoll der Theologischen Fakultät (1744–1923), 55–7.

³⁰ W. M. L. de Wette, *Über Religion und Theologie: Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815), 145.

³¹ Edgar Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, 1460–1960* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1971), 372–3.

criticized his immediate predecessor, Emanuel Merian (1765–1829), for his failures in ‘critical’ scholarship. ‘He undoubtedly possessed great erudition in languages, history, mathematics, physics, and also an unmistakable philosophical acumen’, Hagenbach assessed. ‘What he lacked, however, was a thorough formation in *Wissenschaft* in the German sense of the word and method’ (*im deutschen Sinne des Wortes und die Methode*).³² Schleiermacher, of course, had often used the phrase, ‘in the German sense’, to qualify his idealist attitude toward the humanities and the university. In 1808, the phrase appeared prominently in the title of Schleiermacher’s *Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten in deutschem Sinn*. De Wette also made frequent use of the expression in describing his efforts to reshape Basel into a thriving hotbed of ‘science after the German fashion’ (*Wissenschaft nach deutscher Art*).³³ In his rectorial address at the university in 1834, de Wette called for a renewal of the spirit of ‘genuine *Wissenschaftlichkeit*’. He had dedicated himself to the health of Basel during the ‘Troubles’ (*Wirren*) in the early 1830s—which led to the division of the canton of Basel into the two separate half-cantons of Basel-Stadt and Basel-Land in 1833—because of the ‘high meaning of *Wissenschaft* and the enthusiasm I carry for it, which filled my soul from an early age to adulthood and shall fill it beyond. I would venture to say this out of love for Basel and out of a clear knowledge of her needs. Also, I would venture to express again today that the question concerning the continuance and re-establishment of our university is truly a vital question for Basel’. The city as a whole might emerge as a ‘bastion of *Wissenschaft*, where the holy flame of truth is kept’, centred around the first university ‘in the German sense’ (*im deutschen Sinne*) in Switzerland.³⁴ When Hagenbach stepped in as interim rector of

³² K. R. Hagenbach, *Die theologische Schule Basels und ihre Lehrer von Stiftung der Hochschule 1460 bis zu Dewette’s Tod* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1860), 56.

³³ W. M. L. de Wette, *Von der Stellung der Wissenschaft im Gemeinwesen: Rektoratsrede, gehalten den 2. Juli 1829* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1829), in UBB, Un 206:3.

³⁴ W. M. L. de Wette, *Eine Betrachtungen über den Geist unserer Zeit: Academische Rede am 12. September 1834 gehalten* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1834), 21, 24–5, 1, in UBB, Falk 3190:19.

the university in 1832, he, too, declared, ‘the enemy of the principle of *Wissenschaft* is the principle of barbarism and vulgarity, cloaked in cheaply acquired wisdom’.³⁵

The ideal of German science became an integral aspect of Hagenbach’s work. An early short address, *Ueber den Begriff und Bedeutung der Wissenschaftlichkeit im Gebiete der Theologie* (1830), underlined his commitment to the model of science he had come to appreciate from his time in Bonn and Berlin. ‘Above all’, he said, ‘we must discard the false notion that we often associate with the word science (*Wissenschaftlichkeit*), often confusing it with the science of mere erudition’ (*Gelahrtheit*). The concept of *Wissenschaft* derived from Fichte, Humboldt, Schelling, and Schleiermacher should take the place of ‘false sciences’. Hagenbach employed metaphors of shallowness and depth to distinguish between German theological science, which was deep, from other, putatively shallow forms of scholarship. ‘Deep within the mining shaft of the earth gold is brought to light and the diver retrieves the pearl from the bottom of the dark sea. So also [in theology] one must dig deep and spare no efforts of genuine *Wissenschaft*’.³⁶ On another occasion, he distinguished between biblical exegetes and church historians along similar lines: ‘The exegete may be likened to the miner who descends the mining shaft in order to bring the gold of pure scriptural truth into the light of day, while the historian resembles the artificer (*Künstler*) who melts the masses down, and gives them their form and impression. . . . Here, like everywhere else, the one must aid the other.’³⁷ His students quickly picked up on these themes.³⁸

Basel’s four-year course of study reflected the new ideals of scholarship—‘sparing no efforts of genuine science’, in Hagenbach’s phrase. Theology professors

³⁵ K. R. Hagenbach, *Rectoratsrede gehalten den 13. September 1832* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1832), 11, in UBB, FS II 3:3.

³⁶ K. R. Hagenbach, *Ueber den Begriff und Bedeutung der Wissenschaftlichkeit im Gebiete der Theologie* (Basel: Neukirch, 1830), 7–9, in UBB, FS II 3:2.

³⁷ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 199.

³⁸ Cf. Thomas K. Kuhn, “‘Dem Nebellande müßigen Grübelns ferngeblieben’: Lehre und Lehrer bei Karl Rudolf Hagenbach’, in Sommer (ed.), *Im Spannungsfeld von Gott und Welt*, 293–306.

continued to teach in more than one area, while students generally devoted themselves to one major discipline per year. Before turning directly to Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie*, the nature of mediating theology, that nineteenth-century theological tsunami set in motion by Schleiermacher, requires clarification.

THE LIVELY SPIRIT OF MEDIATING THEOLOGY

'The mediating theologian is the born surveyor of the world, who can put everything neatly in its place. . . . The mediating theologian is a man who thinks practically and tactically. He is by nature unfavourably disposed towards the extremes, towards a Strauss or a Tholuck, because in the most particular sense he thinks ecclesiastically'. He is 'a born churchman, Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor transposed into Protestantism'. Thus ran Barth's equally partisan and colourful witticism.³⁹ The classic, if dated, account from Ragnar Holte highlighted two major goals for the mediating project. The first was 'bridging the old oppositions between supernaturalism and rationalism . . . via a positive connection of the Christian faith with modern science'. The second was a theological union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Germany, to solidify the institutional union enacted with the 1817 Prussian *Unionskirche*.⁴⁰ The annals of historical theology have tended to embrace that portrayal. Matthias Gockel pinned the first appearance of the term 'Vermittlungstheologie' to Karl Schwarz's use of it in his 1856 critique of recent trends in German theological circles.⁴¹ Before this, Leipzig's Karl Kahnis (1818–88) portrayed the period of 1817–40 as a 'striving to reconcile the natural and rational

³⁹ Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, 559–61.

⁴⁰ Ragnar Holte, *Die Vermittlungstheologie: Ihrer theologischen Grundbegriffe kritische untersucht*, trans. Björn Kommer (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1956), 9 ff. On the *Unionskirche*, see Walter Elliger (ed.), *Die evangelische Kirche der Union* (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1967).

⁴¹ Matthias Gockel, 'Mediating Theology in Germany', in David Fergusson (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Nineteenth-Century Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 300. Cf. Karl Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1856), 248–9, 428.

with the positive doctrine and ordinances of the church. The theology at that time may simply be described as a theology of mediation' (*Vermittlungstheologie*).⁴² Kahnis even titled a chapter of his work, 'Die vermittelnde Theologie'.⁴³ De Wette and Hase stood out as his representative figures, along with Karl Ullmann (1796–1865), Richard Rothe (1799–1867), Johann Peter Lange (1802–84), and Isaak Dorner (1809–84). In an important work on nineteenth-century Protestant dogmatics, Martin Kähler (1835–1912) defined *Vermittlungstheologie* broadly as theological thought that mediates 'between historical Christianity and the development of intellectual (*geistiger*) culture as it has developed' in the present, 'especially this culture in its literary-scientific form and particularly as philosophy'.⁴⁴

The epithet is properly traced back to the first decades of the nineteenth century and the founding of a new theological journal. Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Lücke founded the *Theologische Zeitschrift* in Berlin in 1819. Writing in the name of all three theologians, de Wette issued a directive for contributors: 'We insist only on seriousness, profundity, clarity, and liveliness, in a word, *Wissenschaftlichkeit*, and we promise to take great pains to accomplish the highest impartiality and versatility, although each [scholar] in his own work will remain rigorously faithful to his own presuppositions and convictions'. The goal, he said, was to create a 'centre point' (*Mittelpunkt*) around which young, learned theologians might gather to serve 'the higher purposes of science'.⁴⁵ Though the journal continued only until 1822, Lücke bequeathed the same animating spirit to another periodical that he helped co-found a

⁴² K. F. A. Kahnis, *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Dörffling, 1854), 193. Cf. John Groh, *Nineteenth-Century German Protestantism: The Church as Social Model* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982).

⁴³ Kahnis, *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus*, 183–211.

⁴⁴ Martin Kähler, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ernst Kähler (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), 87. Cf. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Vermittlungstheologie', in *HWP* ii. 726–8; Friedemann Voigt, *Vermittlung im Streit: Das Konzept theologische Vermittlung in den Zeitschriften den Schulen Schleiermachers und Hegels* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); and Annette G. Aubert, *The German Roots of Nineteenth-Century American Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 62–94.

⁴⁵ W. M. L. de Wette, 'Vorrede', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1819), xx–xxi.

few years later. In 1828, two theologians at the University of Heidelberg, Karl Ullmann and F. W. K. Umbreit, organized the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken: Eine Zeitschrift für das gesammte Gebiet der Theologie*, in association with Lücke, Gieseler, and Carl Immanuel Nitzsch (1787–1868). Bonn's leading theologian since 1822, Nitzsch would come to be known as a 'Schleiermacher of the Rhineland'.⁴⁶ The periodical, which ran for over a century, became a high-octane vehicle for discussion and dissemination of new ideas serving the 'true mediation' (*wahre Vermittlung*) between historical Christianity and modern scientific consciousness. The editors desired to avoid 'slavery to the letter' on one side and the 'fanatical spirit of unrestrained freedom and lawlessness' on the other side.⁴⁷ What resulted was a loosely knit group of thinkers endeavouring to 'satisfy simultaneously the claims of *Wissenschaft* and the church'.⁴⁸ The journal gained purchase in its second year when Schleiermacher chose to publish in its pages his famous post-Kantian call for an 'eternal covenant between the living Christian faith and completely free, independent, scientific enquiry'.⁴⁹ Newer issues continued to spell out the concepts involved in the mediation between seemingly opposed forces, and carried out energetic discussions in the 1830s and 1840s on 'the encyclopaedic question' (*die enzyklopädische Frage*) in German university theology.⁵⁰

In an 1836 essay, 'Ueber Partei und Schule, Gegensätz und deren Vermittelung', Ullmann wrote that 'mediation reduces relative oppositions to their original unity; through mediation an inner reconciliation and higher standpoint is gained in which the oppositions are lifted' (*aufgehoben*). The oppositions included

⁴⁶ Willibald Beyschlag, *Carl Immanuel Nitzsch: Eine Lichtgestalt der neueren deutsch-evangelischen Kirchengeschichte* (2nd edn, Halle: Strien, 1882), 182.

⁴⁷ Ferdinand Kattenbusch, 'Hundert Jahre Studien und Kritiken', *TSK* 100 (1928), vi.

⁴⁸ Frederick Gregory, *Nature Lost? Natural Science and the German Theological Traditions of the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 50.

⁴⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Über seine Glaubenslehre an Herrn Dr. Lücke, zwei Sendschreiben', *TSK* 2 (1829), 255–84, 481–532.

⁵⁰ See Voigt, *Vermittlung im Streit*, 22–104.

faith and science, religious belief and growing philosophical and historical criticism of dogma and of the Bible. 'The scientific state that emerges as a result of this mediation', he continued, 'is the true, healthy centre . . . [and] only that which springs from spiritual needs and is scientifically justified is a true [mediation]'.⁵¹

While one might read Ullmann as following a sort of Hegelian 'sublation', Ullmann and the writers affiliated with the periodical were generally students of Schleiermacher. The founding of additional theological journals contributed to the swelling number of publications by mediating figures, including the *Vierteljahrschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1845) and the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (1856). Related periodicals also surfaced outside of the German states. In 1845, Hagenbach founded the *Kirchenblatt für die Reformierte Schweiz*, a newsletter for the Reformed churches in Switzerland. As editor for twenty years, he carefully oriented the *Kirchenblatt* to serve a rapprochement between historically-inclined professional scholarship and Christian piety. He also wrote a popular apology for mediating theology in 1858, the first work to treat systematically the new theological 'school'.⁵²

If mediating thinkers drew extensively from Schleiermacher, they did not all share the same approach. They appealed eclectically to new concepts in German idealism, philosophy, natural science, and the 'spirit', if not the 'letter', of the traditional creeds and confessions of Christianity. A desire to reconcile theology with modern forms of consciousness—speculative, historical, or otherwise scientific—motivated their work. It is more appropriate, then, to consider the 'school' as an inclusive group inspired by and contributing to the emerging historicization of European intellectual life.⁵³ Randall Collins's comments on the social fabric of philosophy capture something of the group's fluid essence. 'The

⁵¹ Karl Ullmann, 'Ueber Partei und Schule, Gegensätze deren Vermittelung', *TSK* 9 (1936), 41.

⁵² K. R. Hagenbach, *Über die sogenannte Vermittlungstheologie: Zunabwehr und Verständigung* (Zurich: Meyer & Zeller, 1858).

⁵³ Cf. Glen Most (ed.), *Historicization—Historisierung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

history of philosophy is to a considerable extent the history of groups. Nothing abstract is meant here', noted Collins, 'but groups of friends, discussion partners, close-knit circles that often have the characteristics of social movements'.⁵⁴ Scholarly influence, in other words, tended to run along flexible networks, rather than fixed hierarchical patterns.

Those who identified in some sense with the aims of mediating theology dominated German university theology over the middle-third of the nineteenth-century, galvanizing theology with a keen sense of the possibilities unlocked by the modern historical imagination.⁵⁵ Parallels between this theological outlook and other forms of modernization are insightful. Like Schleiermacher's programme, contemporary innovations in the natural sciences, politics, and especially in technology—the 'triad of railway, steamship, telegraph'—all became symbols of progress.⁵⁶ Even in Germany's reactionary period before the European revolutions of 1848, encouraging prospects also unfolded, however obliquely, for an 'unhindered exchange of controversial opinions in the free market of ideas and beliefs'—a broad 'exchange space'.⁵⁷ Indeed, numerous ventures in 'remaking the rhythms of life' abounded in German-speaking Europe throughout the mid-nineteenth century.⁵⁸ In the face of 'forces of modernity', traditional ways of understanding Christianity seemed woefully inept. Historical contextualization appeared to open up new vistas

⁵⁴ Randall Collins, *The Sociology of Philosophers: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 3.

⁵⁵ Cf. Johannes Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas: Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 8, 204, 277–324; and Robert M. Bigler, *The Politics of German Protestantism: The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815–1848* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), 159 ff.

⁵⁶ Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986), 194; David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley (eds.), *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 176–205.

⁵⁷ Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte, 1815–1845/9* (Munich: Beck, 1996), 540. See also Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).

⁵⁸ Oliver Zimmer, *Remaking the Rhythms of Life: German Communities in the Age of the Nation-State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 293–306.

for all academic work and for theology particularly. The legitimacy that theology achieved as an academic discipline in the modern university through the labours of Schleiermacher and others brought with it a new focus on the historical aspects of study. The mediating theologians, neither strictly iconoclasts, nor sceptics, nor prophets of cultural despair, variously held the conviction that new tools in historical and philosophical research could, if kept in check by the needs of the church, yield a deeper awareness of theology than had the past. They sought to negotiate a balance between ecclesial and scientific demands, a task in which Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* proved integral.

HISTORICAL CONDITIONS AND THE FOURFOLD PATTERN

Hagenbach published the first edition of the *Encyklopädie* in 1833. He wrote the book to accompany the new theological encyclopaedia course in Basel's revamped curriculum.⁵⁹ Nine of its twelve editions appeared during Hagenbach's own lifetime, revealing its prominent use and widespread popularity as an academic textbook. That longevity testifies to its unique ability to satisfy the changing exigencies of higher education. Like a host of other German professors, Hase wrote to inform Hagenbach just after publication of the first edition that he was delighted with its treatment of theology.⁶⁰ In the late 1830s, Hagenbach gained the scholarly friendship and esteem of August Neander after Neander read a copy of the *Encyklopädie* that Hagenbach had sent his former professor.⁶¹ When Neander died in 1850,

⁵⁹ Before the book's appearance, Hagenbach had lectured on the subject four times: in the summer semesters of 1827, 1829, 1831, and 1833. See *Basler Lektionskatalog 1820–1844*, in UBB, Un 4° 203.

⁶⁰ Hase to Hagenbach, 21 September 1833, in StaBS PA 838a D151.

⁶¹ Hagenbach to Neander, 2 October 1833, in WLB, Cod.hist.4°713,295; Neander to Hagenbach, 18 March 1839, Neander to Hagenbach, 9 August 1842, in StaBS PA 838a D291. Cf. Hagenbach,

Hagenbach's name circulated as a possible successor to Neander's important chair, though intra-faculty politics in Berlin finally caused the Prussian *Kultusministerium* to turn elsewhere in its search.⁶²

Hagenbach dedicated each edition of the book to fellow mediating figures. He symbolized his admiration for both Schleiermacher and de Wette by dedicating the first edition to them. The second edition (1845), coming eleven years after Schleiermacher's death, was dedicated solely to de Wette. The third (1851), fourth (1854), fifth (1857), and sixth (1861) editions went to one or both of Lücke and Ullmann. And the ninth (1874) went to his colleagues in theology at the University of Basel. Each edition, moreover, bore a noteworthy epigram from Goethe's

Farbenlehre (1810):

Content without method leads to fanaticism,
Method without content to empty sophistry,
Substance without form to burdensome knowledge,
Form without substance to a hollow delusion.⁶³

As an introduction to the discipline of theology, theological encyclopaedia entailed considerable pedagogical demands. 'Most of the recent encyclopaedias have not only attempted to introduce the student to theology, but also to promote the development of science itself', Hagenbach noted.⁶⁴ Balancing content and method, form and substance, all fit into the larger goals of mediating theology—putting flesh

'Neaders Verdienste um als Kirchengeschichte: Eine akademische Gedächtnißrede gehalten 4. November 1850', *TSK* 24 (1851), 543–94.

⁶² Translator's preface to Hagenbach, 'Neander's Services as a Church Historian', trans. H. B. Smith, *BSac* 8 (1851), 822. Cf. Kurt-Victor Selge, 'Die Berliner Historiker', in Reimer Hansen and Wolfgang Ribbe (eds.), *Geschichtswissenschaft in Berlin im 19. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992), 409–47.

⁶³ 'Gehalt ohne Methode führt zur Schwärmerei / Methode ohne Gehalt zum leeren Klügeln / Stoff ohne Form zum beschwerlichen Wissen / Form ohne Stoff zu einem hohlen Wähnen.' Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Zur Farbenlehre*, in Erich Trunz (ed.), *Goethes Werke: Hamburger Ausgabe* (Munich: Beck, 1981), xiv. 51.

⁶⁴ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 4.

on Bernard M. G. Reardon's 'Romantic spirit [that] longs for ultimate reconciliation and peace'.⁶⁵

In the first prefatory dedication to Schleiermacher and de Wette, Hagenbach wrote: 'What I have said in the last ten to twelve years in the realm of theology that is good and true, I believe I have acquired' from those two 'stimulating and encouraging influences, one as a teacher [Schleiermacher] . . . the other as an older friend and colleague [de Wette].' To the extent, he remarked, 'that one may designate being in agreement with the essential principles of *Wissenschaft* a school, then consequently to your [Schleiermacher's and de Wette's] school belong all who pay homage to neither of the two extremes, but rather the much-vaunted middle; who search neither in eclectic empiricism, nor in the nebulous regions of arbitrary speculation, but rather only for the historical-philosophical way'.⁶⁶ His intent to clear a pathway between opposed viewpoints and his use of language—as in the expression, 'the much-vaunted middle'—evokes the collective group of mediating thinkers with whom he sympathized.

Hagenbach explicitly identified the 'two extremes', or at least torchbearers of each. One of them was J. T. L. Danz, who published his *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* in 1832. The other was Karl Rosenkranz. Because each had recently produced noteworthy theological encyclopaedias, he found it necessary to justify his own in the increasingly crowded pedagogical field.⁶⁷ Danz's work was inadequate, he judged—along with many others—for ineptly trudging out Kant's out-of-date philosophy in a new epoch.⁶⁸ He characterized

⁶⁵ Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religion in the Age of Romanticism: Studies in Early Nineteenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 5. Cf. Jack Forstman, *A Romantic Triangle: Schleiermacher and Early German Romanticism* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); and Frederick C. Beiser, *The Romantic Imperative: The Concept of Early German Romanticism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

⁶⁶ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), vi–vii.

⁶⁷ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), ix.

⁶⁸ Cf. J. F. Rübiger, *Theologik, oder Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Leipzig: Reiland, 1880), 62.

Rosenkranz's work, in turn, as 'more a philosophy of theological science than an encyclopaedia in the ordinary sense', that is, more indebted to Hegelian speculation than properly theological currents. But Rosenkranz proffered a significant rival account of the theological sciences that needed answering. Between Rosenkranz and Danz there remained 'a spacious centre', a void that Hagenbach aspired to fill.⁶⁹

Hagenbach also clarified the relation of his textbook to what was clearly the foundational text in the field, Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung*. When he studied at Berlin in the early 1820s, he did not sit through any of Schleiermacher's lectures on theological encyclopaedia.⁷⁰ He had read the *Kurze Darstellung* 'as a student without the commentary of the teacher', he said. The work was too 'epigrammatic and nearly enigmatic', forcing him 'in some places to guess and intuit' Schleiermacher's meaning. It was a brilliant 'sketch rapidly drawn with a firm hand, which wants only the pencil of a Herder to make it, by a finishing stroke, a rich, fair picture'. Still, it held the 'key to Schleiermacher's entire theology', and was the foremost work in the modern age to demonstrate theology's 'scientific autonomy' (*wissenschaftliche Selbständigkeit*). Thus, the hope for his own work was to 'satisfy equally the heart and mind' of the 'beginning student of theology'. The student, then, might 'understand the whole of theology, as well as its parts, scientifically'. He would clarify the *Kurze Darstellung*, while also providing a fuller, more comprehensive account.⁷¹

In the preface to the second edition, which appeared in the same year as the second edition of Rosenkranz's encyclopaedia, Hagenbach reiterated his position:

⁶⁹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), x. Hagenbach also stated that he produced the early drafts of his text before reading Rosenkranz.

⁷⁰ Joachim Boekels, *Schleiermacher als Kirchengeschichtler: Mit Edition der Nachschrift Karl Rudolf Hagenbach von 1821/22* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 35–6.

⁷¹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), xi–xii, 118, 1–2, xiii.

I feel that my essential view of the religious and churchly life has so far remained the same, that even now I am not yet ready to bring myself either to return to the old orthodoxy of the letter or to allow my innermost personal convictions to be taken up into the smokestack (*Rauchfänge*) of abstract speculation. Still, I will have to keep myself prepared to initiate the two sides; one must accept the charge of being unscientific (*Unwissenschaftlichkeit*), and the other of being undecided (*Unentschiedenheit*). But I also know that there are still a great number of old and young theologians . . . that give a strong verdict neither to the one, nor to the other kind; and instead of throwing themselves into the arms of one extreme, or having to impose upon themselves a mediation (*Vermittlung*) of extremes by a formula, search for this mediation itself, and want to be instructed and refreshed from one who has also searched himself.⁷²

He once more directed his textbook to the latter group, which called not so much for a ‘scholarly book’ (*Gelehrtenbuch*) as for a ‘student book’ (*Studentenbuch*).⁷³

Though Hagenbach continued to tinker with various aspects, he did not subject the *Encyklopädie* to major surgery, cosmetic or otherwise, in its many revisions. Apart from the work’s gradual expansion and additional bibliographic entries, the most significant change was an early structural one. In the second edition, Hagenbach merged the previously divided sections on theological encyclopaedia and theological methodology. The introduction remained, followed by Part I, covering ‘the relations of theology to the other sciences, and its aims’, and Part II, subdivided according to the four branches of theology: exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical. The methodological sections, once isolated, now appeared alongside each branch. This new structure remained in all subsequent editions. He did not want to write a new book each time, he explained, but only to increase the lucidity of the previous edition.⁷⁴

Nevertheless, he was mindful of what would make his ‘student book’ a lasting success. He put his treatment of each theological field through its paces, added up-to-date terms, and incorporated theories from the latest learned treatises making the

⁷² Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1845), vii.

⁷³ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1845), viii.

⁷⁴ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1845), viii–ix.

rounds, all of which reflected the tenacious commitment to ‘spare no efforts in genuine *Wissenschaft*’. In fact, with the publication of each new edition, he had his own personal copy of the book specially bound so that after every folio of printed text there appeared a blank folio—roughly twice as thick as the printed pages—effectively doubling the volume’s size. Insertion of the unmarked sheets served a dual purpose: it furnished him with critical space, first, to indicate emendations, in dip pen and pencil, for the next edition; and second, to mark passages and references for his accompanying lectures.⁷⁵ Like the records of a skilled astronomer, the successive editions charted the ever-expanding theological universe, inscribing on the page short-lived meteor showers, discoveries of new planets, and, in some cases, the brilliant energy bursts of supernovae across the scholarly cosmos.

With extensive citations to Schelling, Fichte, and Schleiermacher, Hagenbach supplied a full definition of theological encyclopaedia:

Theological encyclopaedia is part of the general encyclopaedia, and as this is the epitome of all knowledge, so does it represent the epitome of theological knowledge. Its ultimate goal is not to unite within itself all that deserves to be known, but rather to comprehend the further development of *Wissenschaft* as conditioned by its historical character; and also, to describe its form and extent in their inward and outward relations by properly demarcating its limits. While the theological encyclopaedia represents and introduces one to the organism of the theological sciences, it itself has no position within this organism; it stands either outside or above it. It is, however, a member of the great general organism of sciences and as such, theological encyclopaedia forms a bridge to encyclopaedia in general.⁷⁶

Theological encyclopaedia represented the ‘epitome of all knowledge’. ‘The study of encyclopaedia can never be exhausted. . . . [A]nd as exponents change with varying magnitudes, so encyclopaedia keeps pace with *Wissenschaft*’.⁷⁷ Theology as ‘developed by a positive religion’, Hagenbach added, ‘will assume a scientific character as the content of that religion is more intelligent and complete. At the

⁷⁵ E.g., Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (4th edn, 1854), in FG, Frey-Gryn S I 34b.

⁷⁶ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 1–2.

⁷⁷ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 4.

highest place, in this regard, stands the theology of Protestant Christianity'.⁷⁸ The quest for the unity of knowledge remained essential to his pedagogical approach.

Hagenbach identified theology as a 'positive science', oriented toward practical ends. Where Rosenkranz enlisted Hegel and Marheineke in his definition of theology, Hagenbach quoted Schleiermacher. 'Theology is a positive science (*positive Wissenschaft*) or applied science (Schleiermacher, [*Kurze Darstellung*] §1), and its scientific character is consequently not determined by anything within itself, as is the case of a pure science, but from without by an existent and historically-conditioned fact, namely, the Christian church and its manifestation in time'.⁷⁹ Theology as an academic discipline satisfied the criteria of modern science though its connection to the 'general organism of science' and practical service to the church.⁸⁰

Hagenbach's focus on the practical benefits of study also revealed Schleiermacher's influence. As Schleiermacher wondered at those who would cut off faith and learning from one another or separate Christianity and historical knowledge, Hagenbach puzzled over the same question: 'The school and actual life are not to form a contrast. . . . The school is to prepare for life, to impart life, to beget and promote life. . . . Science can only give life by entering into things, not as an abstract theory'. If 'life is to assume a scientific character', he proceeded, 'it will be necessary that science should also live; there must be interaction'.⁸¹ As a result, he devoted considerably more space to issues of pedagogy and methodology than the *Kurze Darstellung*.

Hagenbach's discussion approximated Schleiermacher's famous 'prince of the church'. Yet many, he allowed, 'are too indolent to study or think', and

⁷⁸ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 35.

⁷⁹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 50–1.

⁸⁰ Cf. Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (2nd edn, 1830), in *KGA* i/6. §1, 325–6.

⁸¹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 6. Cf. Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §9, 29–30; §§18–9, 332–3; §28, 336.

consequently ‘despair of the scientific character of theology’.⁸² Notably, he turned to David Friedrich Strauss for support on this point. ‘Theological study, formerly the means employed to study for the service of the church, now forms the most direct road to unfitness for that service’, Strauss wrote sardonically in his controversial *Glaubenslehre* (1840–1). Anywhere that remains ‘secure against the penetration of science, now constitutes a better place for preparatory practice for the ministry than the universities and seminaries. Religious idiots and self-taught theologians, the leaders and speakers of pietistic gatherings—these constitute the clergy of the future’.⁸³

Relatedly, late eighteenth-century diatribes against ‘bread-scholars’ reappeared in Hagenbach’s deliberations. He grew fond of Daub’s version of the argument, which applied specifically to theology students seeking clerical positions. Hagenbach further shifted the older focus when he put the question into explicit moral and spiritual terms derived from the New Testament, especially directions for partaking of the Lord’s Supper or Eucharist. ‘None are compelled to become theologians, unless they choose’, he stated. ‘The apostle’s words, “Let a man examine himself”, and “he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself”, well apply here, where no mere bread-studies in the common sense are involved, but the dispensing of the bread and drawing of the water of life itself.’⁸⁴

Schleiermacher’s formulation held the antidote to both maladies, Hagenbach announced: ‘It should be required, in the interest of genuine science, that the study of theology be made practical’. Indeed, in a highly suggestive and pregnant construction that alluded to the Sermon on the Mount, he divulged: ‘*Wissenschaft* [is]

⁸² Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 6.

⁸³ D. F. Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1840–1), ii. 625–6.

⁸⁴ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 9.

. . . a salt that shall penetrate the entire mass' of theology; 'but if the salt loses its savour, with what may one salt?'⁸⁵

By highlighting theological encyclopaedia as 'the epitome of all knowledge', while simultaneously urging students to 'keep pace with science', Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* manifested a tension between the static and the dynamic, the individual and the universal, or between theology's complete unity as a science and its perpetual development.⁸⁶ 'Every student should subject himself . . . [to] the thorough investigation of some specialty, [even] if his aim is to prepare for the simplest duties in the church rather than for the work of theological scholarship. Only those who have themselves untied knots can appreciate the labours of others, and only they who have the patience and courage to go to the bottom of the individual and special can attain the power to comprehend the universal', he said.⁸⁷ At risk of accelerating the rate of specialization, the *Encyklopädie* encouraged a thorough education in the individual (the 'parts') as preparation to better grasp the universal (the 'whole'). 'It is no doubt true that the one who wants to contribute something to science must confine himself to a single branch (a specialty)', he reasoned, 'though this restriction should not begin too early.'⁸⁸ This point was also not lost on Hagenbach's students. 'Due to the enormous expansion of science', wrote Burckhardt in 1840, then studying history with Leopold von Ranke in Berlin, 'one is obliged to limit oneself to some definite subject and pursue it single-mindedly'.⁸⁹

Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie*, furthermore, established the supremacy of the fourfold division of theology after Schleiermacher's unconventional threefold division. Though the categories did not originate with him, Hagenbach classified

⁸⁵ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 7–8.

⁸⁶ Cf. Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 314.

⁸⁷ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 46.

⁸⁸ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 8.

⁸⁹ Jacob Burckhardt, *Briefe*, i, ed. Max Burchardt (Basel: Schwabe, 1949), 233–4.

theology according to the branches of exegesis, historical theology, systematic theology, and practical theology. The fourfold classification expressed the very ‘nature’ of theology, he said, and also reflected Basel’s restructured four-year curriculum. The ‘study of positive theology is required by its very nature to conform to the four leading divisions of Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical theology’, an order which students must respect. The order of study began with exegesis. As a positive science, theology ‘has for its source . . . revelation’; therefore, ‘the beginnings of theology will coincide with that fact, and must be found in the documents relating . . . to revelation’. One would take up the remaining three subdisciplines in turn. ‘Starting from the sources, [theology] traces the progress of historical development down to our own time, and then combines into a mental picture of the present what history has furnished [i.e., historical theology]. It obtains by this process a clear idea of the connection and coherence running through the whole [i.e., systematic theology], and from there deduces the necessary principles for converting theory into practice [i.e., practical theology].’⁹⁰ Quoting Schleiermacher, Hagenbach determined that the order of exegesis, historical studies, dogmatics, and practice culminated in the ‘crown of the tree of life’.⁹¹

In Hagenbach’s work, the historical component of the theological curriculum emerged as the keystone, linking the different subdisciplines together. Scripture has ‘historical importance beyond that of the other monuments of Christian antiquity . . . as the deed of our foundation’. Yet, ‘it cannot be denied’, he maintained, ‘that in the broad sense exegetical theology may be properly included under historical theology, inasmuch as it is the work of exegesis to determine conditions essentially historical’.⁹² Similarly, practical theology, the government of the church, the organization of the liturgy—all ‘are grounded in historical conditions’. Practical theology is ‘regulated . .

⁹⁰ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 111–12.

⁹¹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 363.

⁹² Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 113.

. by the Christian church in its determinate historical individuality', and cannot be understood apart from Christianity's 'historically-conditioned reality'.⁹³

Dogmatics stood in much the same relation to history. Contra Rosenkranz, historical theology provided the surest foundation. 'Not until the mind has developed its powers by historical studies . . . will it be fitted to attempt the study of dogmatics, which demands a robust intellect. The mind that, on the contrary, begins the study of theology with dogmatics, may be likened to the bird which tries to fly before its wings have grown or the architect who attempts the erection of a building before its foundations have been laid'.⁹⁴ Dogmatics springs 'from the soil of history'. To put dogmatics or speculative theology first would be to 'plant theology on its head'.⁹⁵ But to radicalize the historicist impulse, as Strauss and others had done, Hagenbach argued, was also problematic. Dogmatics must 'grow out of a living apprehension of history', but the result is just as much the fruit of 'intellectual mediation between the past and present'.⁹⁶ Schleiermacher was fundamentally correct, Hagenbach decided, to make dogmatics 'a science of the present as historically conditioned'. He pointed his readers to Schleiermacher's statement: 'The designation "systematic theology" . . . rightly stresses that doctrine is not to be presented as a mere aggregate of propositions, whose coherent interrelation is not clearly shown. It nevertheless conceals, to the detriment of the subject, *the historical character of the discipline* . . . and numerous misinterpretations are bound to arise as a result.'⁹⁷

Seeing a necessary choice to be made between Hegel and Schleiermacher, Hagenbach positioned his *Encyklopädie* firmly with the latter. Rosenkranz's 'textbook indicated the fact, which subsequent history has illustrated, that the Hegelian

⁹³ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 362–4.

⁹⁴ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 300. Cf. Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), 261 ff.

⁹⁵ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 116.

⁹⁶ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 304–5. Cf. Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, i. 71.

⁹⁷ Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung*, §97, 363 (emphasis added).

tendency considered itself entitled to the privilege enjoyed by that of Schleiermacher, of opening for itself a victorious way through the newly cultivated regions of theology'. Rosenkranz had even claimed that 'speculative theology, which Schleiermacher separated from theology', would bring about the 'mighty transformation' of all theological disciplines.⁹⁸ Hegel's apologist operated with three overarching premises: '1) that the Christian religion, as being the religion of truth and liberty, is the absolute religion; 2) that Protestantism is not the dissolving of religion into nihilism, but rather its development into an affirmative self-consciousness of its rational character; and 3) that the reconciliation of Christian theology with philosophy is possible.'⁹⁹ In opposition, Hagenbach hoped to launch 'a period of exhaustion and suspicion with reference to speculative thought . . . among theologians'.¹⁰⁰ What is more, he nodded approvingly at Schleiermacher's claim that piety consisted in the 'feeling of absolute dependence', rejecting the Hegel-Rosenkranz critique as mere 'cynical reflection'.¹⁰¹ Rolf Schäfer has rightly noted in the 'Editor's Introduction' to the critical edition of Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* that the broad reception enjoyed by Schleiermacher's dogmatic masterpiece depended in no small way upon Hagenbach's many readers.¹⁰² Throughout the nineteenth century, multiple generations of students cut their theological teeth on Hagenbach's book.

From the beginning, Hagenbach attempted to write a textbook for the 'school of science', a proposed *via media*. In terms of actual use and pedagogical success, his *Encyklopädie* became the standard textbook for mediating thinkers—and the standard for nearly all beginning students of theology in German universities. He sought to

⁹⁸ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 107–8.

⁹⁹ Karl Rosenkranz, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (2nd edn, Halle: Schwetschke, 1845), iii–iv.

¹⁰⁰ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 67.

¹⁰¹ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie*, 17.

¹⁰² Rolf Schäfer, 'Historische Einführung', in *KGA* i/13.1. liii.

legitimize the discipline of modern theology and its place in society, with reference to the academic community of science and the religious community of the church. He also used his work to defend of the role of historical theology against the encroaching Hegelian system typified by Rosenkranz. In place of speculative theology, Hagenbach extolled ‘the historical’ (*das Geschichtliche*), and gave voice to the dominant mid-century paradigm of moderate historicism, arguing, ‘we can only really know something, when we know how it has developed’.¹⁰³

INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE

The ‘German model’ of the university, based on the University of Berlin, concomitant with German theological scholarship, rose to become the ‘global standard in the nineteenth century’ and had a tremendous impact on higher education and scholarship in the Anglo-American world and beyond.¹⁰⁴ As both ascended the heights of international esteem, so too did Hagenbach’s encyclopaedia. Even in the 1880s, Berlin’s theological faculty ‘strongly advised’ students to read and master ‘Hagenbach’s textbook, which is tried and tested through so many years of use’. The directive appeared in the preliminary section of the handbook provided to all students; Hagenbach’s was the only specific book mentioned in any discipline, proving its indispensable quality.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie* (1833), 5.

¹⁰⁴ Nicholas Boyle, “‘Art,’ Literature, Theology: Learning from Germany’, in Robert E. Sullivan (ed.), *Higher Learning and the Catholic Traditions* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 89.

¹⁰⁵ ‘Theologische Fakultät. Anweisung für Studierende der Theologie auf der Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin’, in Paul Daude (ed.), *Die königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin: Systematische Zusammenstellung der für dieselbe bestehenden gesetzlichen, statutarischen und reglementarischen Bestimmung* (Berlin: Müller, 1887), 351. Cf. Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, ‘Studenten, Studium und Lehre’, in Bruch and Tenorth (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden*, i. 231–2.

Like his textbooks of *Kirchengeschichte* and *Dogmengeschichte*, Hagenbach's encyclopaedia became the model and norm in its respective genre.¹⁰⁶ In 1857, a Hungarian-language edition appeared, which served as an introduction to modern theology for the Hungarian Reformed Church.¹⁰⁷ Portions of his *Kirchengeschichte* and *Dogmengeschichte*, which followed the same principles outlined in his *Encyklopädie*, and other related works of his soon appeared in Danish, Swedish, Dutch, English, Russian, and eventually Chinese.¹⁰⁸ His theological encyclopaedia enjoyed virtually unmatched success in shaping theological study in the United States. Its reception in English translation, through a series of curious channels, satisfied the longing for German scholarship, 'learned piety', and adaptability for use in seminars and survey courses for an unusually broad range of theologians and church historians. The English-language reception of Hagenbach's book began with the American Congregationalist Edwards Amasa Park (1808–1900) of Andover Theological Seminary.

In 1839, Park produced a collection of sermons from contemporaneous German mediating theologians that swelled to almost five hundred pages. The introduction described the Germans as 'purveyors of mind', engaged in 'the commerce of intellect': while pragmatic Americans 'are making ships, they [German theologians] are manufacturing theories'. Park's anthology was an attempt at 'looking away from our own land' to see 'phrases that truth assumes elsewhere'.¹⁰⁹ Fixed on Europe, Park made three trips to Germany beginning in 1842–3. Philip Schaff, then still in Europe, was one of two lecturers hired to introduce Park to the

¹⁰⁶ For a detailed examination of the success of Hagenbach's textbooks, especially in the United States, see Zachary Purvis, 'Transatlantic Textbooks: Karl Hagenbach, Shared Interests, and German Academic Theology in Nineteenth-Century America', *CH* 83/3 (2014), 650–83.

¹⁰⁷ K. R. Hagenbach, *A theologiai tudományok Encyklopaediája és Methodologiaja*, trans. Imre Révész (Pest, 1857).

¹⁰⁸ See 'Kirchengeschichte nach Hagenbach', in UBB, F w 241.

¹⁰⁹ Edwards Amasa Park and Bela Bates Edwards (eds.), *Selections from German Literature* (Andover, Mass.: Gould, Newman, and Saxon, 1839), 5, 8, 10.

writings of Schleiermacher, Hegel, Hagenbach, and others when Park visited Heidelberg in 1843. Park also called on Neander and Hengstenberg in Berlin and Tholuck in Halle.¹¹⁰ When he returned home, he took over editorial duties of the journal *Bibliotheca Sacra*, modelling it after *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*. As editor, Park demonstrated a resolute commitment to discuss matters of foreign religious scholarship and culture in the journal.¹¹¹

In the journal's first issue in 1844, writing for an unnamed group of New England theologians, Park compared the state of theological science and education in America with that in Germany. Though enthusiastic about American theology's practicality and good sense, he lamented, 'we have no treatise, which can serve the purpose of an encyclopedia, or general introduction to the science of theology; no comprehensive outline of the science, its various departments, its literature'.¹¹² The task of furnishing such an English-language encyclopaedia began through translation. Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung* appeared in English in 1850.¹¹³ Park translated portions of Tholuck's 1842–3 lectures on the subject at Halle and published them the next year.¹¹⁴ Over the next four decades, only a handful of American works in the genre appeared, usually culled from transcriptions of classroom lectures.¹¹⁵

Impressed with German *Wissenschaft* and conscious of major lacunae in the English literature, two American Methodists, John Hurst (1834–1903) and George Crooks (1822–97), turned toward Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie*. They planned to

¹¹⁰ Frank Hughes Foster, *The Life of Edwards Amasa Park* (New York: Revell, 1936), 113–27; George R. W. Scott, 'Professor Edwards Amasa Park', in Daniel Little Furber (ed.), *Professor Park and His Pupils* (Boston: Usher, 1899), 34–5.

¹¹¹ Cf. John D. Hannah, 'History of Bibliotheca Sacra', *BSac* 133 (1976), 229–42.

¹¹² 'Thoughts on the State of Theological Science and Education in our Country', *BSac* 1 (1844), 739.

¹¹³ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Drawn up to Serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures*, trans. William Farrer (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1850).

¹¹⁴ F. A. G. Tholuck, 'Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology: Translated from the Unpublished Lectures of Prof. Tholuck of Halle, by Edwards A. Park', *BSac* 1 (1844), 178–217, 332–67, 552–78, 726–35.

¹¹⁵ See, e.g., John M'Clintock, *Lectures on Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology*, ed. John T. Short (Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1873); and Revere Franklin Weidner, *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology: Based on Hagenbach and Krauth*, 3 vols (Philadelphia: Garner, 1885–91); 2nd rev. edn, 2 vols (Chicago: Wartburg, 1910).

produce something more than a strict translation, hoping to render the work more directly useful for their intended American classroom by providing English-language bibliographic resources and new sections on recent American theology, particularly Wesleyanism. Their part translation, part redrafting came into print in 1884, and a second edition appeared ten years later, both developed explicitly ‘on the basis of Hagenbach’. The opening line by Hurst and Crooks read:

Our American and English theology has been singularly destitute of a general introductory work to the theological sciences. The following Encyclopedia and Methodology is designed to supply this lack. . . . The volume on this subject by the Rev. Dr. Karl Hagenbach, who taught Historical Theology many years at Basel University, has been so highly esteemed that we have made it the basis of our work. We have endeavored, by utilizing the rich material of Hagenbach, to make a handbook for the theological student; a guide to show him the right path of inquiry; a plan or draft of the science, so that by the help here afforded he can see its exterior lines, the boundaries of its subdivisions, and can take the whole into the compass of a complete survey.¹¹⁶

The Hurst-Crooks rendering garnered enthusiastic support. H. M. Scott, a professor at Chicago Theological Seminary, praised the work, while pointing out the difficulty in identifying it as ‘simply’ a translation, due to the bibliographical additions and periodic insertions on American religion. ‘The valuable and indispensable book of Hagenbach is not merely given to us in American address, but the additions and adaptations make it well-nigh an independent authority.’ Hagenbach is the unparalleled ‘guide to hundreds desiring to investigate special fields of religious philosophy, history, and doctrine’, declared another reviewer.¹¹⁷ Analysts as different as the editorial staff at *Harper’s Magazine* and the conservative and confessional president of Princeton Seminary, Francis Patton (1843–1932), expressed the same conclusion.¹¹⁸ ‘America has not yet produced an original work on the

¹¹⁶ George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology: On the Basis of Hagenbach* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884; 2nd edn, New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1894), 6.

¹¹⁷ Albert Osborn, *John Fletcher Hurst: A Biography* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1905), 286–7.

¹¹⁸ ‘Editor’s Literary Record’, *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* (September 1844), 639; Francis L. Patton, ‘Review of Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology on the Basis of Hagenbach’, *The Presbyterian Review* 5 (1884), 741–2.

subject', Schaff ruled near the end of the century, 'but has [at least] made Hagenbach accessible to American students'.¹¹⁹

Where Hurst and Crooks adapted Hagenbach's textbook, Schaff used it as a model for his own, reflecting his wish to 'mediate' between German-speaking Europe and the New World. Schaff had taught theological propaedeutics, the term he preferred over 'encyclopaedia', since the 1860s, first at Mercersburg Seminary in Pennsylvania and then at Union Theological Seminary in New York, at a time when it was far from common to offer the course in the United States and potential accompanying readers remained rarer still. 'When I was appointed, in 1869, "Professor of Encyclopedia and Symbolic," in the Union Theological Seminary', Schaff once quipped, 'a doctor of divinity and editor of a leading religious periodical asked me, "Pray, tell me the name of your professorship." When I told him, he said with an expression of surprise, "As to Symbolic, I have never heard of it in all my life; and as to Encyclopedia, if you are a professor of that, they need no other professor!"' In 1893, Schaff published his class notes as *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology*. 'Propaedeutic is as yet a new study in this country', he said, 'but it should be taught in every institution'. He leaned heavily on Hagenbach throughout the entire work, a dependence he openly acknowledged. The *Propaedeutic* aspired 'to answer the same purpose for English-speaking students as the well-known *Encyklopädie und Methodologie* of the late Dr. Hagenbach of Basel'.¹²⁰ As Charles Torrey, an early reviewer, opined at first with envy and then feelings of belated pride, 'German and Swiss theological students since 1833 have had their

¹¹⁹ Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical, including Encyclopaedia, Methodology, and Bibliography; A Manual for Students* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), 10. Cf. Francis L. Patton, 'Theological Encyclopaedia', in *Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, Biblical and Theological Studies* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), 1–34; and Geerhardus Vos to B. B. Warfield, 22 October 1889, in Vos, *The Letters of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005), 129–30.

¹²⁰ Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, iii–iv.

Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie*, which has passed through a dozen or more editions'.

After the Hurst-Crooks rendition and now Schaff's volume, Torrey beamed, 'at last we have a text-book of Theological Encyclopedia that we can call our own'.¹²¹ After Schaff's death, Charles Ripley Gillett, Union's librarian, took over instruction of the course, 'Theological Encyclopedia, Methodology, and Bibliography', using Schaff's text, thus giving extended life to Hagenbach's work.¹²² Countless other professors in a diverse array of institutions similarly borrowed from Hagenbach.¹²³ Their engagements with his textbook contributed to the transatlantic, and, indeed, as Jürgen Osterhammel has argued, global impact of European 'cultural exports' in education.¹²⁴

CONCLUSION

Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* firmly established the fourfold pattern of theology, in which a moderate form of historical theology held together the other branches of exegesis, dogmatics, and church practice. His construction became 'virtually universal for Protestant schools throughout the nineteenth century and for theological education in Europe and America'.¹²⁵ From its first appearance in 1833 onward, his textbook served as the primary introductory text for German-speaking

¹²¹ Charles Torrey, review of Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, in *The Andover Review* 29 (1893), 249–51.

¹²² George Lewis Prentiss, *The Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York* (New York: Randolph, 1899), 340.

¹²³ Cf. Robert Wood Lynn, 'Notes toward a History: Theological Encyclopedia and the Evolution of Protestant Seminary Curriculum, 1808–1868', *Theological Education* 17 (1981), 118–41; Glenn T. Miller, *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870–1970* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 48–50, 145; Elizabeth A. Clark, *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 144–5. See also William Rainey Harper, 'Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How?' *AJT* 3 (1899), 45–66; and 'Theological Libraries' Round Table: Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Library Association', *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11 (1917), 357.

¹²⁴ Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 798–808.

¹²⁵ Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 101.

students of theology and carried far-reaching implications for how ‘the penumbral world of intellectuals’, in Edward Shils’s phrase, related to theology and the university.¹²⁶ In Schaff’s verdict from 1893: ‘Hagenbach’s *Encyklopädie* has served and still serves . . . German students, who prize it as a useful student book’.¹²⁷

When Burckhardt remarked that ‘history and the historical observation of the world and time has generally begun to penetrate our entire education and culture’, the historical stimulus of Hagenbach’s lectures, along with de Wette’s insights, lurked in the background.¹²⁸ Burckhardt’s contemporaries in Basel, including influential Swiss-German theologians Daniel Schenkel (1813–85), Alois Biedermann (1819–85), and Christoph Johannes Riggensbach (1818–90), tendered analogous judgments on the influence of Hagenbach’s *Encyklopädie* in the early stages of their respective theological careers, as did a host of others.¹²⁹ When Adolf von Harnack lectured on theological encyclopaedia in the 1880s, he, too, relied on Hagenbach’s textbook, highlighting the work’s broad appeal.¹³⁰ In fact, the work continued to be read and studied well into the twentieth century.¹³¹

What is more, Hagenbach carefully refined mediating theology and assisted students in the modern university in navigating among theological adversaries and competing schools of thought. At the dawn of a period of scholarly activity situated, in Eduard Spranger’s words, ‘under the decisive influence of positivism’, that is, an

¹²⁶ Edward Shils, *The Constitution of Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 225.

¹²⁷ Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, iv.

¹²⁸ Jacob Burckhardt, *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen* (1905), quoted in John R. Hinde, *Jacob Burckhardt and the Crisis of Modernity* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2000), 142. Cf. Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 130–1.

¹²⁹ See Alois Emanuel Biedermann, ‘Curriculum vitae’, 2, in StaBS Kirchenarchiv N17; UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Nachlass Biedermanns, A.II.a; Gottlieb Bischoff, ‘Die Universität Basel’, 14–16, in UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Nachlass Bischoff; and Alois Emanuel Biedermann, ‘Erinnerungen’ (1881), in Biedermann, *Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Reimer, 1885), 378–433. Cf. Thomas K. Kuhn, *Der junge Alois Emanuel Biedermann: Lebensweg und theologische Entwicklung bis zur ‘Freien Theologie’ 1819–1844* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 108–57. On Biedermann, Riggensbach, and Schenkel, respectively, see *BBKL* i. 583–4; *BBKL* xviii. 351–4; and *BBKL* ix. 150–3.

¹³⁰ Friedemann Steck (ed.), ‘Adolf Harnacks Vorlesung über Encyklopädie der Theologie’, *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 13/2 (2006), 179–226.

¹³¹ Purvis, ‘Transatlantic Textbooks’, 675–83. Cf. the reviews in StaBS PA 838a B92.

era brimming with highly specialized and disconnected research problems, Hagenbach exhibited the tension between theology as a complete science and the development of its individual branches.¹³² In short, his *Encyklopädie* became a success in these realms second to none.

In 1849, at the same time that de Wette extolled Hagenbach's historical and theological virtues in the speech with which this chapter opened, another peer, the well-known professor of German studies, Wilhelm Wackernagel (1806–69), articulated one of the more insightful interpretations not only of Hagenbach, but also of the entire outlook for which he stood. Wackernagel offered a poem to Hagenbach on the occasion of his twenty-five-year tenure at the university. In an eloquent turn of phrase, defying easy translation, Hagenbach was, he said, 'with spirit and strength, a priest of sacred science' (*mit Geist und Kraft, ein Priester der heil'gen Wissenschaft*).¹³³

In later years, a cascade of accolades supported that view. On Hagenbach's fifty-year jubilee—reported on throughout the French, Swiss, and German press—theological faculties from across Europe sent him congratulatory notes and honorary certificates, observing that he had given 'scientific life to the theological faculty' at Basel and laboured with a 'scientific spirit and piety of the heart'.¹³⁴ Leipzig's faculty even sent a large plaque and an intricately carved wooden medallion.¹³⁵ To quote from one characteristic testimony—applicable as much to Hagenbach as to the success both of his *Encyklopädie* and work to revive the historical-theological curriculum—Breslau's theological faculty wrote to him: 'Half a century of academic work will soon be completed by you. You have sown an abundance of precious seeds in the minds (*Geister*) of your audience in these hundred semesters. What an expert, what a graceful leader you have become of young students also from other

¹³² Eduard Spranger, *Wandlungen im Wesen der Universität seit 100 Jahren* (Leipzig: Wiegandt, 1913), 38.

¹³³ Wilhelm Wackernagel, 'Gedicht von Wilhelm Wackernagel, Hagenbachs 25. jähr. Jubiläum' (1849), in StaBS PA 838a B31.

¹³⁴ See StaBS PA 838a B39.

¹³⁵ In StaBS PA 838a B37.

universities and in our Germany, especially in the historical areas of theological science!’¹³⁶

¹³⁶ ‘Den hochwürdigen Herren K. R. Hagenbach und J. J. Stähelin Doktoren der Theologie und Professoren derselben an der Universität Basel zur Feier Ihrer 50jähriger Lehrthätigkeit am 8. September 1883. Die evangelische-theologische Fakultät zu Breslau, 3. August 1873’, in StaBS PA 838a B37. Though addressed to Hagenbach and his colleague J. J. Staehelin, these remarks applied specifically to Hagenbach; Staehelin was a professor of Old Testament.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

One word for the students of theology. You have chosen a science which claims and cannot but claim to be the goal, the foundation, the keystone of all others. But this queenly dignity belongs to theology only upon the condition that she makes use of the sister sciences; that that she has opportunity, has liberality, has self-confidence enough to appropriate the good sound material worked up by other sciences, to pluck the best fruits from all branches of the tree of knowledge, to trade with such 'talents' and 'make them five talents more'. . . . Her very existence depends on the steady maintenance, by teacher and pupil alike, of the 'historical sense' in its greatest purity. . . . It depends upon the estimation of new truths in other fields of knowledge at their just value. The question is one of life and death.

J. J. Ignaz von Döllinger, 1867

On a number of occasions I have referred to the origins of theological encyclopaedia. But what of its downfall? Through the cunning of history, the project of theological encyclopaedia died a slow death—or at least appeared to—with the last gasps of Wilhelmine Germany and the intoxicating first spells of the Weimar Republic—a time marked by radical, avant-garde developments in the study of theology and religion, generational conflicts, and intense church, political, and educational disputes, all played out in a series of crises.¹ Untangling the causes of its apparent demise remains a troublesome task, mired in a complex web of challenges.

What Ignaz von Döllinger had called theology's 'queenly dignity' in fact well-nigh disappeared in the nineteenth century, the philosophy faculty long since divesting it of its crown in the realm of science. Though a Catholic with liberal

¹ Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Protestantische Universitätstheologie in der Weimarer Republik', *Der heilige Zeitgeist* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 1–110.

sympathies, Döllinger was also an astute observer of Protestant university theology in Germany on this point.² Loss of theology's royal authority over other fields of knowledge resulted already from the 1750s, but the rising tide of the modern German university could still boost the image of Protestant theological faculties at home and abroad. As a chorus of voices have testified, the German educational system did precisely that. In 1886, Lord Acton wrote, 'every branch of knowledge has felt its [Germany's] influence'.³ The Oxford scholar and minister L. P. Jacks even quipped that the period extending to 1914 was 'the age of German footnotes', a view reinforced by the reception of textbooks like Hagenbach's, not to mention the tremendous impact of the 'German model' of the university on the European and Anglo-American worlds.⁴

Theology's striving to claim the mantle of *Wissenschaft* in the nineteenth century, adapting to myriad modernizing and secularizing forces, helped it to maintain a respectable reputation in the modern academy, despite vocal gainsayers, as Thomas Albert Howard has noted.⁵ 'Scientific' theology reaped the rejuvenating benefits of Schleiermacher's programme. With a newfound 'scientific-historical' focus, modern theology sought self-consciously, at least partly, to speak the language of other disciplines along with its own.

After Schleiermacher, in the 1830s and again toward the end of the nineteenth century—both clear transitional times—the literature of theological encyclopaedia burgeoned. As one theologian in Bern commented: 'That the attempts at theological encyclopaedia are becoming more frequent is no poor testimony to the

² J. J. Ignaz von Döllinger, *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt: Rectorats-Rede gehalten am 22. Dezember 1866* (Munich: Weiß, 1867), 53–4.

³ Lord Acton, 'German Schools of History', *EHR* 1 (1886), 39.

⁴ Lawrence Pearsall Jacks, 'A Theological Holiday—And After', *Hibbert Journal* 14 (1915), 1–5. Cf. R. C. Schwinges (ed.), *Humboldt International: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001); and Gert Schubring (ed.), *'Einsamkeit und Freiheit' neu besichtigt: Universitätsreformen und Disziplinenbildung in Preussen als Modell für Wissenschaftspolitik im Europas des 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1991).

⁵ Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 207–402.

efforts of our theologians: we see in them the bright side of the spirit of our age, which is the desire to have the overview of all knowledge and to understand the connections, without which there is no clarity of thought and no possible freedom of action'.⁶ Taking their cue from Schleiermacher's ambition to 'reform Protestantism', the most prominent among these functioned as ventures of self-identification, where proponents delineated the tenets of their respective schools for their students.

Schleiermacher's programme for university theology found its greatest expositor in Hagenbach. Located in the age between pietism and positivism, Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* offers an unusually insightful look into the progressive professionalization and historicization of academic theology within German-speaking universities. The concern for a proper, rigorous, *wissenschaftlich* textbook meant discoursing on the need for and merit of a 'modern' theological approach and organization; it also called for a rebuttal of Hegel's and Rosenkranz's philosophical system. For Hagenbach, the fourfold pattern of exegesis, history, systematics, and practice displayed theology's 'very nature', and a temperate historical theology, ultimately oriented to the life of the church, constituted the key to the unity of the theology's various parts. Because of that, Marheineke and Rosenkranz upbraided Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie* as, in their view, a kind of 'retrograde science' (*Zurückschreiten der Wissenschaft*) built unfortunately upon Schleiermacher.⁷ Besides Hagenbach's paradigmatic account, a few other works in the genre merit mention.

Georg Heinrici, a student of Albrecht Ritschl (1822–89) who taught at Marburg and Leipzig, penned his *Theologische Encyklopädie* in 1893.⁸ Pushing into

⁶ Friedrich Zyro, 'Versuch einer Revision der christlich theologischen Encyklopädie', *TSK* 10 (1837), 689.

⁷ Philipp Marheineke, 'Hagenbach: Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften', *JWK* 76 (1834), 627.

⁸ C. F. Georg Heinrici, *Theologische Encyklopädie* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1893). On Ritschl's school, see Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 131–285; and James Richmond, *Ritschl, A Reappraisal: A Study in Systematic Theology* (London: Collins, 1978).

deeper waters, Heinrici argued that modern theology demanded a thoroughly historical approach to all of its questions. 'The only authority' for theology, he said, was 'the historical and inner truth'. The church had no claim upon theology understood as 'science', but could profit from the oversight of scholarly theologians on guard against 'intellectual atrophy' (*intellektuelle Verkümmierung*).⁹ Past 'historicist' assertions paled in comparison. Heinrici summed up his scheme by announcing that 'history itself is the content of theology, [which] must explain the becoming of things in order to understand their being'.¹⁰ Basel's C. A. Bernoulli, the student of Franz Overbeck, swam in the same current with his *Die wissenschaftliche und die kirchliche Methode in der Theologie* (1897).¹¹ Bernoulli desired 'to free theology from all practical connection with the interests of the Church by giving it a new basis as a science investigating the history of religion'.¹² His final lectures on the topic, given in the year 1933, represent one of the last waves of theological encyclopaedia.¹³

These concluding efforts reflected the strong undercurrent of progress that ran throughout the literature and proceeded from the ideal of *Wissenschaft* in post-Enlightenment Germany. The climate in which they appeared, however, differed thoroughly from the era of Schleiermacher and even Hagenbach. The thought of Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack had presented new dilemmas for the future of university theology. The world-historical events of the First World War shattered nineteenth-century notions of progress and 'dealt a staggering death blow to epistemological confidence' about the past.¹⁴ In the extreme versions from Heinrici and Bernoulli, the implicit consequences of relativized ways of understanding the

⁹ Heinrici, *Theologische Encyklopädie*, 6.

¹⁰ Heinrici, *Theologische Encyklopädie*, 10, 23.

¹¹ C. A. Bernoulli, *Die wissenschaftliche und die kirchliche Methode in der Theologie: Ein encyklopädischer Versuch* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1897).

¹² Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 18.

¹³ C. A. Bernoulli, *Theologie und Wissenschaft: Schlussvortrag einer Vorlesung über 'Theologische Enzyklopädie'* (Sommersemester 1933) (Basel: Schwabe, 1933).

¹⁴ David N. Myers, *Resisting History: Historicism and its Discontents in German-Jewish Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 2.

past in Schleiermacher and his successors manifested themselves, challenging the origins on which 'scientific' theology had generally rested. These factors culminated in the 'problem of historical knowledge', prompting Ernst Troeltsch to speak of a 'crisis of historicism'.¹⁵

A short glance at Franz Overbeck and Friedrich Nietzsche, two of Hagenbach's colleagues in Basel at the end of his life, demonstrates the critical point at which modern theology tottered. 'History is an abyss into which Christianity has been catapulted wholly against its will', Overbeck said.¹⁶ He pronounced elsewhere: 'Asking about the meaning of history is a bad habit that people acquired during the long period when human thought was dominated by Christianity and was not yet, in that respect, "enlightened". The Enlightenment is still too young to have ensured that we have completely put that habit aside'.¹⁷ These censures reached a crescendo in his scathing account of modern theology, *Über die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* (1873).¹⁸ Nietzsche stimulated the discussion on the relativity of history in his *Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen* from the same year.¹⁹ The pair symbolized their shared critique when they bound together their books from 1873 in two single volumes, presenting them as gifts to one another and signs of their deep friendship.

¹⁵ Ernst Troeltsch, 'Die Krise des Historismus' (1922), 572–90, in Troeltsch, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), xv. 433–55. On this 'historicist crisis', see also Georg Iggers, 'Historicism: History and Meaning of the Term', *JHI* 56/1 (1995), 129–52; F. R. Ankersmit, 'Historicism: An Attempt at Synthesis', *HT* 34 (1995): 143–73; Karl Mannheim, 'Historismus', *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 52 (1924), 1–60; Friedrich Meinecke, *Historism: The Rise of a New Historical Outlook*, trans. J. E. Anderson (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972); Dwight E. Lee and Robert N. Beck, 'The Meaning of Historicism', *AHR* 59/3 (1954), 568–77; and Gerhard Otto Oexle, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 41–72.

¹⁶ Franz Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur: Gedanken und Anmerkungen zur modernen Theologie*, ed. C. A. Bernoulli (Basel: Schwabe, 1919), 8, 242. Cf. Matthew Henry, 'Franz Overbeck on Carl Albrecht Bernoulli', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 68 (2003), 392–5.

¹⁷ Franz Overbeck, 'Kirchenlexicon', in Overbeck, *Werke und Nachlass*, ed. Barbara von Reibnitz (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995), iv. 120.

¹⁸ Franz Overbeck, *Über die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* (Leipzig: Fritsch, 1873).

¹⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Cf. Christian J. Emden, 'Toward a Critical Historicism: History and Politics in Nietzsche's Second "Untimely Meditation"', *MIH* 3/1 (2006), 1–31.

They spoke as much about themselves in this period when they referred to the two short works as ‘the twins’ (*die Zwillinge*).²⁰

Overbeck and Nietzsche, with various other ‘alienated theologians’, attacked claims that the study of history would guarantee the acquisition of truth.²¹ Though their critiques did not immediately take root in the minds of their peers, the longer term results proved significant. Amid growing recognition that human values and ideas—certain theological claims not least among them—were historically conditioned and always subject to change with time, relativism and loss of faith abounded. Modern theology, and its institutional representation in theological encyclopaedia, resembled a grotesque contradiction in terms, concluded Overbeck—its professors ‘traitors to the cause they are to defend’.²² In a pointed statement on what this meant for the content of theology, Troeltsch noted, ‘Once the historical method is applied to biblical studies and to church history it becomes a leaven that alters everything and that finally blows open the whole earlier form of theological method’.²³

As the nineteenth century lurched forward, theology’s academic standing faced an ever-increasing number of challengers, especially in the new emerging fields known as the ‘science of religion’ (*Religionswissenschaft*) and ‘comparative religious history’ (*vergleichende Religionsgeschichte*). Non-Western and non-Christian religious expressions captured the imaginations of scholars, just as artefacts, manuscripts, and other material found their way to Europe through the hands of missionaries,

²⁰ Lionel Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 417. See also Andreas Urs Sommer, *Der Geist der Historie und das Ende des Christentums: Zur ‘Waffengenossenschaft’ von Friedrich Nietzsche und Franz Overbeck* (Berlin: Akademie, 1997); and C. A. Bernoulli, *Franz Overbeck und Friedrich Nietzsche: Eine Freundschaft*, 2 vols (Jena: Diedrichs, 1908).

²¹ Cf. Van A. Harvey, ‘The Alienated Theologian’, in Robert A. Evans (ed.), *The Future of Philosophical Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 113–43.

²² Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur*, 13.

²³ Ernst Troeltsch, ‘Über historische und dogmatische Methode in der Theologie’ (1900), in Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1913), ii. 730.

colonialists, explorers, and others seeking out the treasures of the 'Orient'.²⁴ As the German-born Oxford scholar Max Müller (1823–1900) contended: 'A Science of Religion, based on an impartial and truly scientific comparison of all, or at all events, of the most important, religions of mankind, is now only a question of time. It is demanded by those whose voice cannot be disregarded'. The 'great problems' studied by the science of religion, he proclaimed, 'have attracted the eyes of many inquirers, and its results have been anticipated either with fear or delight. It becomes therefore the duty of those who have devoted their life to the study of the principal religions of the world in their original documents, and who value religion and reverence it in whatever form it may present itself, to take possession of this new territory in the name of true science'.²⁵ Just before delivering those remarks, Müller presented a paper on 'Buddhist Nihilism' before the Association of German Philologists, in which he trumpeted: 'He who knows only one [religion], knows none'.²⁶ Universities across Germany and Europe soon established new chairs in the comparative discipline.²⁷ The first edition of the definitive lexicon of worldwide religion, *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1909–13), carried out Müller's proposal.²⁸ How could Schleiermacher's notion of theology as a 'positive science', committed still to church leadership and the training of Christian clergy, remain relevant to dedicated reflection on non-Christian religions? Theology faculties had to grapple with these pressing problems.

²⁴ Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in an Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 252–91.

²⁵ Friedrich Max Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion* (London: Longmans, 1873), 34–5.

²⁶ Friedrich Max Müller, *Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism* (London: Trübner, 1869), 3. See also Joseph M. Kitagawa and John S. Strong, 'Friedrich Max Müller and the Comparative Study of Religion', in Ninian Smart et al. (eds.), *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), iii. 179–80.

²⁷ See Louis Henry Jordan, *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905), 580–606.

²⁸ Ruth Conrad, *Lexikonpolitik: Die erste Auflage der RGG im Horizont protestantischer Lexikographie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 179–346. More generally, see Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

The 'History of Religions School' (*religionsgeschichtliche Schule*), based largely at the University of Göttingen, proved similarly resonant.²⁹ Its advocates argued that the views contained in the Old and New Testaments remained essentially unintelligible if kept from seemingly parallel or antecedent religious systems in ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt, and beyond. The correct use of comparison as a tool became 'the question of the hour'.³⁰ The 1920 Berlin lectures on theological encyclopaedia from Paul Tillich and the *Einführung in das theologische Studium* (1908; 3rd edn, 1921), by Basel's prominent 'history of religions' theologian Paul Wernle, evidenced the inroads of the school and the extent to which trailblazing interests displaced theological encyclopaedia's former centre.³¹

Debate over *Religionswissenschaft* and the utility of historical knowledge occurred within the broader environs identified by Fritz Ringer as the 'decline of the German mandarins'.³² Professors, state officials, and other persons of letters comprising the influential, educated elite in Germany wrestled with a series of economic, political, and cultural forces that flowed together into the dominant themes of pessimism, nostalgia, and malaise. Already in the 1880s and 1890s, but especially in the post-war uncertainty, the nineteenth-century assumptions on which the likes of Ritschl, Heinrici, and Harnack depended seemed of a piece with darker times, unable to cope with the cultural and political exigencies at hand.³³ Out of this

²⁹ See Mark D. Chapman, *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology: Religion and Cultural Synthesis in Wilhelmine Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 13–44; and Mark D. Chapman, 'History of Religion School', in David A. Fergusson (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Nineteenth-Century Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 434–54.

³⁰ H. R. Mackintosh, 'Does the Historical Study of Religion Yield a Dogmatic Theology?' *AJT* 13 (1909), 565.

³¹ Paul Tillich, 'Encyklopädie der Theologie und Religionswissenschaft (Wintersemester 1920)', *Berliner Vorlesungen I (1919–1920)*, ed. Erdmann Sturm (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 259–96; and Paul Wernle, *Einführung in das theologische Studium* (3rd edn, Tübingen: Mohr, 1921). See also the posthumous Marburg lectures from Rudolf Bultmann, *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, ed. Eberhard Jüngel and Klaus W. Müller (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984); Eng. trans. in Bultmann, *What is Theology?*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).

³² Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964).

³³ See Charles Bambach, 'Weimar Philosophy and the Crisis of Historical Thinking', and Peter E. Gordon, 'Weimar Theology: From Historicism to Crisis', in Peter E. Gordon and John P. McCormick

mood developed two final causes responsible for dimming theological encyclopaedia's star: radical scholarly specialization and dialectical theology.

In the nostalgic parlance of Germany's eminent historian Heinrich von Sybel (1817–95), the 'unprecedented' expansion and diversification of knowledge in the second half of the nineteenth century all but destroyed the organic unity of science. Each new (and smaller) niche subfield moved further and further away from the common root of scientific knowledge. In 1874, Sybel rehearsed the magnetic appeal of the older ideal: 'In the depths of ancient forests you frequently find groups of trees, four or five powerful stems close together, whose tops spread their branches far and wide in all directions, but when you come to examine them more closely you find that they all grow from one single root. Thus it is with the different branches of science; they stretch out in many different directions, but he who digs deep below the surface finds the common root.'³⁴ Perhaps no other theological writer in the period corroborated the risks and rewards of specialization as Hagenbach, whose work traversed the pivotal decades for the accretion of positivism and the changes to *Wissenschaft* as an ideology, comprehended in progressively non-idealist terms.³⁵

Theological encyclopaedia's commitment to the unity of knowledge held little cachet in the face of dynamic specialization. One theorist decried the change as the shift from 'the metaphysical totality of learning' to the 'sum of specialized disciplines'.³⁶ Friedrich Meinecke understood the last two decades of the nineteenth century—the 'positivist' age of specialization—as the plucking apart of a rose: 'Now

(eds.), *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 133–49, and 150–78, respectively. Cf. Allan Megill, *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985), 5–6, *passim*.

³⁴ Heinrich von Sybel, *Die deutschen Universitäten, ihre Leistungen und Bedürfnisse* (Bonn: Cohen, 1874), 19–20.

³⁵ Cf. W. M. Simon, *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963), 238–63.

³⁶ Eduard Spranger, 'Das Wesen der deutschen Universität', in Michael Doeberl et al. (eds.), *Das akademische Deutschland* (Berlin: Weller, 1930–1), iii. 12, 33.

the petals will go on lying there, and they will not grow back together'.³⁷ The scholarly disciplines had assented, Max Weber famously observed, to a merciless view of 'progress that goes on *ad infinitum*'.³⁸ In the end, theological encyclopaedia simply could not outrun the profound fissuring of longstanding assumptions about science as an idealist utopia, disrupting the foundations of Protestant university theology.³⁹

'Neutrality' and the 'absence of presuppositions' (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*) likewise became central tenets of modern university life, forcefully confronting theology's confessional and ecclesiastical ties. Even liberal mediating theology after Schleiermacher had retained one foot in the realm of the church while seeking out approval from scholars in other fields. Theology's critics thus used the (essentially) phantasm of 'presuppositionless' science to argue that theology represented an 'alien substance' (*Fremdkörper*) within the modern scientific university.⁴⁰ Phrases like 'Science and Church in Dispute over Theological Faculties' graced the titles of countless pamphlets, tracts, and addresses in Germany.⁴¹ For these reasons, Friedrich Paulsen reported in 1903 that 'the theological faculty is a bald anachronism'.⁴²

Finally, the genesis of dialectical theology in the 1920s threatened to paralyze the encyclopaedic impulse by cutting off its connection to the scientific community.⁴³

³⁷ Friedrich Meinecke, *Erlebtes 1862–1919*, i (Stuttgart: Koehler, 1964), 68.

³⁸ Max Weber, 'Science as Vocation', in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 138.

³⁹ Cf. Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 322.

⁴⁰ Ernst-Lüder Solte, *Theologie an der Universität: Staats- und kirchenrechtlichen Probleme der theologischen Fakultät* (Munich: Claudius, 1971), 14; and Hermann Mulert, *Evangelische Kirchen und theologische Fakultäten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930), 30.

⁴¹ Martin von Nathusius, *Wissenschaft und Kirche im Streit um die theologischen Fakultäten* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1886). Cf. August Dillmann, *Über die Theologie als Universitätswissenschaft* (Berlin: Vogt, 1875); C. F. Georg Heinrici, *Von Wesen und Aufgabe der evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten* (Marburg: Elwert, 1885); and Ernst Hamann Haenssler, *Die Krisis der theologischen Fakultät* (Leipzig: Rascher, 1929).

⁴² Friedrich Paulsen, *The German Universities and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly and William W. Elwang (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 384.

⁴³ On dialectical theology, see Jürgen Moltmann (ed.), *Die Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie*, 2 vols (Munich: Kaiser, 1962–3); Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its*

In Weimar Germany, no one embodied scientific theology to the same degree as Berlin's Harnack (1851–1930)—pupil of Ritschl, professor at the University of Berlin, Director of the Royal Library, Secretary of the Prussian Academy of Sciences, and President of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society.⁴⁴ In a series of addresses, Harnack offered persuasive arguments to retain theological faculties in the German university against both conservative churchmen sceptical of 'scientific' theology and liberal detractors sceptical of modern theology's residual confessionalism and 'other-worldly' beliefs.⁴⁵ 'Is there any other theology than that which has strong ties and is in a blood-relationship with science in general (*Wissenschaft überhaupt*)?' Harnack provocatively asked.⁴⁶

The dialectical movement rose up to topple that perspective. Theology had 'to talk of what one cannot talk', professed critics like Karl Barth (1886–1968), and to stand where 'one cannot stand', even—or perhaps especially—if that meant eliminating the cultural influence theology enjoyed.⁴⁷ In the middle of the twentieth century, Barth censured the entire theological encyclopaedia movement for attempting to legitimize theology by acquiescing to scientific methodology and the 'earthly' demands of academic respectability.⁴⁸ His popular *Einführung in die evangelische Theologie* (1962) judged:

Genesis and Development, 1909–1936 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); Christophe Chalemet, *Dialectical Theologians: Wilhelm Hermann, Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2005); and Graf, *Der heilige Zeitgeist*.

⁴⁴ Cf. Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 380–1. For his biography, see Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1951).

⁴⁵ Adolf von Harnack, 'Die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultäten', *PJ* 175 (1919), 363–74.

⁴⁶ Adolf von Harnack, 'Fünfzehn Fragen an die Verächter der wissenschaftlichen Theologie unter den Theologen', in Harnack, *Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten*, ed. Axel von Harnack (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), 51–4. Cf. Martin Rumscheidt, *Revelation and Theology: An Analysis of the Barth-Harnack Correspondence of 1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

⁴⁷ Douglas J. Cremer, 'Protestant Theology in Early Weimar Germany: Barth, Tillich, and Bultmann', *JHI* 56/2 (1995), 289–307.

⁴⁸ Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, trans. Grover Foley (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston, 1963), 3.

What concerns us here is not the place, right, and possibility of theology within the domain and limits of general culture; especially not with the boundaries of the *universitas litterarum*, or what is otherwise known as general humanistic studies! Ever since the fading of its illusory splendour as a leading academic power during the Middle Ages, theology has taken too many pains to justify its own existence. It has tried too hard, especially in the nineteenth century, to secure for itself at least a small but honourable place in the throne room of general science. This attempt at self-justification has been no help to its own work. The fact is that it has made theology, to a great extent, hesitant and half-hearted; moreover, this uncertainty has earned theology no more respect for its achievements than a very modest tip of the hat. . . . Theology had first to renounce all apologetics or external guarantees of its position within the environment of other sciences, for it will always stand on the firmest ground when it simply acts according to the law of its own being. . . . Even today, theology has by no means done this vigorously and untiringly enough. On the other hand, what are 'culture' and 'general science', after all? Have these concepts not become strangely unstable within the last fifty years?⁴⁹

Comparable criticisms found their way into the first volume of Barth's *Church Dogmatics* (1932). Against the 'attempts of scientific encyclopaedia to include theology as a science, as they have ever and anon been made since the time of Schleiermacher, the general objection may be raised that the abnormality of the peculiar status of theology is thereby overlooked and something fundamentally impossible therefore undertaken. The actual result of all such attempts', Barth thundered, 'was and will be the disturbing, in fact destructive, surrender of theology to the general concept of science, and the mild inattention with which non-theological science—possibly with a better nose for actualities than theologians who thirst for synthesis—is wont to reply to this particular mode of justifying theology.'⁵⁰ Any bid to define theology in terms of modern scientific enquiry and according to the standards and needs of the university, he argued, was categorically unsound.

On the heels of his own first academic appointment, an 'honorary professorship' in theology at the University of Göttingen, Barth pondered over the

⁴⁹ Barth, *Evangelical Theology*, 15–6.

⁵⁰ Karl Barth, 'The Church, Theology, and Science', *Church Dogmatics*, i/1, trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 9–10.

relationship between theology and the university in greater detail in the address, 'Das Wort Gottes als Aufgabe der Theologie' (1922).

It is clear that theology's existence in the university does not stand in need of a priori justification. It is there in response to a crisis, but not to be removed because this crisis is permanent. This marks its similarity to the church in society. It is the paradoxical but undeniable truth that as a science like other sciences theology has *no* right to its place; for it becomes then a wholly unnecessary duplication of disciplines belonging to the other faculties. . . . Only when a *theological* faculty undertakes to say, or at least points out the need for saying, what the others . . . dare not say, or dare not say aloud, only when it keeps reminding them that a chaos, though wonderful, is not a cosmos, only when it is a question mark and an exclamation point on the outermost edge of scientific possibility—or rather, in contrast to the philosophy faculty, beyond the outermost edge—only then is there a *reason* for it.⁵¹

Against this backdrop, the once radiant promises of theological encyclopaedia lost much of their lustre, beset, in Peter Gay's terms, by 'a precarious glory, a dance at the end of a volcano . . . a short, dizzying, fragile moment' from the Weimar Republic.⁵² With this, muttered Harnack: 'What seems to be lost entirely is the link between theology and the *universitas litterarum*'.⁵³

These crises unsettled the terrain in which the project of theological encyclopaedia unfolded. Its particular idealist superstructure, committed to the unity of knowledge, sunk under their cumulative weight, and consequently disintegrated. Theology in the university, it appeared, could no longer continue as a single science, one discipline whose parts formed an organic unity. Theological modernity's conflicted condition,

⁵¹ Karl Barth, 'Das Wort Gottes als Aufgabe der Theologie', in Barth, *Vorträge und kleinere Arbeiten, 1922–1925*, ed. Holger Finze (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990), 155–7.

⁵² Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (New York: Norton, 2001), xiv. See also Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Die "antihistorische Revolution" in der protestantischen Theologie der zwanziger Jahre', in Jan Rohls and Gunther Wenz (eds.), *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 357–76.

⁵³ Harnack to Martin Rade, 13 August 1928, in Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack*, 536.

nonetheless, did not sound the final death knell.⁵⁴ On one level, the model of theological encyclopaedia persists in confessional seminaries and other schools of theology committed to unity in theological enquiry, to the mutually supportive work of biblical studies, historical theology, dogmatics, and church practice.⁵⁵ The fourfold pattern of study, in fact, still structures the curriculum in many institutions. On another level, even avowedly non-confessional university faculties and departments of theology and religion seek out narratives to link chairs, research groups, and lecturers operating with a remarkably diverse number of specialties and methods. Of course, pressures and doubts in determining one's disciplinary 'home' loom large under the circumstances of the latter.

The vision of *Wissenschaft* crafted by Schleiermacher and his contemporaries served as 'the philosophy that legitimated the foundation of the University of Berlin and was meant to be the motor both of its development and the development of contemporary knowledge', deemed Jean-François Lyotard.⁵⁶ As Lyotard contemplated the 'splintering' of higher education, he could not escape from the seemingly unmet claims of that vision. Where Harnack had championed modern academic theology as a cornerstone of 'the edifice of modern German science and culture', Lyotard posited its 'internal erosion'.⁵⁷ 'There is erosion at work . . . and by loosening the weave of the encyclopedic net in which each science was to find its place, it eventually sets them free.'⁵⁸

Such a prognosis does not, to be sure, uncover the grand total of theological encyclopaedia, nor constitute the final word. The idea of a scientific encyclopaedia

⁵⁴ Cf. Gerhard Ebeling, *Studium der Theologie: Eine enzyklopädische Orientierung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1975); Eng. trans. in Ebeling, *The Study of Theology*, trans. Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).

⁵⁵ See, e.g., the reflective essay by D. G. Hart, 'The Divine and Human in the Seminary Curriculum', *WTJ* 65 (2003), 27–44.

⁵⁶ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 34.

⁵⁷ Harnack, 'Über die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultäten', 367.

⁵⁸ Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 39.

took on paramount importance in academic self-reflection in the nineteenth century, and continues to make its appearance today. German scientific theology and theological encyclopaedia do not fully exhaust one another, even if they faced similar quandaries. Can *Wissenschaft* capture the full compass of human learning? What is the study of theology, and what should it be? Whither the ancient, humble pursuit of *fides quaerens intellectum*? What is clear, however, is that theological encyclopaedia represented not only a means of describing the foundations and methods of theological study—the ‘metalanguage’ of the discipline—but became a form of theology itself. If, at last, the centre did not hold, the project of theological encyclopaedia nevertheless resulted in a powerful synthesis that fundamentally transformed the reigning theological paradigms in nineteenth-century Germany and beyond. Indeed, the project of theological encyclopaedia represented modern university theology *par excellence*. Wherever theology continues to be taught or studied, wherever theological faculties remain, there is reason, perhaps, for theological encyclopaedia to exist.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Sources

AHTL, R. B. R. 610.2 S341.4ue 1799
 BBAW, Nachlass Schleiermacher 547/1
 FG, Frey-Gryn S I 34b
 HABW, M: Pd 370 (2)
 HABW, M: Pd 370 (2a)
 HUB, Yt 16383:F8
 KBAB, H621
 KBAB, R9T3B21
 NStUBG, 8 HLU I, 1536
 NStUBG, H. lit. pt. III. 38/1
 PHL, 'Fr. Lücke to E. B. P. Pusey 1827–1830', Pusey Papers
 SBB-PK, Dep. 42 de Gruyter
 SBB-PK, Dep. 42a Schleiermacher-Archiv, K4, M22, C7
 SBB-PK, Dep. 42a Schleiermacher-Archiv, K4, M23, C8
 SBB-PK, Ms. germ. oct. 670
 SBB-PK, Ms. germ. oct. 1107, seit 1967
 SBB-PK, Ms. germ. qu. 2162
 SBB-PK, Nachlass 481, Schleiermacher-Sammlung
 SBB-PK, Nachlass Twesten, K1
 StaBS Kirchenarchiv N17
 StaBS O 2a Protokoll der Theologischen Fakultät (1744–1923)
 StaBS PA 838a B1
 StaBS PA 838a B31
 StaBS PA 838a B37
 StaBS PA 838a B39
 StaBS PA 838a B42
 StaBS PA 838a B92
 StaBS PA 838a D151
 StaBS PA 838a D291
 UAG, Kur. 4 II b
 UBB, F w 241
 UBB, Falk 3190:19
 UBB, FS II 3:2
 UBB, FS II 3:3
 UBB, Un 206:3
 UBB, Un 4° 203
 UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Frey-Gryn Mscr VIII 1
 UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Nachlass Biedermanns
 UBB, Handschriftenabteilung, Nachlass Bischoff

UBL, Theol.Enz.157/2
 UBT, Gi 3504 ah
 ULBB, Autogr
 ULBSA, AB 140549
 ULBSA, Gb 930 e 4° (1)
 WLB, Cod.hist. 4°713,295

Catalogues, Newspapers, and Periodicals

Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek
Allgemeine Revision der gesammten Schul- und Erziehungswesen
The Andover Review
Basler Lektionskatalog 1820–1844
Catalogus praelectionum publice et privatim in Academia Georgia
EKZ
Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen
Göttingische Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen
Harper's New Monthly Magazine
Heidelbergische Jahrbücher der Litteratur
Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung
Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie
JALZ
JWK
Kirchenblatt für die Reformierte Schweiz
Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung
Literarische Beilage zum Intelligenz-Blatt der Stadt Basel
Litteratur des katholischen Deutschlands
Museum der Altherthums-Wissenschaft
Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek
Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes
The Presbyterian Review
The Princeton Review
TSK
ThZ
Vierteljahrschrift für Theologie und Kirche
ZWT

Printed Sources

Akademische Studien-Pläne für die der Theologie, Jurisprudenz, Medicin, Cameral- und Naturwissenschaften, Mathematik, Pharmacie, Landwirthschaft, Philologie, und Pädagogik beflissenen (Jena: Adolph Suckow, 1860).

ALEMBERT, JEAN LE ROND D', *Preliminary Discourse to the Encyclopédie of Diderot*, trans. Richard N. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

Allgemeines Verzeichnis der Bücher, welche in der Frankfurter und Leipziger Ostermesse des 1811 Jahres entweder ganz neu gedruckt (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1811).

ALSTED, JOHANN HEINRICH, *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta*, 2 vols (Herborn, 1630).

—— *Panacea philosophici* (Herborn, 1610).

ANRICH, ERNST (ed.), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität: Die fünf Grundschriften aus der Zeit ihrer Neubegründung durch klassischen Idealismus und romantischen Realismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956).

Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums und zur Kenntniß der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der Königlichen Preußischen Friedrichsuniversität (Halle, 1805); 2nd edn, as *Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums zur Kenntniß der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der Königlichen Preußischen vereinigten Halle- und Wittenbergischen Friedrichsuniversität* (Halle, 1821; 3rd edn, 1832; 4th edn, 1837).

Anweisung für Studirende der Theologie auf der vereinigten Friedrichs-Universität Halle-Wittenberg (Halle, 1891).

BACHOFEN, J. J., *Gesammelte Werke*, x, ed. Karl Meuli (Basel: Schwabe, 1967).

BAHRDT, CARL FRIEDRICH, *Geschichte seines Lebens, seiner Meinungen und Schicksale, von ihm selbst geschrieben* (Frankfurt am Main, 1790).

—— *Ueber das theologische Studium auf Universitäten* (Berlin, 1785).

BARTH, KARL, *Church Dogmatics*, i/1, trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969).

—— *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, trans. Grover Foley (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston, 1963).

—— *The Theology of Schleiermacher: Lectures at Göttingen: Winter Semester 1923/24*, ed. Dietrich Ritschl, trans. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

—— *Vorträge und kleinere Arbeiten, 1922–1925*, ed. Holger Finze (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990).

BAUMGARTEN, OTTO, *Die Voraussetzungslosigkeit der protestantischen Theologie* (Kiel: Lipsius und Tischer, 1903).

BAUR, F. C., *Symbolik und Mythologie oder die Naturreligion des Alterthums*, 2 vols in 3 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1824–5).

BAUR, SAMUEL, *Charakteristik der Erziehungsschriftsteller Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1790).

BELLERMANN, J. J., *Der Theologe, oder, encyklopädische Zusammenstellung der Wissenwürdigsten und Neuesten im Gebiete der theologischen Wissenschaften, für Protestanten und Katholiken*, 8 vols (Erfurt: Henning, 1803–12).

- BERNOULLI, C. A., *Die wissenschaftliche und die kirchliche Methode in der Theologie: Ein encyclopädischer Versuch* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1897).
- *Theologie und Wissenschaft: Schlussvortrag einer Vorlesung über 'Theologische Enzyklopädie' (Sommersemester 1933)* (Basel: Schwabe, 1933).
- BIEDERMAN, ALOIS EMANUEL, *Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Reimer, 1885).
- BOECKH, AUGUST, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, ii, ed. Ferdinand Ascherson (Leipzig: Teubner, 1859).
- BOEKELS, JOACHIM, *Schleiermacher als Kirchengeschichtler: Mit Edition der Nachschrift Karl Rudolf Hagenbach von 1821/22* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994).
- BÖRNE, LUDWIG, *Sämtliche Schriften*, i, ed. Inge Rippmann and Peter Rippmann (Düsseldorf: Joseph Melzer, 1964).
- BREITHAUPT, J. J., *Exercitatio inauguralis, de studio theologico* (Halle, 1702).
- BRENTANO, CLEMENS, 'Universitati litterariae: Kantate auf den 15ten October 1810' (Berlin, 1810).
- BUCHNER, ALOIS, *Encyclopaedie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Sulzbach: Seidel, 1837).
- BULLINGER, HEINRICH, *Ratio studiorum de institutione, qui studia literarum sequentur, libellus aureus* (Zurich, 1594).
- BULTMANN, RUDOLF, *Theologische Enzyklopädie*, ed. Eberhard Jüngel and Klaus W. Müller (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984); trans. Roy A. Harrisville as *What is Theology?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).
- BURCKHARDT, JACOB, *Briefe*, i, ed. Max Burchardt (Basel: Schwabe, 1949).
- *Über das Studium der Geschichte: Der Text der 'Weltgeschichtlichen Betrachtungen' nach den Handschriften*, ed. Peter Ganz (Munich: Beck, 1982).
- CALOV, ABRAHAM, *Isagoges theologicae, liber II, paedia theologica, de methodo studii theologici* (Wittenberg, 1652).
- CAMPE, J. H., 'Von den Universitäten', *Allgemeine Revision der gesammten Schul- und Erziehungswesen* 16 (1792), 145–220.
- CHAMBERS, EPHRAIM, *Cyclopaedia, or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, 2 vols (London, 1728).
- CÖLLN, DANIEL VON, and SCHULZ, DAVID, *Ueber theologische Lehrfreiheit auf den evangelischen Universitäten und deren Beschränkung durch symbolische Bücher* (Breslau: Gosohorsky, 1830).

- COMTE, AUGUST, *Cours de philosophie positive*, ed. Michel Serres et al., 2 vols (new edn, Paris: Hermann, 1975).
- CROOKS, GEORGE R., and HURST, JOHN F., *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology: On the Basis of Hagenbach* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884; 2nd edn, New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1894).
- DANZ, J. T. L., *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Weimar: Hoffmann, 1832).
- DAUB, CARL, *D. Carl Daub's philosophische und theologische Vorlesungen*, ed. Philipp Marheineke and Theodor Wilhelm Dittenberger, 7 vols in 8 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1838–44).
- ‘Die Theologie und ihre Encyclopädie im Verhältniß zum akademischen Studium beider: Fragment einer Einleitung in die letztere’, in Carl Daub and Friedrich Creuzer (eds.), *Studien*, ii (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1806), 1–69.
- *Einleitung in das Studium der christlichen Dogmatik aus dem Standpunkte der Religion* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1810).
- *Lehrbuch der Katechetik: Zum Behuf seiner Vorlesungen* (Frankfurt am Main: Hermann, 1801).
- *Predigten nach kantischen Grundsätzen* (Königsberg, 1794).
- DAUDE, PAUL (ed.), *Die königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin: Systematische Zusammenstellung der für dieselbe bestehenden gesetzlichen, statutarischen und reglementarischen Bestimmung* (Berlin: Müller, 1887).
- DE WETTE, W. M. L., *Dewettiana: Forschungen und Text zu Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Leben und Werk*, ed. Ernst Staehelin (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1956).
- *Eine Betrachtungen über den Geist unserer Zeit: Academische Rede am 12. September 1834 gehalten* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1834).
- *Theodor, oder des Zweiflers Weihe: Bildungsgeschichte eines evangelischen Geistlichen*, 2 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1822); trans. James F. Clarke as *Theodore; or the Skeptic's Conversion*, 2 vols (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, 1841).
- *Über Religion und Theologie: Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815).
- *Von der Stellung der Wissenschaft im Gemeinwesen: Rektoratsrede, gehalten den 2. Juli 1829* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1829).
- ‘Vorrede’, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1819), iii–xxi.
- DENIS, MICHAEL, *Einleitung in der Bücherkunde*, 2 vols (Vienna, 1777–8).

- ‘Die Kirchengeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts by Hagenbach’, *The Princeton Review* 22/3 (1850), 347–76.
- DIETZ, PETER (ed.), ‘Briefe des Antistes Jakob Burckhardt (1785–1858) an seinen Freund Johann Jakob Frei (1789–1852)’, *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 53 (1954), 99–158.
- DILLMANN, AUGUST, *Über die Theologie als Universitätswissenschaft* (Berlin: Vogt, 1875).
- DÖLLINGER, J. J. IGNAZ VON, *Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt: Rectorats-Rede gehalten am 22. Dezember 1866* (Munich: Weiß, 1867).
- DORNER, AUGUST, *Grundriss der Encyclopädie der Theologie* (Berlin: Reimer, 1901).
- DREY, JOHANN SEBASTIAN, *Die Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christenthums in seiner Erscheinung*, 3 vols (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1838–47).
- *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System* (Tübingen: Heinrich Laupp, 1819); trans. Michael J. Himes as *Brief Introduction to the Study of Theology, with Reference to the Scientific Standpoint and the Catholic System* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1994).
- DROYSSEN, JOHANN GUSTAV, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Rudolf Hübner, 2 vols (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1929).
- *Historik*, ed. Peter Leyh and Horst Walter Blanke, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1977–2008).
- EBELING, GERHARD, *Studium der Theologie: Eine enzyklopädische Orientierung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1975); trans. Duane A. Priebe as *The Study of Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).
- ‘Editor’s Literary Record’, *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* (September 1844), 639.
- ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Werner Welzig, 8 vols (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967–80).
- *The Essential Erasmus*, ed. and trans. John P. Dolan (New York: New American Library, 1964).
- ERHARD, JOHANN BENJAMIN, *Ueber die Einrichtung und den Zweck der höhern Lehranstalten* (Berlin: Braun, 1802).
- FABRICIUS, JOHANN ANDREAS, *Abriß einer allgemeinen Historie der Gelehrsamkeit*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1752–4).
- FICHTE, JOHANN GOTTLIEB, *Addresses to the German Nation*, ed. Gregory Moore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

- *J. G. Fichte-Gesamtausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ed. Reinhard Lauth et al. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1964 ff.).
- *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1808).
- *The Science of Knowing*, ed. and trans. Peter Heath and John Lachs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- *Über die einzige mögliche Störung der akademischen Freiheit* (Berlin, 1812; repr., Heidelberg: Winter, 1905).
- FRANCKE, AUGUST HERMANN, *Definitio studii theologici* (Halle, 1708).
- *Idea studiosi theologiae, oder, Abbildung eines der Theologie beflissenen* (Halle, 1712).
- *Methodus studii theologici* (Halle, 1723).
- *Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Erhard Peschke (Berlin: Luther-Verlag, 1969).
- GANS, EDWARD, *Rückblicke auf Personen und Zustände* (Berlin: Veit, 1836).
- GAß, W. (ed.), *Fr. Schleiermacher's Briefwechsel mit J. Chr. Gaß* (Berlin: Reimer, 1852).
- GATTERER, JOHANN CHRISTOPH, *Abriß der Genealogie* (Göttingen, 1788).
- GERBERT, MARTIN, *Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicarum* (Fribourg, 1754; 2nd edn, 1764).
- GERHARD, JOHANN, *Loci theologici*, 9 vols (Jena, 1610–25); rev. edn, ed. Eduard Preuss (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–85).
- *Methodus studii theologiae* (Jena, 1620).
- *Theological Commonplaces*, i: *On the Nature of Theology and of Scripture*, ed. Benjamin T. G. Mayes, trans. Richard J. Dinda (St. Louis: Concordia, 2006).
- GESNER, JOHANN MATTHIAS, *Primae lineae isagoges in eruditionem universalem nominatim philologiam historiam, et philosophiam* (Göttingen, 1756; 2nd edn, 1760); 3rd edn, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1774).
- GOCKEL, ERNST, *Deliciae academicae, in quibus natura et pleraeque civitates universitatum* (Augsburg, 1682).
- GOETHE, JOHANN WOLFGANG VON, *Faust: Part One*, trans. David Luke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- *Goethes Werke: Hamburger Ausgabe*, ed. Erich Trunz, 14 vols (Munich: Beck, 1981).
- GUNDLING, NICOLAUS HIERONYMUS, *Collegium ad Historiam Litterariam* (Halle, 1715).

- *Geschichte der übrigen Wissenschaften, führnehmlich der Gottesgelahrtheit* (Bremen, 1742).
- HAENSSLER, ERNST HERMANN, *Die Krisis der theologischen Fakultät* (Leipzig: Rascher, 1929).
- HAGEMANN, THEODOR, *Plann und Vorschlag zu einer juristischen Lese-Bibliothek auf der Akademie zu Helmstädt, nebst einer kurzen Vorerinnerung vom jurischten Studium* (Helmstedt, 1786).
- HAGENBACH, K. R., *A theologiai tudományok Encyclopaediája és Methodologiaja*, trans. Imre Révész (Pest, 1857).
- *Die theologische Schule Basels und ihre Lehrer von Stiftung der Hochschule 1460 bis zu Dewette's Tod* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1860).
- *Gedichte*, 2 vols (Basel: Schweighauser, 1846).
- *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (12 edns, Leipzig, 1833–89).
- *Die Kirchengeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts aus dem Standpunkte des evangelischen Protestantismus betrachtet*, 2 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1848–9).
- ‘Neander's Services as a Church Historian, trans. Prof. H. B. Smith’, *BSac* 8 (1851), 822–57.
- ‘Neaders Verdienste um als Kirchengeschichte: Eine akademische Gedächtnißrede gehalten 4. November 1850’, *TSK* 24 (1851), 543–94.
- *Rectoratsrede gehalten den 13. September 1832* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1832).
- *Ueber den Begriff und Bedeutung der Wissenschaftlichkeit im Gebiete der Theologie* (Basel: Neukirch, 1830).
- *Über die sogenannte Vermittlungstheologie: Zunabwehr und Verständigung* (Zurich: Meyer & Zeller, 1858).
- HARLEß, G. C. ADOLPH VON, *Theologische Encyklopädie und Methodologie vom Standpunkte der protestantischen Kirche* (Nuremberg: Schrag, 1837).
- HARMS, CLAUS, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Kiel: Akademische Buchhandlung, 1851).
- HARNACK, ADOLF VON, *Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten*, ed. Axel von Harnack (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930).
- *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1900); new edn, ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1999).
- ‘Die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultäten’, *PJ* 175 (1919), 363–74.
- ‘Vom Großbetrieb der Wissenschaft’, *PJ* 119 (1905), 193–201.

- HARPER, WILLIAM RAINEY, 'Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How?' *AJT* 3 (1899), 45–66.
- HEGEL, GEORG WILHELM FRIEDRICH, *Werke in 20 Bänden*, ed. Eva Moldenhauer and Karl Markus Michel, 20 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969–71).
- *The Encyclopaedia Logic: Part I of the Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences*, trans. F. R. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H. S. Harris (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991).
- *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, trans. Gustav Emil Mueller (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959).
- HEINRICI, C. F. GEORG, *Theologische Encyklopädie* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1893).
- *Von Wesen und Aufgabe der evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten* (Marburg: Elwert, 1885).
- HENGSTENBERG, ERNST WILHELM, 'Der Kunst- und Wissenschafts-Enthusiasmus in Deutschland als Surrogat für die Religion', *EKZ* 69–70 (27–8 August 1828), 545–9, 553–6.
- HERDER, JOHANN GOTTFRIED, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan, 33 vols (Berlin: Weidmann, 1877–1913).
- HILGENFELD, ADOLF, 'Die wissenschaftliche Theologie und ihre gegenwärtige Aufgabe', *ZWT* 1 (1858), 1–21.
- HINRICHS, HERMANN FRIEDRICH WILHELM, *Die Religion im innern Verhältnisse zur Wissenschaft* (Heidelberg: Neue akademische Buchhandlung, 1822).
- HOFMANN, J. CH. K. VON, *Encyclopädie der Theologie*, ed. H. J. Bestmann (Nördlingen: Beck, 1879).
- HOFFMEISTER, JOHANNES, and NICOLIN, FRIEDHELM (eds.), *Briefe von und an Hegel*, 4 vols in 5 (Hamburg: Meiner, 1969–81).
- HOLBACH, P. H. D', *Le Bon Sens, ou Idées naturelles opposées aux idées surnaturelles* (London, 1772); new edn, ed. J. Deprun (Paris: Éditions Rationalistes, 1971).
- HUBER, ERNST RUDOLF (ed.), *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789*, i (2nd edn, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990).
- HYPERIUS, ANDREAS, *De formandis concionibus sacris* (Marburg, 1553); trans. John Ludham as *The Practise of Preaching, Otherwise Called the Pathway to the Pulpit* (London, 1557).
- *De recte formando theologiae studio* (1556); 2nd edn, as *De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, libri IIII* (Basel, 1559).

- JACKS, LAWRENCE PEARSALL, 'A Theological Holiday—And After', *Hibbert Journal* 14 (1915), 1–5.
- KAHNIS, K. F. A., *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Dörffling, 1854).
- KANT, IMMANUEL, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Otto Schöndörffer, 3 vols (Leipzig: Meiner, 1924).
- *The Conflict of the Faculties / Der Streit der Fakultäten*, trans. Mary J. Gregor (New York: Abaris Books, 1979).
- *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 29 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1902–97).
- *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, trans. Theodore H. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson (Chicago: Open Court, 1934).
- KAPP, AUGUST (ed.), *Briefwechsel zwischen Ludwig Feuerbach und Christian Kapp, 1832 bis 1848* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1876).
- KÄSTNER, ABRAHAM GOTTHELF, *Matheseos et physica idea generalis in unum lectionum encyclopaedicarum* (Göttingen, 1756).
- *Vorlesungen: In der Königlichen deutschen Gesellschaft zu Göttingen gehalten* (Altenburg, 1768).
- KEIL, CARL AUGUST GOTTLIEB, *Systematische Verzeichniß derjenigen theologischen Schriften und Bücher, deren Kenntniß allgemein nötig und nützlich ist* (2nd edn, Stendal, 1792).
- KIERKEGAARD, SØREN, *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*, iv, ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975).
- KLEE, HEINRICH, *Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1832).
- KLEUKER, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, *Grundriß einer Encyklopädie der Theologie oder der christlichen Religionswissenschaft*, 2 vols (Hamburg: Perthes, 1800–1).
- KLÜGEL, GEORG SIMON, *Encyclopädie, oder zusammenhängender Vortrag der gemeinnützigsten, insbesondere aus der Betrachtung der Natur und des Menschen gesammelten Kenntnisse*, 7 vols (3rd edn, Berlin: Nicolai, 1806–17).
- KOCH, JOHANN FRIEDRICH (ed.), *Die preussischen Universitäten: Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen*, 2 vols (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1839–40).
- KUYPER, ABRAHAM, *Encyclopaedie der heilige Godgeleerdheit*, 3 vols (Amsterdam, 1894; 2nd edn, Kampen: Kok, 1808–9).

- *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles*, trans. J. Hendrik De Vries (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898).
- LANGE, JOACHIM, *De genuina studii theologici, praecipue thetici, indole ac methodo* (Halle, 1712).
- LESS, GOTTFRIED, *Ueber christliches Lehr-Amt dessen würdige Führung, und die schickliche Vorbereitung dazu, nebst einem Anhang von der Privat-Bereichte* (Göttingen, 1790).
- LESSING, GOTTHOLD EPHRAIM, *Werke und Briefe zwölf Bänden*, i, ed. Wilfried Barner (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1989).
- *Werke*, vii, ed. Herbert G. Göpfert (Munich: Hanser, 1976).
- LEUTWEIN, LORENZ FRIEDRICH, *Theologische Encyklopädie und Methodik* (Stuttgart, 1799).
- LEXIS, WILHELM (ed.), *Die deutschen Universitäten: Für die Universitätsausstellung in Chicago 1893; unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Universitätslehrer*, 2 vols (Berlin: Asher, 1893).
- LÜCKE, FRIEDRICH, 'Erinnerungen an Dr. Friedrich Schleiermacher', *TSK* 7 (1834), 745–813; trans. as 'Reminiscences of Schleiermacher', in Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Drawn up to Serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures*, trans. William Farrer (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1850), 3–86.
- LUTHER, MARTIN, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Schriften*, 73 vols (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009).
- MACKINTOSH, H. R., 'Does the Historical Study of Religion Yield a Dogmatic Theology?' *American Journal of Theology* 13 (1909), 505–19.
- M'CLINTOCK, JOHN, *Lectures on Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology*, ed. John T. Short (Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1873).
- MARHEINEKE, PHILIPP, *D. Philipp Marheineke's theologische Vorlesungen*, i, ed. C. Stephan Matthies and Wilhelm Vatke (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1847).
- *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1819); 2nd edn, as *Die Grundlehren der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1827).
- *Einleitung in die öffentlichen Vorlesungen über die Bedeutung der hegelschen Philosophie in der christlichen Theologie* (Berlin: Enslin, 1842).
- 'Hagenbach: Encyklopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften', *JWK* 75–6 (1834), 621–6, 627–9.

- MELANCHTHON, PHILIP, *Corpus Reformationum, Philippi Melanchthoni Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Karl Bretschneider and Heinrich Bindseil, 28 vols (Halle: Schwetschke, 1834–60).
- *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*, ed. and trans. Clyde L. Manschreck (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*, iii, ed. Robert Stupperich (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1961).
- MEINECKE, FRIEDRICH, *Erlebtes 1862–1919*, i (Stuttgart: Koehler, 1964).
- MEINERS, CHRISTOPH, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen unseres Erdtheils*, 2 vols (Göttingen: Röwer, 1802–5).
- *Ueber die Verfassung und Verwaltung deutscher Universitäten*, 2 vols (Göttingen: Röwer, 1801–2).
- MICHAELIS, JOHANN DAVID, *Raisonnement über die protestantischen Universitäten in Deutschland*, 4 vols (Frankfurt am Main, 1768–76).
- MOLTER, FRIEDRICH, *Kurze Encyclopädie oder allgemeiner Begriff der Wissenschaften* (Karlsruhe, 1762).
- MOMMSEN, THEODOR, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905).
- MORHOF, DANIEL GEORG, *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus*, 2 vols (Lübeck, 1688–92; 4th edn, 1747).
- MOSHEIM, JOHANN LORENZ VON, *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae et recentioris*, 4 vols (Helmstedt, 1755).
- *Kurze Anweisung, die Gottesgelahrtheit vernünftig zu erlernen, in academischen Vorlesungen vorgetragen*, ed. Christian Ernst von Windheim (Helmstedt, 1756; 2nd edn, 1763).
- MÜLLER, FRIEDRICH MAX, *Introduction to the Science of Religion* (London: Longmans, 1873).
- *Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism* (London: Trübner, 1869).
- MURSINNA, SAMUEL, *Primae lineae encyclopaediae theologiae in usum praelectionum ductae* (Halle, 1764).
- MUSCULUS, WOLFGANG, *Loci communes in usus sacrae theologiae candidatorum parati* (Basel, 1560).
- NATHUSIUS, MARTIN VON, *Wissenschaft und Kirche im Streit um die theologischen Fakultäten* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1886).
- NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, *An Essay Concerning the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Toovey, 1845).

- *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
- NICOLIN, GÜNTHER (ed.), *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1970).
- NIEMEYER, AUGUST HERMANN, *Die Universität Halle nach ihrem Einfluß auf gelehrte und praktische Theologie* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1817).
- *Grundsätze der Erziehung und des Unterrichts* (Halle, 1796).
- (ed.), *Leben, Charakter und Verdienste Johann August Nösselts: Königl. Preuß. Geheimraths, Doctors und Professors der Theologie, nebst einer Sammlung einiger zum Theil ungedruckten Aufsätze, Briefe und Fragmente*, 2 vols (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1806–9).
- NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH, *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- NITZSCH, CARL IMMANUEL, *Ad theologiam practicam felicius excolendam observationes* (Bonn, 1831).
- NÖSSELT, JOHANN AUGUST, *Anweisung zur Bildung angehender Theologen*, 3 vols (Halle, 1786–9; 2nd edn, 1791); 3rd edn, ed. August Hermann Niemeyer (Halle, 1818–19).
- *Anweisung zur Kenntniß der besten allgemeineren Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie* (Leipzig, 1779; 4th edn, 1800).
- NOVALIS, *Schriften: Die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs*, ed. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel, 6 vols in 8 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960–99).
- OVERBECK, FRANZ, *Christentum und Kultur: Gedanken und Anmerkungen zur modernen Theologie*, ed. C. A. Bernoulli (Basel: Schwabe, 1919).
- *Über die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* (Leipzig: Fritsch, 1873).
- *Werke und Nachlass*, iv, ed. Barbara von Reibnitz (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995).
- PARK, EDWARDS AMASA, and EDWARDS, BELA BATES (eds.), *Selections from German Literature* (Andover, Mass.: Gould, Newman, and Saxon, 1839).
- PATSCH, HERMANN (ed.), ‘Schleiermachers Briefwechsel mit Eichstädt’, *JHMTh/ZNThG* 2/2 (1995), 255–302.
- PATTON, FRANCIS L., ‘Review of Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology on the Basis of Hagenbach’, *The Presbyterian Review* 5 (1884), 741–2.
- ‘Theological Encyclopedia’, in *Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, Biblical and Theological Studies* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 1–34.

- PELT, ANTON FRIEDRICH LUDWIG, *Theologische Encyclopädie als System, im Zusammenhange mit der Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften und ihrer einzelnen Zweige* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1843).
- PESTALOZZI, HEINRICH, *Sämtliche Werke*, xiii, ed. Herbert Schönebaum and Kurt Schreinert (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1932).
- PFAFF, CHRISTOPH MATTHAEUS, *Introductio in historiam theologiae literariam notis amplissimis, quae novum opus conficiunt, illustrata*, 3 vols (Tübingen, 1724–6).
- Plan des akademischen Studiums der evangelischen Theologie, in Bezug auf Benutzung der Vorlesungen und Theilnahme an den Seminar-Uebungen auf der Universität Bonn vom 22. Oktober 1837* (Bonn, 1837).
- PLANCK, G. J., *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1794–5).
- *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zu der Einführung der Konkordienformel*, 6 vols (Leipzig, 1791–1800).
- *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie von der Konkordienformel an bis in die Mitte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1831).
- *Grundriß der theologischen Encyclopädie zum Gebrauche bey seinen Vorlesungen* (Göttingen: Schneider, 1813).
- *Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation*, trans. Samuel H. Turner (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1834).
- PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character Lately Predominant in the Theology in Germany*, 2 vols (London: Rivington, 1828–30).
- PÜTTER, JOHANN STEPHAN, *Entwurf einer juristischen Encyclopädie* (1757); 2nd edn, as *Neuer Versuch einer juristischen Encyclopädie und Methodologie* (Göttingen, 1767).
- *Versuch einer academischen Gelehrten-Geschichte von der Georg-Augustus-Universität zu Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1765).
- QUINTILIAN, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. H. E. Butler, The Loeb Classical Library, 5 vols (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920–2).
- RABENAR, G. W., ‘Hinkmar von Repkows Noten ohne Text’, *Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes* 2 (1754), 263–306.
- RÄBIGER, J. F., *Encyclopaedia of Theology*, trans. John MacPherson, 2 vols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1884–5).
- *Theologik, oder Encyclopädie der Theologie* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1880).
- *Zur theologischen Encyclopädie: Kritische Betrachtungen* (Leipzig: Morgenstern, 1882).

RANKE, LEOPOLD VON, *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1874).

RAUCH, FRIEDRICH A., *Psychology; Or a View of the Human Soul, Including Anthropology* (New York: Dodd, 1840).

REISCH, GREGOR, *Margarita philosophica* (Basel, 1583).

‘Rezension: Anweisung für angehende Theologen zur Übersicht ihres Studiums und zur Kenntniss der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer akademischen Einrichtungen auf der königlichen preußischen Friedrichs-Universität’, *JALZ* 77–8 (1–2 April 1806), 1–13.

RIPLEY, GEORGE, ‘Letter to a Theological Student’, *The Dial* 1/2 (1840), 183–7.

RITSCHL, ALBRECHT, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (Bonn: Marcus, 1870–74; 3rd edn, 1888–9).

ROSENKRANZ, KARL, *Die Naturreligion: Ein philosophisch-historischer Versuch* (Iserlohn: Langeweiche, 1831).

—— *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Halle: Schwetschke, 1831; 2nd edn, 1845).

—— *Erinnerung an Karl Daub* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1837).

—— *G. W. F. Hegels Leben* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1844; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971).

—— ‘Schleiermacher: Der Christliche Glaube . . . Erster Band’, *JWK* 106–11 (1830), 841–8, 849–56, 857–9, 865–72, 873–80, 881–7.

—— ‘Schleiermacher: Der Christliche Glaube . . . Zweiter Band’, *JWK* 103–6, 116–19 (1831), 824, 825–32, 833–40, 841–3, 929–36, 937–44, 945–52.

—— ‘Staudenmaier: Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften’, *JWK* 61–3 (1835), 489–96, 497–500, 505–8.

—— *Von Magdeburg bis Königsberg* (Berlin: Heimann, 1873).

ROSS, EDWARD A., *Seventy Years of It: An Autobiography* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936).

RÖSSLER, EMIL (ed.), *Die Gründung der Universität Göttingen: Entwürfe, Berichte und Briefe der Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1855).

ROTHER, RICHARD, ‘Rothe’s Address on Philip Melanchthon’, trans. Erskine N. White, *ATR* 3 (1861), 261–83.

—— *Theologische Encyclopädie, aus seinem Nachlasse*, ed. H. Ruppelius (Wittenberg: Koelling, 1880).

- *Theologische Ethik*, 3 vols (Wittenberg: Zimmermann, 1845–8); 2nd edn, 5 vols (Wittenberg: Koelling, 1867–71).
- SAINT-SIMON, HENRI DE, *Oeuvres complètes de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, x (2nd edn, Paris: Dentu, 1867).
- SALZMANN, CHRISTIAN GOTTHILF, *Carl von Carlsberg oder über das menschliche Elend*, 6 vols (Karlsruhe, 1783–7).
- SCHAFF, PHILIP, *Germany; Its Universities, Theology, and Religion* (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857).
- *History of the Apostolic Church* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1853).
- *Theological Propaedeutic: A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical, including Encyclopaedia, Methodology, and Bibliography; A Manual for Students* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893).
- SCHELLING, FRIEDRICH WILHELM JOSEPH, 'Aus einem öffentlichen Vortrag zu H. Steffens Andenken', in *Nachgelassene Schriften von H. Steffens* (Berlin: Schroeder, 1846), iii–lxiii.
- *Aus Schellings Leben: In Briefen*, ed. G. L. Plitt, 3 vols (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1869–70).
- *Briefe und Dokumente*, ed. Horst Fuhrmans, 3 vols (Bonn: Bouvier, 1962–75).
- *On University Studies*, ed. Norbert Guterman, trans. E. S. Morgan (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1966).
- *Philosophie der Offenbarung, 1841/42*, ed. Manfred Frank (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977).
- *Schellings Werke*, ed. Manfred Schröter, 13 vols (Munich: Beck, 1927–66).
- SCHILLER, FRIEDRICH, *Briefe*, ii, ed. Fritz Jonas (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1893).
- *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, ed. and trans. Elizabeth L. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).
- *Sämtliche Werke in 5 Bänden*, iv, ed. Gerhard Fricke und Herbert G. Göpfert (Munich: Hanser, 2004).
- SCHLEGEL, AUGUST WILHELM, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, iii, ed. Ernst Behler (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006).
- SCHLEGEL, FRIEDRICH, *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ii/1, ed. Ernst Behler (Munich: Schöningh, 1967).
- *Literary Notebooks 1797–1801*, ed. Hans Eichner (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957).

- SCHLEIERMACHER, FRIEDRICH, *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben: In Briefen*, ed. Ludwig Jonas and Wilhelm Dilthey, 4 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1858–63).
- *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Drawn up to Serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures*, trans. William Farrer (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1850).
- *Brief Outline of Theology as a Field of Study: Revised Translation of the 1811 and 1830 Editions*, trans. Terrence N. Tice (3rd edn, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011).
- *The Christian Faith*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).
- *Dialectic, or, The Art of Doing Philosophy*, trans. Terrence N. Tice (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Dialektik (1811)*, ed. Andreas Arndt (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986).
- *Friedrich Schleiermachers Briefwechsel mit seiner Braut*, ed. Heinrich Meisner (2nd edn, Gotha: Perthes, 1919).
- *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Hermann Fischer et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980 ff.).
- *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf Einleitender Vorlesungen*, ed. Heinrich Scholz (Leipzig: Deichert, 1910; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982).
- *Occasional Thoughts on Universities in the German Sense, with an Appendix Regarding a University Soon to be Established*, trans. Terrence N. Tice and Edwina Lawler (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2005).
- *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, ed. and trans. Richard Crouter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- *On the Glaubenslehre: Two Letters to Dr. Lücke*, trans. James Duke and Francis Fiorenza (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981).
- *Pädagogik: Die Theorie der Erziehung von 1820/21 in einer Nachschrift*, ed. Christiane Ehrhardt and Wolfgang Virmond (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).
- *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Ludwig Jonas, 8 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1834–64).
- ‘Über seine Glaubenslehre an Herrn Dr. Lücke, zwei Sendschreiben’, *TSK* 2 (1829), 255–84, 481–532.
- SCHMAUß, JOHANN JAKOB, *Entwurf eines Collegii Juris praeparatorii, welches er seinen Auditoribus publice zu halten willens ist* (Göttingen, 1737).

- SCHMIDT, JAMES (ed.), *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996).
- SCHMIDT, JOHANN ERNST CHRISTIAN, *Theologische Encyklopädie* (Giessen: Heyer, 1811).
- Schütze, J. S., 'Die Abendgesellschaften der Hofrätin Schopenhauer in Weimar, 1806–1830', in *Weimars Album zur vierten Säcularfeier der Buchdruckerkunst am 24. Juni 1840* (Weimar: Albrecht, 1840), 185–204.
- SCHWARZ, KARL, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie* (2nd edn, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1856; 4th edn, 1869).
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study about its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, trans. W. Montgomery and F. C. Burkitt (London: Adams and Charles Black, 1910).
- SCHWIMMER, J. M., *Tractatus politicus de academicis omnium facultatem professoribus academia et studiosus* (Jena, 1672).
- SEMLER, JOHANN SALOMO, *D. Johann Salomo Semlers Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst*, 2 vols (Halle, 1781–2).
- *Versuch einer nähern Anleitung zu nützlichen Fleisse in der ganze Gottesgelehrsamkeit für angehende Studiosos Theologiae* (Halle, 1757).
- 'Vorrede', in Johann von Ferreras, *Algemeine Historie von Spanien*, viii, ed. Johann Salomo Semler (Halle, 1757).
- SPALDING, JOHANN JOACHIM, *Kritische Ausgabe*, vi, ed. Albrecht Beutel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).
- *Lebensbeschreibung*, ed. Georg Ludewig Spalding (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1804).
- SPENER, PHILIP, *De impedimentis studii theologici* (Halle, 1707).
- *Pia desideria*, trans. T. G. Tapert (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964).
- *Theologische Bedenken* (Halle, 1700–2).
- SPRANGER, EDUARD, *Der Sinn der Voraussetzungslosigkeit in den Geisteswissenschaften* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1929).
- (ed.), *Fichte, Schleiermacher, Steffens über das Wesen der Universität* (Leipzig: Dürr, 1910).
- *Wandlungen im Wesen der Universität seit 100 Jahren* (Leipzig: Wiegandt, 1913).
- STAUDENMAIER, FRANZ ANTON, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften als System der gesammten Theologie* (1834); 2nd edn, 2 vols (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1840).

STÄUDLIN, KARL FRIEDRICH, *Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Cotta, 1804).

—— *Lehrbuch der Encyklopädie, Methodologie und Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Hanover: Hahn, 1821).

—— *Universalgeschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Hanover: Hahn, 1806; 4th edn, 1833).

STECK, FRIEDEMANN (ed.), 'Adolf Harnacks Vorlesung über Encyklopädie der Theologie', *JHMTh/ZNThG* 13/2 (2006), 179–226.

STEFFENS, HENRICH, *Beyträge zur inneren Naturgeschichte der Erde* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Craz, 1801).

—— *Grundzüge der philosophischen Naturwissenschaft* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1806).

—— *Was ich erlebte: Aus der Erinnerung niedergeschrieben*, 10 vols (Breslau: Josef Max, 1840–4).

STOLLE, GOTTLIEB, *Anleitung zur Historie der juristischen Gelahrheit* (Jena, 1745).

STRAUSS, D. F., *Ausgewählte Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. Eduard Zeller (Bonn: Strauss, 1895).

—— *Briefe von David Friedrich Strauss an L. Georgi*, ed. Heinrich Maier (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912).

—— *Charakteristiken und Kritiken: Eine Sammlung zerstreuter Aufsätze aus den Gebieten der Theologie, Anthropologie und Aesthetik* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1839; 2nd edn, 1844).

—— *Christian Märklin: Ein Lebens- und Charakterbild aus der Gegenwart* (Mannheim: Bassermann, 1851).

—— *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Osiander, 1835–6); trans. George Eliot as *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined* (London: Chapman, 1846).

—— *Der alte und der neue Glaube: Ein Bekenntniß* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1872).

—— *Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesus von Geschichte* (Berlin: Duncker, 1865).

—— *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Osiander, 1840–1).

—— *Friedrich Schleiermacher Theologische Enzyklopädie (1831/32): Nachschrift David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. Walter Sachs (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 1987).

—— *Streitschriften zur Verteidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1837).

- STRUVE, BURKHARD GOTTHELF, *Introductio in notitiam rei litterariae et usum bibliothecarum* (3rd edn, Jena, 1710).
- SULZER, J. G., *Kurze Begriff aller Wissenschaften und anderer Theile Gelehrsamkeit* (Leipzig, 1745; 2nd edn, 1759).
- SYBEL, HEINRICH VON, *Die deutschen Universitäten, ihre Leistungen und Bedürfnisse* (Bonn: Cohen, 1874).
- THANNER, IGNAZ, *Encyklopädisch-methodologische Einleitung zum akademisch-wissenschaftlichen Studium der positiven Theologie, insbesondere der katholischen* (Munich: Lentner, 1809).
- 'Theological Libraries' Round Table: Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Library Association', *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11/4 (1917), 355–60.
- THIEß, JOHANN OTTO, *Handbuch der neuern, besonders deutschen und protestantischen Literatur der Theologie*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1795–7).
- THOLUCK, F. A. G., 'Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology, Translated from the Unpublished Lectures of Prof. Tholuck, by Edwards A. Park', *BSac* 1 (1844), 178–217, 332–67, 552–78, 726–35.
- 'Thoughts on the State of Theological Science and Education in our Country', *BSac* 1 (1844), 736–67.
- TILlich, PAUL, *Berliner Vorlesungen I (1919–1920)*, ed. Erdmann Sturm (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001).
- TORREY, CHARLES, review of Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, in *The Andover Review* 29 (1893), 249–51.
- TREITSCHKE, HEINRICH VON, *Briefe*, iii, ed. Max Cornicelius (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1917).
- TROELTSCH, ERNST, 'Die Krisis des Historismus', *Die neue Rundschau* 23 (1922), 572–90.
- *Gesammelte Schriften*, 4 vols (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912–25).
- 'Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theologischen Wissenschaft', *ZWT* 51 (1908), 97–135.
- 'Über historische und dogmatische Methode in der Theologie', *Theologische Arbeiten aus dem rheinischen wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein* 4 (1900), 87–108.
- 'Voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft', *CW* 15 (1901), 1177–82.
- TWESTEN, AUGUST, *D. August Twisten nach Tagebüchern und Briefen*, ed. C. F. Georg Heinrici (Berlin: Hertz, 1889).

- *Zur Erinnerung an Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher: Vortrag gehalten in der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin am 21. November 1868* (Berlin: Herz, 1869).
- ULLMANN, KARL, 'Ueber Partei und Schule, Gegensätze deren Vermittelung', *TSK* 9 (1936), 5–61.
- VIRMOND, WOLFGANG, (ed.), *Die Vorlesungen der Berliner Universität 1810–1834 nach dem deutschen und lateinischen Lektionskatalog sowie den Ministerialakten* (Berlin: Akademie, 2011).
- VISCHER, FRIEDRICH THEODORE, *Kritische Gänge*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Fues, 1844).
- VOS, GEERHARDUS, *The Letters of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005).
- WALCH, JOHANN GEORG, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaften* (2nd edn, Jena, 1753).
- *Philosophisches Lexikon* (4th edn, Leipzig, 1775).
- WEBER, MAX, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946).
- WEIDNER, REVERE FRANKLIN, *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology: Based on Hagenbach and Krauth*, 3 vols (Philadelphia: Garner, 1885–91); 2nd rev edn, 2 vols (Chicago: Wartburg, 1910).
- WEISCHEDEL, WILHELM (ed.), *Idee und Wirklichkeit einer Universität: Dokumente zur Geschichte der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960).
- WERNLE, PAUL, *Einführung in das theologische Studium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1908; 3rd edn, 1921).
- WIEST, STEPHAN, *Praecognita in theologiam revelatam, quae complectuntur specimen encyclopaediae ac methodologiae theologicae sive institutionum theologicarum*, i (Ingolstadt, 1788).
- WOLF, FRIEDRICH AUGUST, 'Darstellung des Alterthums-Wissenschaft nach Begriff, Umfang, Zweck, und Werth', *Museum der Altherthums-Wissenschaft* 1 (1807), 1–145.
- *Kleine Schriften in Lateinischer und Deutscher Sprache*, ed. G. Bernhardt, 2 vols (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1869).
- ZEZSCHWITZ, GERHARD VON, *Der Entwicklungsgang der Theologie als Wissenschaft insbesondere der Praktiken* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1867).
- ZYRO, FRIEDRICH, 'Versuch einer Revision der christlich theologischen Encyklopädik', *TSK* 10 (1837), 689–725.

Secondary Sources

- ACTON, LORD, 'German Schools of History', *EHR* 1 (1886), 7–42.
- AECHLIS, ERNST CHRISTIAN, 'Die Entstehung der "Praktischen Theologie"', *TSK* 65 (1892), 7–43.
- Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 56 vols (Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1875–1912).
- ANDERSON, BENEDICT, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (rev. edn, London: Verso, 2006).
- ANDERSON, H. GEORGE, 'Challenge and Change within German Protestant Theological Education during the Nineteenth Century', *CH* 39/1 (1970), 36–48.
- ANER, KARL, *Die Theologie der Lessingzeit* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1929).
- ANKERSMIT, F. R., 'Historicism: An Attempt at Synthesis', *HT* 34 (1995), 143–73.
- ARMITAGE, DAVID, 'What's the Big Idea? European History and the Longue Durée', *HEI* 38/4 (2012), 493–507.
- ARNDT, ANDREAS (ed.), *Friedrich Schleiermacher in Halle 1804–1807* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013).
- (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Geselligkeit: Friedrich Schleiermacher in Berlin 1796–1802* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).
- ARNOLD, MATTHEW, *Poems* (London: Longman, 1853).
- AUBERT, ANNETTE G., *The German Roots of Nineteenth-Century American Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- AUGUSTIN, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH, *Bemerkungen eines Akademikers über Halle und dessen Bewohner, in Briefen* (Quedlinburg, 1795).
- BAGCHI, DAVID V. N., 'Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism', in Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark (eds.), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 3–15.
- BAMBACH, CHARLES, 'Weimar Philosophy and the Crisis of Historical Thinking', in Peter E. Gordon and John P. McCormick (eds.), *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 133–49.
- BARNIKOL, ERNST, 'Johann August Nösselt 1734–1807', in Johannes Weigelt (ed.), *250 Jahre Universität Halle: Streifzüge durch ihre Geschichte in Forschung und Lehre* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1944), 77–81.
- BARTH, KARL, 'Brunners Schleiermacherbuch', *Zwischen den Zeiten* 8 (1924), 49–64.

- *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*, trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden (rev. edn, London: SCM, 2001).
- BAUMGART, PETER (ed.), *Vierhundert Jahre Universität Würzburg* (Neustadt: Degener, 1982).
- BAUR, F. C., *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1852).
- *Ferdinand Christian Baur on the Writing of Church History*, ed. and trans. Peter C. Hodgson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).
- BAUTZ, FRIEDRICH WILHELM, and BAUTZ, TRAUGOTT (eds.), *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, 35 vols (Nordhausen: Bautz, 1990–2014).
- BECKER, MATTHEW L., *The Self-Giving God and Salvation History: The Trinitarian Theology of Johannes von Hofmann* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).
- BECKER, PETER, and CLARK, WILLIAM (eds.), *Little Tools of Knowledge: Historical Essays in Academic and Bureaucratic Practices* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001).
- BEISER, FREDERICK C., *Enlightenment, Revolution, and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought 1790–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).
- *The German Historicist Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism, 1781–1801* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- *The Romantic Imperative: The Concept of Early German Romanticism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- BEN-DAVID, JOSEPH, *The Scientist's Role in Society: A Comparative Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
- BENZ, ERNST, *Les sources mystiques de la philosophie romantique allemande* (Paris: Vrin, 1968).
- BERGER, PETER L., *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967).
- BERGJAN, SILKE-PETRA, 'Die Beschäftigung mit der Alten Kirche an deutschen Universitäten in den Umbrüchen der Aufklärung', in Christoph Marksches and Johannes van Oort (eds.), *Zwischen Altertumswissenschaft und Theologie: Zur Relevanz der Patristik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 31–61.
- BERNOULLI, C. A., *Franz Overbeck und Friedrich Nietzsche: Eine Freundschaft*, 2 vols (Jena: Diedrichs, 1908).

- BETZ, HANS DIETER, et al. (eds.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 9 vols (4th edn, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998–2007).
- BEUTEL, ALBRECHT, *Aufklärung in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).
- *Kirchengeschichte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).
- BEYSCHLAG, WILLIBALD, *Carl Immanuel Nitzsch: Eine Lichtgestalt der neueren deutsch-evangelischen Kirchengeschichte* (2nd edn, Halle: Strien, 1882).
- BIEN, GÜNTHER, 'Kants Theorie der Universität und ihr geschichtlicher Ort', *HZ* 219 (1971), 134–60.
- BIGLER, ROBERT M., *The Politics of German Protestantism: The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815–1848* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972).
- BINKLEY, PETER (ed.), *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- BIRKNER, HANS-JOACHIM, 'Ernst Troeltschs Marginalien zu Schleiermachers "Kurze Darstellung"', *Mitteilungen der Ernst-Troeltsch-Gesellschaft* 6 (1991), 8–12.
- *Schleiermacher-Studien*, ed. Hermann Fischer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996).
- *Schleiermachers christliche Sittenlehre im Zusammenhang seines philosophisch-theologischen Systems* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964).
- BLACKBOURN, DAVID, 'Germany and the Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1820', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 51 (2012), 9–20.
- *History of Germany 1780–1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (2nd edn, Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).
- BLACKBOURN, DAVID and ELEY, GEOFF (eds.), *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).
- BLACKWELL, ALBERT, 'Three New Schleiermacher Letters Relating to His Würzburg Appointment of 1804', *HTR* 69 (1975), 333–56.
- BLAIR, ANN M., *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- BLANKE, HORST WALTER, 'Bibliographie der in periodischer Literatur abgedruckten Vorlesungsverzeichnisse deutschsprachiger Universitäten, 1700–1899', *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 6 (1983), 205–27.

- BLANKE, HORST WALTER, FLEISCHER, DIRK, and RÜSEN, JÖRN, 'Historik als akademische Praxis: Eine Dokumentation der geschichtstheoretischen Vorlesungen an deutschsprachigen Universitäten von 1750 bis 1900', *Dilthey-Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Geschichte der Geisteswissenschaften* 1 (1983), 182–255.
- ——— 'Theory of History in Historical Lectures: The German Tradition of Historik, 1750–1900', *HT* 23 (1984), 331–56.
- BLASCHKE, OLAF, 'Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?' *GG* 26/1 (2000), 38–75.
- BLUMENBERG, HANS, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert M. Wallace (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983).
- BÖDEKER, HANS ERICH, 'Die Religiosität der Gebildeten', in Karlfried Gründer and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf (eds.), *Religionskritik und Religiosität in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1989), 145–96.
- BÖDEKER, HANS ERICH, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- BÖDEKER, HANS ERICH, REILL, PETER HANNS, and SCHLUMBOHM, JÜRGEN (eds.), *Wissenschaft als kulturelle Praxis, 1750–1900* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).
- BOEHM, LAETETIA, and SPÖRL, JOHANNES (eds.), *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität: Ingolstadt, Landshut, München, 1472–1972* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1972).
- BOLTER, JAY, 'Friedrich August Wolf and the Scientific Study of Antiquity', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 21 (1980), 83–99.
- BONJOUR, EDGAR, *Die Universität Basel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, 1460–1960* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1971).
- BORNHAK, CONRAD, *Geschichte der preussischen Universitätsverwaltung bis 1810* (Berlin: Reimer, 1900).
- BOWIE, ANDREW, *Schelling and Modern European Philosophy: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- BOYLE, NICHOLAS, "'Art," Literature, Theology: Learning from Germany', in Robert E. Sullivan (ed.), *Higher Learning and the Catholic Traditions* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 87–111.
- BRADY, JR, THOMAS A., *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire, 1450–1550* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- BRAUBACH, MAX, 'Die katholischen Universitäten Deutschlands und die französische Revolution', *HJB* 49 (1929), 263–303.

- BRECKMAN, WARREN, *Marx, The Young Hegelians, and the Origins of Radical Social Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- BREEN, QUIRINIUS, 'The Terms "Loci" and "Loci Communes" in Melanchthon', *CH* 16 (1947), 197–209.
- BROCKLISS, L. W. B., 'The European University in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850', in M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vi/1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).
- BROWN, STEWART J., and NOCKLES, PETER B. (eds.) *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830–1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- BRUCE, STEVE (ed.), *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- BRUCH, RÜDIGER VOM, 'A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the Development of German Universities, 1810–1945', in Michael G. Ash (ed.), *German Universities: Past and Future* (Providence, RI: Berghahn, 1997), 3–27.
- BRUCH, RÜDIGER VOM, and TENORTH, HEINZ-ELMAR (eds.), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden 1810–2010*, 6 vols (Berlin: Akademie, 2010–12).
- BRUFORD, W. H., *Culture and Society in Classical Weimar 1775–1806* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962).
- *The German Tradition of Self-Cultivation: 'Bildung' from Humboldt to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- BRUNNER, OTTO, CONZE, WERNER, and KOSELLECK, REINHART (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, 8 vols (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972–97).
- BRUNSWIG, HENRI, *Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia*, trans. Frank Jelinek (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).
- BUFF, WALTER, *Gerlach Adolph Freiherr von Münchhausen als Gründer der Universität Göttingen* (Göttingen: Kaestner, 1937).
- BULLMAN, JOHANN KARL, *Denkwürdige Zeitperioden der Universität zu Halle von ihrer Stiftung an, nebst einer Chronologie dieser Hochschule seit dem Jahre 1805 bis jetzt* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1833).
- BURDORF, DIETER, and SCHMÜCKER, REINOLD (eds.), *Dialogische Wissenschaft: Perspektiven der Philosophie Schleiermachers* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998).
- BUTTERFIELD, HERBERT, *Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955).
- CAMERON, EUAN, *The European Reformation* (2nd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

- CAMPI, EMIDIO, et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe* (Geneva: Droz, 2008).
- CARHART, MICHAEL C., 'Historia Literaria and Cultural History from Mylaeus to Eichhorn', in Peter N. Miller (ed.), *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of Modern Cultural Science* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 184–206.
- CARRLSON, ERICH WILHELM, 'Johann Salomo Semler, The German Enlightenment, and Protestant Theology's Historical Turn', Ph.D. diss. (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2006).
- CARSTENS, C. E., *Geschichte der theologischen Facultät der Christian-Albrechts-Universität in Kiel* (Kiel: Schmidt & Klaunig, 1874).
- CASSIRER, ERNST, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, trans. Fritz C. A. Koelin and James P. Pettegrove (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951).
- CÉARD, JEAN, 'Encyclopédie et Encyclopédisme à la Renaissance', in Annie Becq (ed.), *L'Encyclopédisme: Actes du Colloque de Caen* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1991), 57–67.
- CHADWICK, OWEN, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- CHAKRABARTY, DIPESH, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- CHALEMET, CHRISTOPHE, *Dialectical Theologians: Wilhelm Hermann, Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2005).
- CHAPMAN, MARK, *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology: Religion and Cultural Synthesis in Wilhelmine Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- 'History of Religion School', in David A. Fergusson (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Nineteenth-Century Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 434–54.
- 'Newman and the Anglican Idea of a University', *JHMT*/ZNTG 18/2 (2011), 212–27.
- CHENU, M. D., 'La Théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle', *Archiv d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 2 (1927), 31–71.
- CHRISTOPHERSEN, ALF, *Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855)*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999).
- CLARK, ELIZABETH A., *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).
- CLARK, ROBERT, *Herder: His Life and Thought* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955).

- CLARK, WILLIAM, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
- CLEMEN, CARL, 'Schleiermachers Vorlesung über theologische Enzyklopädie', *TSK* 98 (1905), 226–45.
- COBB, JAMES DENNIS, 'The Forgotten Reforms: Non-Prussian Universities, 1797–1817', Ph.D. diss. (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980).
- COLISH, MARCIA, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- COLLINS, RANDALL, *The Sociology of Philosophers: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- CONRAD, RUTH, *Lexikonpolitik: Die erste Auflage der RGG im Horizont protestantischer Lexikographie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006).
- CREMER, DOUGLAS J., 'Protestant Theology in Early Weimar Germany: Barth, Tillich, and Bultmann', *JHI* 56/2 (1995), 289–307.
- CROUTER, RICHARD, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Between Enlightenment and Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- 'Hegel and Schleiermacher at Berlin: A Many-Sided Debate', *JAAR* 48 (1980), 19–43.
- CULLER, DWIGHT A., *The Imperial Intellect: A Study of Newman's Educational Ideal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).
- DANZ, CHRISTIAN (ed.), *Schelling und die historische Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).
- 'Schellings Wesensbestimmung des Christentums in den Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums', in Paul Ziche and Gian Franco Frigo (eds.), *'Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften': Schellings 'Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums' als Wissenschafts- und Universitätsprogramm* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2011), 153–84.
- DARNTON, ROBERT, *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie, 1775–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).
- 'The *Encyclopédie* Wars of Prerevolutionary France', *AHR* 78/5 (1973), 1331–52.
- *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
- DAVID, KATHLEEN, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

- DIDIER, BÉATRICE, *Alphabet et raison: Le paradoxe des dictionnaires au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1996).
- DIERKEN, JÖRG, 'Das Absolute und die Wissenschaften: Zur Architektonik des Wissens bei Schelling und Schleiermacher', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 99 (1992), 307–28.
- DIERSE, ULRICH, *Enzyklopädie: Zur Geschichte eines philosophischen und Wissenschaftstheoretischen Begriffs* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1977).
- DIETRICH, DONALD, and HIMES, MICHAEL J. (eds.), *The Legacy of the Tübingen School: The Relevance of Nineteenth-Century Theology for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Crossroad, 1997).
- DILTHEY, WILHELM, *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung: Lessing, Goethe, Novalis, Hölderlin* (16th edn, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).
- *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1942).
- *Leben Schleiermachers* (Berlin: Reimer, 1870).
- DINGEL, IRENE, et al. (eds.), *Philip Melancthon: Theologian in Classroom, Confession, and Controversy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- DOERING, HEINRICH, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands am achtzehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert: Nach ihrem Leben und Wirken*, 4 vols (Neustadt: Wagner, 1831–5).
- DOLE, ANDREW C., *Schleiermacher on Religion and the Natural Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- DÖLLINGER, J. J. IGANZ VON, *Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat: Historisch-politische Betrachtungen* (Munich: Cotta, 1861).
- DOODY, AUDE, 'Pliny's Natural History: *Enkuklios Paideia* and the Ancient Encyclopedia', *JHI* 70/1 (2009), 1–21.
- DORNER, ISAAK, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland* (Munich: Cotta, 1867).
- EBEL, WILHELM, *Die Göttinger Professor Johann Stephan Pütter aus Iserlohn* (Göttingen: Schwarz, 1975).
- *Memorabilia Gottingensia: Elf Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Universität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).
- ECKERT, ALFRED, *Einführung in die Prinzipien und Methoden der evangelischen Theologie*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Strübing, 1909).
- EDWARDS, PAUL (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8 vols (New York: Macmillan, 1967).

- EIJNATTEN, JORIS VAN, 'History, Reform, and *Aufklärung*: German Theological Writing and Dutch Literary Publicity in the Eighteenth Century', *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 7/2 (2000), 173–204.
- ELLIGER, WALTER, *150 Jahre theologische Fakultät Berlin* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960).
- (ed.), *Die evangelische Kirche der Union* (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1967).
- ELLIS, IEUAN, 'Schleiermacher in Britain', *SJT* 33 (1980), 417–52.
- EMDEN, CHRISTIAN J., 'Toward a Critical Historicism: History and Politics in Nietzsche's Second "Untimely Meditation"', *MIH* 3/1 (2006), 1–31.
- ENGELHARDT, J. G. V., *Die Universität Erlangen von 1743 bis 1843* (Erlangen: Universitätsbuchdruckerei, 1843).
- ENGELHORN, WERNER, *Die Universität Würzburg 1803–1848* (Neustadt: Degener, 1987).
- ENGELS, JOSEF, 'Die deutschen Universitäten und die Geschichtswissenschaften', *HZ* 189 (1959), 223–378.
- EPPLER, CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH, *Karl Rudolf Hagenbach: Eine Friedensgestalt aus der streitenden Kirche der Gegenwart* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1875).
- ERBEN, WILHELM, 'Die Entstehung der Universitäts-Seminare', *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 7 (1913), 1247–64.
- EVANS, G. R., *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980).
- EVANS, R. J. W., 'German Universities after the Thirty Years' War', *HU* 1 (1981), 169–90.
- EYBL, FRANZ M., et al. (eds.), *Enzyklopädie der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995).
- FABBIANELLI, FAUSTINO, 'Ein unbekanntes Gutachten von Schelling aus dem Jahre 1804', *International Yearbook of German Idealism* 6 (2008), 301–10.
- FALLON, DANIEL, *The German University: A Heroic Ideal in Conflict with the Modern World* (Boulder, CO: Colorado Associated University Press, 1980).
- FARLEY, EDWARD, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- FESTER, RICHARD, 'Der Universitäts-Bereiser' Friedrich Gedike und sein Bericht an Friedrich Wilhelm II (Berlin: Duncker, 1905).
- FEUERBACH, LUDWIG, *Gesammelte Werke*, x, ed. Werner Schuffenhauer (3rd edn, Berlin: Akademie, 1990).

- FLYGT, STEN, *The Notorious Dr. Bahrdt* (Nashville: Vanderbilt, 1963).
- FORD, GUY STANTON, 'Wöllner and the Prussian Religious Edict of 1788', *AHR* 15 (1910), 264–80.
- FORRESTER, DAVID, *Young Doctor Pusey: A Study in Development* (London: Mowbray, 1989).
- FORSTMAN, JACK, *A Romantic Triangle: Schleiermacher and Early German Romanticism* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- FOSTER, FRANK HUGHES, *The Life of Edwards Amasa Park* (New York: Revell, 1936).
- FOWLER, ROBERT, 'Encyclopaedias: Definitions and Theoretical Problems', in Peter Binkley (ed.), *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 3–29.
- FRANÇOIS, ETIENNE, *Die unsichtbare Grenze: Protestanten und Katholiken in Augsburg, 1648–1806*, trans. Angelika Steiner-Wendt (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1991).
- FREI, HANS, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
- *Types of Christian Theology*, ed. George Hunsinger and William Placher (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- FRIES, HEINRICH, and SCHWAIGER, GEORG (eds.), *Katholische Theologen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols (Munich: Kösel, 1975).
- FRÖHNER, ANNETTE, *Technologie und Enzyklopädismus in Übergang vom 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Johann Georg Krünitz (1728–1796) und seine Oeconomisch-technologische Encyklopädie* (Mannheim: Palatium, 1994).
- FUHRMANS, HORST, 'Schelling im Tübinger Stift Herbst 1790–Herbst 1795', in Manfred Frank and Gerhard Kurz (eds.), *Materialien zu Schellings philosophischen Anfängen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975), 53–87.
- FÜSSEL, MARIAN, 'The Conflict of the Faculties: Hierarchies, Values and Social Practices in Early Modern German Universities', *HU* 25 (2011), 80–110.
- GANDERT, KLAUS-DIETRICH, *Vom Prinzenpalais zur Humboldt-Universität* (Berlin: Henschel, 1985).
- GAWTHROP, RICHARD L., *Pietism and the Making of Eighteenth-Century Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- GAY, PETER, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (New York: Norton, 2001).
- GEBHARDT, BRUNO, *Wilhelm von Humboldt als Staatsmann*, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1896–9).

GECK, ALBRECHT (ed.), *Autorität und Glaube: Edward Bouverie Pusey und Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck in Briefwechsel (1825–1865)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

—— ‘The Concept of History in E. B. Pusey’s First Enquiry into German Theology and Its Background’, *JTS* 38/2 (1987), 387–408.

GERBER, SIMON, ‘Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte bei Schleiermacher’, *JHMTh/ZNThG* 17/1 (2010), 34–55.

—— ‘Schleiermacher und die Kirchenkunde des 19. Jahrhundert’, *JHMTh/ZNThG* 11/2 (2004), 183–214.

GERRISH, BRIAN, *A Prince of the Church: Schleiermacher and the Beginnings of Modern Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

—— *Continuing the Reformation: Essays on Modern Religious Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

—— *Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

GEYER, BERNHARD, ‘Facultas theologica: Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung’, *ZKG* 75 (1964), 133–45.

GIERL, MARTIN, ‘Bestandsaufnahme im gelehrten Bereich: Zur Entwicklung der “Historia literaria” im 18. Jahrhundert’, in Martin Gierl, et al. (eds.), *Denkhorizonte und Handlungsspielräume: Historische Studien für Rudolf Vierhaus zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1992), 53–80.

—— ‘Compilation and the Production of Knowledge in the Early German Enlightenment’, in Hans Erich Bödeker, Peter Hanns Reill, and Jürgen Schlumbohm (eds.), *Wissenschaft als kulturelle Praxis, 1750–1900* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 69–103.

—— *Pietismus und Aufklärung: Theologische Polemik und die Kommunikationsreform der Wissenschaft am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).

GIESELMANN, JOSEF, *Die Katholische Tübinger Schule* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1964).

GOCKEL, MATTHIAS, ‘Mediating Theology in Germany’, in David Fergusson (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Nineteenth-Century Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 301–18.

GOETZMANN, WILLIAM H., *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York: Knopf, 1973).

GOODMAN, DENA, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

- GORDON, PETER E., 'Weimar Theology: From Historicism to Crisis', in Peter E. Gordon and John P. McCormick (eds.), *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 150–78.
- GOSSMAN, LIONEL, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- GRAF, FRIEDRICH WILHELM, *Der heilige Zeitgeist* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- 'Die "antihistorische Revolution" in der protestantischen Theologie der zwanziger Jahre', in Jan Rohls and Gunther Wenz (eds.), *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 357–76.
- *Kritik und Pseudo-Spekulation: David Friedrich Strauss als Dogmatiker im Kontext der positionellen Theologie seiner Zeit* (Munich: Kaiser, 1982).
- 'Kulturprotestantismus: Zur Begriffsgeschichte einer theologiepolitischen Chiffre', *ABG* 28 (1984), 214–68.
- (ed.) *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, 2 vols (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1990–3).
- "'Restaurationstheologie" oder neulutherische Modernisierung des Protestantismus? Erste Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des neulutherischen Konfessionalismus', in Wolf-Dieter Hauschild (ed.), *Das deutsche Luthertum und die Unionsproblematik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1991), 64–109.
- GRAFTON, ANTHONY, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- 'Man muß aus der Gegenwart herausteigen': History, Tradition, and Traditions of Historical Thought in F. A. Wolf, in Hans Erich Bödeker, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 416–29.
- 'Polyhistor into Philolog: Notes on the Transformation of German Classical Scholarship, 1780–1850', *HU* 3 (1983), 159–92.
- 'Prolegomena to Friedrich August Wolf', *JWCI* 44 (1981), 101–29.
- 'The World of the Polyhistor: Humanism and Encyclopedism', *CEH* 18/1 (1985), 31–47.
- GRAY, MARION W., *Prussia in Transition: Society and Politics under the Stein Reform Ministry of 1808* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1986).
- GREGORY, FREDERICK, 'Kant, Schelling, and the Administration of Science in the Romantic Era', *Osiris* 5 (1989), 17–35.
- *Nature Lost? Natural Science and the German Theological Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).

- GROH, JOHN, *Nineteenth-Century German Protestantism: The Church as Social Model* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982).
- GROSSMANN, WALTER, 'Schelling's Copy of Schleiermacher's Über die Religion', *Harvard Theological Bulletin* 13 (1959), 47–9.
- GROTE, SIMON, 'Religion and Enlightenment', *JHI* 75/1 (2014), 137–60.
- GRUNERT, FRANK, and VOLLHART, FRIEDRICH, *Historia Literaria: Neuordnungen des Wissens im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Akademie, 2007).
- HABERMAS, JÜRGEN, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).
- HACKEL, CHRISTIANE, *Die Bedeutung August Boeckhs für den Geschichtstheoretiker Johann Gustav Droysen* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2006).
- HAGER, FRITZ-PETER, and TRÖHLER, DANIEL (eds.), *Studien zur Pestalozzi-Rezeption im Deutschland des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Bern: Haupt, 1995).
- HAMMERSTEIN, NOTKER, *Bildung und Wissenschaft vom 15. bis 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003).
- *Jus und Historie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
- HANNAH, JOHN D., 'History of Bibliotheca Sacra', *BSac* 133 (1976), 229–42.
- HARNACK, ADOLF VON, *Geschichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 3 vols in 4 (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1900).
- HARRIS, HORTON, *David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).
- HART, D. G., 'The Divine and Human in the Seminary Curriculum', *WTJ* 65 (2003), 27–44.
- *John Williamson Nevins: High-Church Calvinist* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005).
- *The University Gets Religion: Religious Studies in American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
- HARTFELDER, KARL, *Philipp Melancthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Berlin: Hofmann, 1889).
- HARVEY, VAN A., 'The Alienated Theologian', in Robert A. Evans (ed.), *The Future of Philosophical Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 113–43.
- HASE, KARL VON, *Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen*, iii/1, ed. G. Krüger (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1891).

- HAUERWAS, STANLEY, *The State of the University: Academic Knowledge and the Knowledge of God* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).
- HAYM, RUDOLF, *Hegel und seine Zeit: Vorlesungen über die Entstehung und Entwicklung, Wesen und Wert der hegel'schen Philosophie* (Berlin: Gaertner, 1857).
- HEAD, RANDOLPH, 'Knowing Like a State: The Transformation of Political Knowledge in Swiss Archives, 1450–1770', *JMH* 75/4 (2003), 745–82.
- HEATH, TERRENCE, 'Logical Grammar, Grammatical Logic, and Humanism in Three German Universities', *Studies in the Renaissance* 18 (1971), 9–64.
- HECKEL, MARTIN, *Die theologischen Fakultäten im weltlichen Verfassungsstaat* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).
- HEEREN, A. H. L., *Christian Gottlob Heyne: Biographisch dargestellt* (Göttingen: Röwer, 1813).
- HEIN, MARTIN, *Lutherisches Bekenntnis und Erlanger Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984).
- HELL, LEONHARD, *Entstehung und Entfaltung der theologischen Enzyklopädie* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999).
- HELMER, CHRISTINE, KRANICH, CHRISTIANE, and REHME-IFFERT, BIRGIT (eds.), *Schleiermachers Dialektik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2003).
- HENNINGSSEN, JÜRGEN, '"Enzyklopädie": Zur Sprach- und Bedeutungsgeschichte eines pädagogischen Begriffs', *ABG* 10 (1966), 271–362.
- HENRY, MATTHEW, 'Franz Overbeck on Carl Albrecht Bernoulli', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 68 (2003), 392–5.
- HERBART, J. F., *Pädagogische Schriften*, ed. Otto Willmann and Theodor Fritzsche, 2 vols (Osterwieck: Zickfeldt, 1913).
- HERMANN, ULRICH, 'Der Begründer der modernen Universitätspädagogik: August Hermann Niemeyer (1754–1828): "denkender Christ"—"unpartheyischer Pädagoge"—"Retter und Wiederbegründer der Franckeschen Anstalten"—"hallescher Patriot"', *Neue Sammlung* 44 (2004), 359–82.
- HERMANN, WILHELM, *Die speculative Theologie in ihrer Entwicklung durch Daub* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1847).
- HERTZ, DEBORAH, *Jewish High Society in Old Regime Berlin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).
- HESTER, CARL, 'Gedanken zu Ferdinand Christian Baur's Entwicklung als Historiker anhand zweier unbekannter Briefe', *ZKG* 84 (1973), 249–69.

- HEUSSI, KARL, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Jena* (Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1954).
- HIGTON, MIKE, *A Theology of Higher Education* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- HINDE, JOHN R., *Jacob Burckhardt and the Crisis of Modernity* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).
- HINRICHS, CARL, *Preußentum und Pietismus: Der Pietismus in Brandenburg-Preußen als religiös-soziale Reformbewegung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).
- HINTZE, OTTO, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, iii (2nd edn, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).
- HINZ, RENATE, *Pestalozzi und Preussen: Zur Rezeption der Pestalozzischen Pädagogik in der preussischen Reformzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Haag & Herchen, 1991).
- HINZE, BRADFORD E., 'Johann Sebastian Drey and Friedrich Schleiermacher on Theology and Its Subject Matter', in Michael Kessler and Ottmar Fuchs (eds.), *Theologie als Instanz der Moderne: Beiträge und Studien zu Johann Sebastian Drey und zur Katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 53–76.
- 'Johann Sebastian Drey's Critique of Schleiermacher's Theology', *HJ* 38/1 (1996), 1–23.
- *Narrating History, Developing Doctrine: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Johann Sebastian Drey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- HIRSCH, EMANUEL, *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens*, 5 vols (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1949–54; 5th edn, 1975).
- HODGE, CHARLES, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols (New York: Charles Scribner, 1872–3).
- HOFFBAUER, JOHANN CHRISTOPH, *Geschichte der Universität zu Halle bis zum Jahre 1805* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1805).
- HOLBORN, HAJO, 'Der deutsche Idealismus in sozialgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung', *HZ* 174 (1952), 359–84.
- *Germany and Europe: Historical Essays by Hajo Holborn* (New York: Doubleday, 1970).
- HOLLORAN, JOHN ROBERT, 'Professor of Enlightenment at the University of Halle, 1690–1730', Ph.D. diss. (University of Virginia, 2000).
- HOLTE, RAGNAR, *Die Vermittlungstheologie: Ihrer theologischen Grundbegriffe kritische untersucht*, trans. Björn Kommer (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1956).
- HOOVER, JEFFREY, 'The Origin of the Conflict between Hegel and Schleiermacher at Berlin', *Owl of Minerva* 20 (1988), 69–79.

- HOPE, NICHOLAS, *German and Scandinavian Protestantism, 1700–1918* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
- HORNIG, GOTTFRIED, *Johann Salomo Semler: Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996).
- HOTSON, HOWARD, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications, 1543–1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).
- HOWARD, THOMAS ALBERT, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- *Religion and the Rise of Historicism: W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- HÜBINGER, GANGOLF, *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik: Zum Verhältnis von Liberalismus und Protestantismus im wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994).
- HUNTER, IAN, 'Kant's Religion and Prussian Religious Policy', *MIH* 2/1 (2005), 1–27.
- *Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- *The Secularisation of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- HURST, JOHN F., *Life and Literature in the Fatherland* (New York: Scribner, 1875).
- IGGERS, GEORG, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (rev. edn, Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983).
- 'Historicism: History and Meaning of the Term', *JHI* 56/1 (1995), 129–52.
- 'The University of Göttingen and the Transformation of Historical Scholarship, 1760–1800', *Storia della Storiografia* 2 (1982), 11–37.
- IGGERS, GEORG, and POWELL, JAMES, *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990).
- ISRAEL, JONATHAN, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- IZENBERG, GERALD N., *Impossible Individuality: Romanticism, Revolution, and the Origins of Modern Selfhood, 1787–1802* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

- JACKSON, SAMUEL MACAULEY (ed.), *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 13 vols (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1907–14).
- JACOBS, WILHELM G., *Zwischen Revolution und Orthodoxie? Schelling und seine Freunde im Stift und an der Universität Tübingen: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1989).
- JACOBSEN, DOUGLAS, and JACOBSEN, RHONDA HUSTEDT, *No Longer Invisible: Religion in University Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- JARAUSCH, KONRAD, 'The Institutionalization of History in Eighteenth-Century Germany', in Hans Erich Bödeker, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 25–48.
- JENNY, ERNST, 'Wie de Wette nach Basel kam', *BJB* 41 (1941), 51–78.
- JENSEN, KIPTON E., 'The Principle of Protestantism: On Hegel's (Mis)Reading of Schleiermacher's Speeches', *JAAR* 71 (2003), 405–22.
- JOACHIMSEN, PAUL, 'Loci Communes: Eine Untersuchung zu Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation', *Luther-Jahrbuch* 9 (1926), 27–97.
- JORDAN, LOUIS HENRY, *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905).
- JÜTTE, ROBERT, 'Andreas Hyperius und die Reform des frühneuzeitlichen Armenwesen', *ARG* 75 (1984), 113–38.
- KAEGI, WERNER, 'Jacob Burckhardt als Student bei Hagenbach und De Wette', *ThZ* 1 (1945), 120–44.
- *Jacob Burckhardt: Eine Biographie*, 7 vols in 8 (Basel: Schwabe, 1947–82).
- KAFKER, FRANK A. (ed.), *Notable Encyclopedias of the Late Eighteenth Century: Eleven Successors of the Encyclopédie* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1994).
- KÄHLER, MARTIN, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ernst Kähler (Munich: Kaiser, 1962).
- KANG, CHI-WON, *Frömmigkeit und Gelehrsamkeit: Die Reform des Theologiestudiums im lutheranischen Pietismus des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Basel: Brunnen, 2001).
- KANTZENBACH, FRIEDRICH WILHELM, 'Das Kommunikationsproblem theologischer Zeitschriften seit dem 17. Jahrhundert und die kirchlicher Presse in der heutigen "Öffentlichkeit"', *ZRG* 35 (1983), 193–220.
- *Die Erlanger Theologie: Grundlinien ihrer Entwicklung im Rahmen der Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät, 1743–1877* (Munich: Evangelische Presseverband, 1960).
- KATTENBUSCH, FERDINAND, 'Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie', *ZTK* 11 (1930), 161–205.

—— ‘Hundert Jahre Studien und Kritiken’, *TSK* 100 (1928), i–xv.

KAUFMANN, GEORG, *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertjährigen Bestehens der Universität Breslau*, 2 vols (Breslau: Hirt, 1911).

KAUFMANN, THOMAS, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 1997).

KELSEY, DAVID, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: The Theological Education Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

KEßLER, MARTIN, *Johann Gottfried Herder: Der Theologe unter den Klassikern: Das Amt des Generalsuperintendenten von Sachsen-Weimar*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

KESSLER, MICHAEL, and FUCHS, OTTMAR (eds.), *Theologie als Instanz der Moderne: Beiträge und Studien zu Johann Sebastian Drey und zur Katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Tübingen: Francke, 2005).

KIRCHNER, JOACHIM, *Das deutsche Zeitschriftenwesen: Seine Geschichte und seine Probleme*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962).

KIRN, OTTO, *Die Leipziger theologische Fakultät in fünf Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1909).

KLAUSER, THEODER, et al. (eds.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950 ff.).

KLEMP, ADALBERT, *Die Säkularisierung der universal-historischen Auffassung: Zum Wandel des Geschichtsdenkens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1960).

KOLB, ROBERT, ‘Teaching the Text: The Commonplace Method in Sixteenth-Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary’, *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987), 571–85.

KÖNIG, R., *Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität* (Berlin: Runde, 1935).

KÖPF, ULRICH, *Die Anfänge der theologischen Wissenschaftstheorie im 13. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1974).

KÖPKE, R., *Die Gründung der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Berlin: Schade, 1860).

KÖRTE, WILHELM, *Leben und Studien, Friedrich August Wolfs, des Philologen*, 2 vols (Essen: Bädeker, 1833).

- KOSELLECK, REINHART, *Preußen zwischen Reform und Revolution* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1967).
- KOŠENINA, ALEXANDER, *Der gelehrte Narr: Gelehrten satire seit der Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004).
- KRABBE, OTTO, *August Neander: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Charakteristik* (Hamburg: Rauhen, 1852).
- KRAUSE, GERHARD, MÜLLER, GERHARD, and SCHWERTNER, SIEGFRIED (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 36 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976–2006).
- KRIEG, MATTHIAS, and ROSE, MARTIN (eds.), *Universitas in theologia, theologia in universitate* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1997).
- KRONENBERG, M., *Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus*, 2 vols (Munich: Beck, 1912).
- KUHN, THOMAS K., “‘Dem Nebellande müßigen Grübelns ferngeblieben’: Lehre und Lehrer bei Karl Rudolf Hagenbach’, in Andreas Urs Sommer (ed.), *Im Spannungsfeld von Gott und Welt: Beiträge zu Geschichte und Gegenwart des Frey-Grynaeischen Instituts in Basel 1747–1997* (Basel: Schwabe, 1997), 293–306.
- *Der junge Alois Emanuel Biedermann: Lebensweg und theologische Entwicklung bis zur ‘Freien Theologie’ 1819–1844* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).
- KUROPKA, NICOLE, ‘Philip Melancthon on Aristotle’, *Lutheran Quarterly* 25 (2011), 16–27.
- LA VOPA, ANTHONY, *Fichte: The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762–1799* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- *Grace, Talent, and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- *Prussian Schoolteachers: Profession and Office, 1763–1848* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).
- LAERKE, MOGENS, ‘Leibniz, the Encyclopedia, and the Natural Order of Thinking’, *JHI* 75/2 (2014), 237–59.
- LAMM, JULIA, *The Living God: Schleiermacher’s Theological Appropriation of Spinoza* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1996).
- LEE, DWIGHT E., and BECK, ROBERT N., ‘The Meaning of Historicism’, *AHR* 59/3 (1954), 568–77.
- LEGASPI, MICHAEL C., *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- LEHMANN, HARTMUT, ‘Lutheranism in the Seventeenth Century’, in R. Po-chia Hsia (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 56–72.

- LEHNER, ULRICH, *Enlightened Monks: The German Benedictines, 1740–1803* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- LEINSLE, ULRICH, G., ‘Wissenschaftstheorie oder Metaphysik als Grundlage der Enzyklopädie?’ in Franz M. Eybl, et al. (eds.), *Enzyklopädie der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995), 98–119.
- LENZ, MAX, *Geschichte der königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, 4 vols in 5 (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1910–18).
- LERNER, MARC, *A Laboratory of Liberty: The Transformation of Political Culture in Republican Switzerland, 1750–1848* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- LESTITION, STEVEN, ‘Kant and the End of the Enlightenment in Prussia’, *JMH* 65/1 (1993), 57–112.
- LEVINGER, MATTHEW, *Enlightened Nationalism: The Transformation of Prussian Political Culture, 1806–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- LIDDON, HENRY PARRY, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 vols (London: Longmans, 1894).
- ‘The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined, by Dr. David Friedrich Strauss’, *British Quarterly Review* 5 (1847), 206–64.
- LILGE, FREDERIC, *The Abuse of Learning: The Failure of the German University* (New York: Macmillan, 1948).
- LINSTRUM, ERIK, ‘Strauss’s Life of Jesus: Publication and the Politics of the German Public Sphere’, *JHI* 71/4 (2010), 593–616.
- LLOYD, GENEVIEVE, *Enlightenment Shadows* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- LOEMKER, LEROY E., *Struggle for Synthesis: The Seventeenth Century Background of Leibniz’s Synthesis of Order and Freedom* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973).
- LOWENTHAL, DAVID, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- LÖWTH, KARL, *Meaning in History: Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949).
- LÜCKE, FRIEDRICH, *Dr. Gottlieb Jacob Planck: Ein biograpischer Versuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1835).
- LYNN, ROBERT WOOD, ‘Notes toward a History: Theological Encyclopedia and the Evolution of Protestant Seminary Curriculum, 1808–1868’, *Theological Education* 17 (1981), 118–41.

- LYOTARD, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).
- MAAG, KARIN (ed.), *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1999).
- *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995).
- MAATSCH, JONAS, ‘Jenaer Vorlesungen zur Enzyklopädie und Wissenschaftskunde’, in Thomas Bach, Jonas Maatsch, and Ulrich Rasche (eds.), ‘*Gelehrte*’ *Wissenschaft: Das Vorlesungsprogramm der Universität Jena um 1800* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 125–40.
- MCCLELLAND, CHARLES E., *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- *State, Society, and University in Germany 1700–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- MCCONVILLE, WILLIAM E., ‘Theology and Encyclopedia: A Study in the Thought of Franz Anton Staudenmaier’, Ph.D. diss. (Vanderbilt University, 1983).
- MCCORMACK, BRUCE L., *Karl Barth’s Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development, 1909–1936* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
- MACINTYRE, ALASDAIR, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990).
- MCKENZIE, D. F., *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- MACNAB, K. E., ‘Editing Liddon: From Biography to Hagiography?’ in Rowan Strong and Carol Engelhardt Herringer (eds.), *Edward Bouverie Pusey and the Oxford Movement* (London: Anthem, 2012), 31–48.
- MAGER, INGE, ‘Zu Johann Lorenz von Mosheims theologischer Biographie’, in Martin Muslow, et al. (eds.) *Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693–1755): Theologie im Spannungsfeld von Philosophie, Philologie und Geschichte* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), 277–96.
- MANEGOLD, KARL-HEINZ, ‘Das “Ministerium des Geistes”: Zur Organisation des ehemaligen preußischen Kulturministeriums’, *Die deutsche Berufs- und Fachschule* 63 (1967), 512–21.
- MANETSCH, SCOTT, ‘Psalms before Sonnets: Theodore Beza and the Studia Humanitatis’, in Robert J. Bast and Andrew C. Gow (eds.), *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 400–16.

- MANN, GUSTAV, *Das Verhältnis der Schleiermacher'schen Dialektik zur Schelling'schen Philosophie* (Stuttgart: Vereins-Buchdruckerei, 1914).
- MANNHEIM, KARL, *Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. Paul Kecskemeti (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952).
- 'Historismus', *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 52 (1924), 1–60.
- MARCHAND, SUZANNE, L., *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).
- *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- MARIÑA, JACQUELINE (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- MARINO, LUIGI, *Praeceptores Germaniae: Göttingen 1770–1820*, trans. Brigitte Szabó-Bechstein (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).
- MARSDEN, GEORGE M., *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- MARTENS, WOLFGANG, 'Vom Thomasius bis Lichtenberg: Zur Gelehrten satire der Aufklärung', *Lessing Yearbook* 10 (1978), 7–34.
- MARX, KARL, and ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, *Collected Works*, 50 vols (New York: International Publishers, 1975–2004).
- MASSEY, MARILYN CHAPIN, *Christ Unmasked: The Meaning of the 'Life of Jesus' in German Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1983).
- MASUZAWA, TOMOKO, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
- MATTHEWS, H. C. G., 'Noetics, Tractarians, and the Reform of the University of Oxford in the Nineteenth Century', *HU* 9 (1990), 195–225.
- MAU, RUDOLF, 'Programme und Praxis des Theologiestudiums im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *ThV* 11 (1979), 71–91.
- MAZÓN, PATRICIA M., *Gender and the Modern Research University: The Admission of Women to German Higher Education, 1865–1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003).
- MECKENSTOCK, GÜNTER (ed.), *Schleiermachers Bibliothek: Bearbeitung des faksimilierten Rauschen Auktionskatalogs und Hauptbücher des Verlages G. Reimer* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993).

- (ed.), *Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991).
- MEGILL, ALLAN, *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985).
- (ed.), *Rethinking Objectivity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994).
- MEINECKE, FRIEDRICH, *Historism: The Rise of a New Historical Outlook*, trans. J. E. Anderson (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972).
- MELTON, JAMES VAN HORN, *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- MEYER, JOHANN, 'Geschichte der Göttinger theologischen Fakultät', *ZGNK* 42 (1937), 7–107.
- MEYER, REGINA, 'Das Licht der Philosophie: Reformgedanken zur Fakultätenhierarchie im 18. Jahrhundert von Christian Wolff bis Immanuel Kant', in Notker Hammerstein (ed.), *Universitäten und Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1995), 97–114.
- MILLER, GLENN T., *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870–1970* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- MINDER, ROBERT, 'Das Bild des Pfarrhauses in deutschen Literatur', in *Kunst und Literatur in Deutschland und Frankreich* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1963), 44–72.
- MOELLER, BERND, 'Johann Lorenz von Mosheim und die Gründung der Göttinger Universität', in Bernd Moeller (ed.), *Theologie in Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 9–40.
- (ed.), *Theologie in Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).
- MÖLLER, HORST, *Aufklärung in Preussen: Der Verleger, Publizist und Geschichtsschreiber Friedrich Nicolai* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1974).
- MOLTMANN, JÜRGEN (ed.), *Die Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie*, 2 vols (Munich: Kaiser, 1962–3).
- MOMIGLIANO, ARNALDO, 'Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography', *JWCI* 9 (1946), 152–63.
- MOST, GLEN (ed.), *Historicization–Historisierung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).
- MULERT, HERMANN, *Evangelische Kirchen und theologische Fakultäten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930).

- *Schleiermachers geschichtsphilosophische Ansichten in ihrer Bedeutung für seine Theologie* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1907).
- MÜLLER, GOTTHOLD, *Identität und Immanenz: Zur Genese der Theologie von David Friedrich Strauss* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1968).
- MULLER, RICHARD A., *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to 1725*, 4 vols (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003).
- MÜLLER, WINFRIED, *Universität und Orden: Die bayerische Landesuniversität Ingolstadt zwischen der Aufhebung des Jesuitenorens und der Säkularisation, 1773–1803* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1986).
- MÜNKEL, K. K., *Karl Johann Phillip Spitta: Ein Lebensbild* (Leipzig: Frieze, 1861).
- MÜSEBECK, ERNST, *Das preußische Kultusministerium vor hundert Jahren* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1918).
- MUSLOW, MARTIN, 'Practices of Unmasking: Polyhistorians, Correspondence, and the Birth of Dictionaries and Pseudonymity in Seventeenth-Century Germany', *JHI* 67/2 (2006), 219–50.
- MYERS, DAVID N., *Resisting History: Historicism and its Discontents in German-Jewish Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1953 ff.).
- NEVO, BRUNO, 'L'Église, l'État et l'Université: Les Facultés de Théologie Catholique en France au XIXe Siècle', in Nigel Aston (ed.), *Religious Change in Europe 1650–1914* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 325–44.
- NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*, ed. Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, trans. Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzinno Mantarini, 15 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988).
- NIPPERDEY, THOMAS, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 1800–1866*, trans. Daniel Nollan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).
- *Religion im Umbruch: Deutschland 1870–1918* (Munich: Beck, 1988).
- NOCKLES, PETER B., 'An Academic Counter-Revolution: Newman and Tractarian Oxford's Idea of a University', *HU* 10 (1991), 137–97.
- NOOKE, CHRISTOPH T., *Gottlieb Jakob Planck (1751–1833): Grundfragen protestantischer Theologie um 1800* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

- NOVICK, PETER, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- NOWAK, KURT, *Schleiermacher: Leben, Werk und Wirkung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002).
- OBENAU, SIBYLLE, 'Die deutschen allgemeinen kritischen Zeitschriften in der erste Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv für Buchwesens* 14 (1973), 1–122.
- OBERMAN, HEIKO A., *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (London: Lutterworth, 1967).
- OEXLE, GERHARD OTTO, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).
- OLESKO, KATHRYN M. (ed.), 'Science in Germany: The Intersection of Institutional and Intellectual Issues', *Osiris* 5 (1989).
- O'MEARA, THOMAS, *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982).
- ONG, WALTER J., *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
- O'REAGAN, CYRIL, *The Heterodox Hegel* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994).
- 'The Trinity in Kant, Hegel, and Schelling', in Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 254–66.
- OSBORN, ALBERT, *John Fletcher Hurst: A Biography* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1905).
- OSTERHAMMEL, JÜRGEN, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).
- OVERFIELD, JAMES H., *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).
- OZMENT, STEVEN, *The Age of Reform, 1250–1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).
- PALETSCHEK, SYLVIA, 'The Invention of Humboldt and the Impact of National Socialism: The German University Idea in the First Half of the Twentieth Century', in Margit Szöllösi-Janze (ed.), *Science in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), 37–58.
- PALMER, R. R., *The Improvement of Humanity: Education and the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

- PANNENBERG, WOLFHART, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).
- PARK, JOON-CHUL, 'Philip Melancthon's Reform of German Universities and its Significance: A Study on the Relationship between Renaissance Humanism and the Reformation', Ph.D. diss. (Ohio State University, 1995).
- PATTISON, GEORGE, *Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Nineteenth Century: The Paradox and the 'Point of Contact'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- *Kierkegaard, Religion and Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- PAUCK, WILHELM, *From Luther to Tillich: The Reformers and Their Heirs*, ed. Marion Pauck (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984).
- PAUL, JEAN-MARIE, *D. F. Strauss (1801–1874) et son époque* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1982).
- PAULSEN, FRIEDRICH, *Die deutschen Universitäten und das Universitätsstudium* (Berlin: Asher, 1902); trans. Frank Thilly and William E. Elwang as *The German Universities and University Study* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906).
- *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten: Vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart* (3rd edn, Leipzig: Veit, 1919–21).
- PELIKAN, JAROSLAV, *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- PETERSON, PETER, *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im protestantischen Deutschlands* (Leipzig: Meiner, 1921).
- PFEIFFER, EHRHARD, *Karl Daub und die Krisis der spekulativen Theologie* (Leipzig: Edelmann, 1943).
- PFLEIDERER, GEORG, "'Theologie als Wissenschaft': Recent German Debates and What They (Could) Learn from Schleiermacher', in Brent W. Sockness and Wilhelm Gräb (eds.), *Schleiermacher, the Study of Religion, and the Future of Theology: A Transatlantic Dialogue* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 81–96.
- PFLEIDERER, OTTO, *The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and its Progress in Great Britain since 1825*, trans. J. Frederick Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1890).
- PIEPER, JOSEF, *Scholasticism: Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Pantheon, 1960).
- PILTZ, ANDERS, *The World of Medieval Learning*, trans. David Jones (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981).
- PINKARD, TERRY, *Hegel: A Biography* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

- PLESSNER, HELMUTH, *Diesseits der Utopie* (Düsseldorf: Diedrichs, 1966).
- PRENTISS, GEORGE LEWIS, *The Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York* (New York: Randolph, 1899).
- PREUSS, ROBERT D., *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 2 vols (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970–2).
- PRINTY, MICHAEL, 'The Determination of Man: Johann Joachim Spalding and the Protestant Enlightenment', *JHI* 74/2 (2013), 189–212.
- *Enlightenment and the Creation of German Catholicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- 'Protestantism and Progress in the Year XII: Charles Viller's Essay on the Spirit and Influence of Luther's Reformation (1804)', *MIH* 9/2 (2012), 303–39.
- PURVIS, ZACHARY, 'The New Ethicist and the Old Bookkeeper: Isaak Dorner, Johann Quenstedt, and Modern Appropriations of Classical Protestantism', *JHMTTh/ZNThG* 19/1 (2012), 14–33.
- 'Quiet War in Germany: Friedrich Schelling and Friedrich Schleiermacher', *JHI* (forthcoming).
- 'Transatlantic Textbooks: Karl Hagenbach, Shared Interests, and German Academic Theology in Nineteenth-Century America', *CH* 83/3 (2014), 650–83.
- RASHDALL, HASTINGS, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1936).
- READINGS, BILL, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996).
- REARDON, BERNARD M. G., *Religion in the Age of Romanticism: Studies in Early Nineteenth Century Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- REDEKER, MARTIN, *Schleiermacher: Life and Thought*, trans. John Wallhausser (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973).
- REETZ, DANKFRIED, *Schleiermacher im Horizont preußischer Politik: Studien und Dokumente zu Schleiermachers Berufung nach Halle, zu seiner Vorlesung über Politik 1817 und zu den Hintergründen der Demagogenverfolgung* (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2002).
- REILL, PETER HANNS, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975).

- REIMER, DORIS, “‘Fahre fort mich zu lieben.’ Zum Beginn der Freundschaft und Verlagsbeziehung von Schleiermacher und Georg Andreas Reimer—mit Blick auf die spätere Zeit’, in Andreas Arndt (ed.), *Wissenschaft und Geselligkeit: Friedrich Schleiermacher in Berlin 1796–1802* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 93–119.
- *Passion & Kalkül: Der Verleger Georg Andreas Reimer (1776–1842)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999).
- REINHARDT, RUDOLF, ‘Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät Tübingen im ersten Jahrhundert ihres Bestehens’, in Rudolf Reinhardt (ed.), *Tübinger Theologen und ihre Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), 1–42.
- REVEL, JACQUES, *Jeux d'échelles: la micro-analyse à l'expérience* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996).
- RICHARDS, ROBERT J., *The Romantic Conception of Life: Science and Philosophy in the Age of Goethe* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2002).
- RICHARDSON, HERBERT (ed.), *Schleiermacher and the Founding of the University of Berlin: The Study of Religion as a Scientific Discipline* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1991).
- RICHMOND, JAMES, *Ritschl, A Reappraisal: A Study in Systematic Theology* (London: Collins, 1978).
- RIJK, L. M. DE, “‘Enkuklios paideia’: A Study of its Original Meaning’, *Vivarium* 3 (1965), 24–93.
- RINGER, FRITZ K., *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969).
- RITSCHL, DIETRICH, ‘Johann Salomo Semler: The Rise of the Historical-Critical Method in Eighteenth-Century Theology on the Continent’, in Robert Mollenauer (ed.), *Introduction to Modernity: A Symposium on Eighteenth-Century Thought* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), 107–33.
- RITTER, GERHARD, *Via antiqua und via moderna auf den deutschen Universitäten des XV. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1922).
- RITTER, JOACHIM, et al. (eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, 13 vols (Basel: Schwabe, 1971–2007).
- RIVIÈRE, J., ‘Theologia’, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 16 (1936), 47–57.
- ROBERTS, JON H., and TURNER, JAMES M. (eds.), *The Sacred and the Secular University* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- ROBERTSON, RITCHIE, ‘Religion and the Enlightenment: A Review Essay’, *GH* 25/3 (2007), 422–32.
- ROGERSON, JOHN, *W. W. M. L. de Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992).

- ROREM, PAUL, *Hugh of Saint Victor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- ROSE, MIRIAM, *Schleiermachers Staatslehre* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- RÖßLER, MARTIN, *Schleiermachers Programm der Philosophischen Theologie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994).
- ROTERMANN, STEFANIE, *Wozu (noch) Theologie an Universitäten?* (Münster: LIT, 2001).
- RÜEGG, WALTER (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992–2004).
- ‘Der Mythos der Humboldtschen Universität’, in Matthias Krieg and Martin Rose (eds.), *Universitas in theologia, theologia in universitate* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1996), 155–76.
- RUMMEL, ERIKA, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).
- RUMSCHEIDT, MARTIN, *Revelation and Theology: An Analysis of the Barth-Harnack Correspondence of 1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- RUPP, GORDON, *Culture-Protestantism: German Liberal Theology at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- RÜSEN, JÖRN, ‘Historische Methode und religiöser Sinn—Vorüberlegungen zu einer Dialektik der Rationalisierung des historischen Denkens in der Moderne’, in Wolfgang Küttler, et al. (eds.), *Geschichtsdiskurs*, ii (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1994), 344–79.
- SALIS, ARNOLD VON, ‘Zum hundertsten Geburtstag Jakob Burckhardt: Erinnerungen eines alten Schülers’, *BJB* (1918), 270–306.
- SANDBERGER, JÖRG F., *David Friedrich Strauss als theologischer Hegelianer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
- SAUTER, MICHAEL J., *Visions of the Enlightenment: The Edict on Religion of 1788 and the Politics of the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century Prussia* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- SCHAFF, PHILIP, *Saint Augustin, Melancthon, Neander: Three Biographies* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885).
- SCHELSKY, HELMUT, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen* (Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1971).
- SCHERER, EMIL CLEMENS, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten: Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zu selbständigen Disziplinen* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1927).
- SCHINDLING, ANTON, ‘Die protestantischen Universitäten im Heiligen Römischen Reich deutscher Nation im Zeitalter der Aufklärung’, in Notker Hammerstein (ed.), *Universitäten und Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1995), 9–19.

- SCHIVELBUSCH, WOLFGANG, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986).
- SCHLOEMANN, MARTIN, *Sigmund Jacob Baumgarten: System und Geschichte der Theologie des Übergangs zum Neuprottestantismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- SCHMIDT-BIGGEMANN, WILHELM, 'Einleitung: Die Schulphilosophie in den reformierten Territorien', in Helmut Hozhey and Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann (eds.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, iv/1 (Basel: Schwabe, 2001), 392–7.
- SCHNÄDELBACH, HERBERT, *Philosophy in Germany 1831–1933*, trans. Eric Matthews (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- SCHNEIDER, ROBERT, *Schellings und Hegels schwäbische Geistesahnen* (Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938).
- SCHNEIDERS, WERNER (ed.), *Christian Wolff 1679–1754: Interpretationen zu seiner Philosophie und deren Wirkung* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1983).
- SCHOLLMEIER, JOSEPH, *Johann Joachim Spalding: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1967).
- SCHRADER, WILHELM, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle*, 2 vols (Berlin: Dümmler, 1894).
- SCHRÖTER, MARIANNE, 'Enzyklopädie und Propädeutik in der Halleschen Tradition', *PN* 35 (2009), 115–47.
- SCHUBRING, GERT (ed.), *'Einsamkeit und Freiheit' neu besichtigt: Universitätsreformen und Disziplinenbildung in Preussen als Modell für Wissenschaftspolitik im Europas des 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1991).
- SCHUURMANS, FRANK, 'Economic Liberalization, Honour, and Perfectibility: Karl Sigmund Altenstein and the Spritualization of Liberalism', *GH* 16/2 (1998), 165–84.
- SCHWARZ, KARL, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing als Theologe* (Halle: Pfeffer, 1854).
- SCHWEHN, MARK, *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- SCHWINGES, R. C. (ed.), *Humboldt International: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001).
- SCOTT, GEORGE R. W., 'Professor Edwards Amasa Park', in Daniel Little Furber (ed.), *Professor Park and His Pupils* (Boston: Usher, 1899).
- SCOTT, JAMES C., *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

- SELGE, KURT-VICTOR, 'August Neander: A Baptized Jew of Hamburg of the Time of Emancipation and Restoration as the First Berlin Church Historian, 1813–1850', *New Athenaeum/Neues Athenaeum* 3 (1992), 83–126.
- 'Die Berliner Historiker', in Reimer Hansen and Wolfgang Ribbe (eds.), *Geschichtswissenschaft in Berlin im 19. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992), 409–47.
- 'Neander und Schleiermacher', in Günter Meckenstock (ed.), *Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 33–50.
- SELLE, GOTZ VON, *Die Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1737–1937* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937).
- *Geschichte der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg in Preußen* (2nd edn, Würzburg: Holzner, 1956).
- 'Stein und Hardenberg als Göttinger Studenten', *Göttinger Nebenstunden* 5 (1927), 45–50.
- SELWYN, PAMELA SUE, *Everyday Life in the German Book Trade: Friedrich Nicolai as Bookseller and Publisher in the Age of Enlightenment, 1750–1810* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).
- SHAFFER, ELINOR S., 'Romantic Philosophy and the Organization of the Disciplines: The Founding of the University of Berlin', in Andrew Cunningham and Nicholas Jardine (eds.), *Romanticism and the Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 38–54.
- SHANTZ, DOUGLAS H., *An Introduction to German Pietism: Protestant Renewal at the Dawn of Modern Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013).
- SHEEHAN, JAMES J., *German History, 1770–1866* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- SHEEHAN, JONATHAN, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- 'Enlightenment, Religion, and the Enigma of Secularization: A Review Essay', *AHR* 108/4 (2003), 1061–80.
- SHILS, EDWARD, *The Constitution of Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- SILBER, KATE, *Pestalozzi: The Man and His Work* (4th edn, London: Kegan Paul, 1976).
- SIMON, W. M., *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963).
- SMART, NINIAN, et al. (eds.), *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

- SMITH, ELIZABETH L., *Henry Boynton Smith: His Life and Work* (New York: Armstrong, 1880).
- SMITH, HELMUT WALSER (ed.), *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany, 1800–1914* (Oxford: Berg, 2001).
- SOCKNESS, BRENT W., *Against False Apologetics: Wilhelm Hermann and Ernst Troeltsch in Conflict* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- ‘The Forgotten Moralist: Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Science of Spirit’, *HTR* 96 (2003), 317–48.
- SOLTE, ERNST-LÜDER, *Theologie an der Universität: Staats- und kirchenrechtliche Probleme der theologischen Fakultäten* (Munich: Claudius, 1971).
- SOMMER, ANDREAS URS, ‘Die Ambivalenz der “Vermittlung”: Karl Rudolf Hagenbach (1801–1874)’, in Andreas Urs Sommer (ed.), *Im Spannungsfeld von Gott und Welt: Beiträge zu Geschichte und Gegenwart des Frey-Grynaeischen Instituts in Basel 1747–1997* (Basel: Schwabe, 1997), 91–110.
- *Der Geist der Historie und das Ende des Christentums: Zur ‘Waffengenossenschaft’ von Friedrich Nietzsche und Franz Overbeck* (Berlin: Akademie, 1997).
- ‘Neologische Geschichtsphilosophie: Johann Friedrich Jerusalem’s Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der Religion’, *JHMTh/ZNThG* 9/2 (2002), 169–217.
- SORKIN, DAVID, ‘Reclaiming Theology for the Enlightenment: The Case of Sigmund Jacob Baumgarten (1706–1757)’, *CEH* 36/4 (2003), 503–30.
- *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- ‘Wilhelm von Humboldt: The Theory and Practice of Self-Formation (*Bildung*), 1791–1810’, *JHI* 44/1 (1983), 55–73.
- SPANKEREN, MALTE VAN, *Johann August Nösselt (1734–1807): Ein Theologe der Aufklärung* (Halle: Franckesche Stiftung, 2012).
- SPEITKAMPF, WINFRIED, ‘Educational Reforms in Germany between Revolution and Restoration’, *GH* 10/1 (1992), 1–23.
- SPIEGLER, GERHARD, *The Eternal Covenant: Schleiermacher’s Experiment in Cultural Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).
- SPITZ, LEWIS, ‘The Importance of the Reformation for Universities: Culture and Confession in the Critical Years’, in James K. Kittelson and Pamela J. Transue (eds.), *Rebirth, Reform, and Resilience: Universities in Transition, 1300–1700* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984), 42–67.
- SPRANGER, EDUARD, ‘Altensteins Denkschrift von 1807 und ihre Beziehung zur Philosophie’, *FBPG* 18 (1906), 107–58.

- ‘Das Wesen der deutschen Universität’, in Michael Doerbel, et al. (eds.), *Das akademische Deutschland*, iii (Berlin: Weller, 1930), 1–38.
- ‘Philosophie und Pädagogik der preußischen Reformzeit’, *HZ* 104 (1910), 278–321.
- STAEHELIN, ANDREAS, *Geschichte der Universität Basel 1818–1835* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1959).
- STALNAKER, JOANNA, *The Unfinished Enlightenment: Description in the Age of the Encyclopedia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010).
- STAMP, ROBERT M., ‘Educational Thought and Practice during the Years of the French Revolution’, *HEQ* 6 (1966), 35–49.
- STEIGER, JOHANN, ‘Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus (1761–1851) zwischen Spätaufklärung, Liberalismus, Philosemitismus und Antijudaismus: Zum 150. Todestag’, *ZBK* 70 (2001), 119–35.
- STEINHOFF, ANTHONY, ‘Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter? Nachdenken über die Religion im langen 19. Jahrhundert’, *GG* 30/4 (2004), 549–70.
- STEINMETZ, DAVID C., ‘The Scholastic Calvin’, in Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark (eds.), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 16–30.
- STERK, ANDREA (ed.), *Religion, Scholarship, and Higher Education: Perspectives, Models, and Future Prospects* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002).
- STICHWEH, RUDOLF, *Zur Entstehung des modernen Systems wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen: Physik in Deutschland, 1740–1890* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984).
- STÖLZEL, ADOLF, ‘Die Berliner Mittwochsgesellschaft über Aufhebung oder Reform der Universitäten (1795)’, *FBPG* 2 (1889), 201–22.
- STOLZENBERG, ARNOLD, *Die Theologie des Jo. Franc. Buddeus und des Chr. Matth. Pfaff: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aufklärung in Deutschland* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1926).
- STROUP, JOHN, ‘Protestant Church Historians in the German Enlightenment’, in Hans Erich Bödeker, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 169–92.
- *The Struggle for Identity in the Clerical Estate: Northwest German Protestant Opposition to Absolutist Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1984).
- SÜSKIND, HERMANN, *Christentum und Geschichte bei Schleiermacher: Die geschichtsphilosophischen Grundlagen der Schleiermacherschen Theologie untersucht* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911).

- *Der Einfluss Schellings auf die Entwicklung von Schleiermachers System* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1909).
- SWEET, PAUL ROBINSON, *Humboldt: A Biography*, 2 vols (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980).
- TAYLOR, CHARLES, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).
- TEICHMANN, ALBERT, *Die Universität Basel in den fünfzig Jahren seit ihrer Reorganisation im Jahre 1835* (Basel: Reinhardt, 1885).
- TELMAN, DAVID, 'Clio Ascendant: The Historical Profession in Nineteenth-Century Germany', Ph.D. diss. (Cornell University, 1993).
- TENORTH, HEINZ-ELMAR, "'Encyklopädie, Methodologie und Literatur': Pädagogisches Wissen zwischen Amt und Wissenschaft', in Jürgen Oelkers, Fritz Osterwalder, and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (eds.), *Das verdrängte Erbe: Pädagogik im Kontext von Religion und Theologie* (Weinham: Betz, 2003), 123–46.
- THEMEL, KARL, 'Die Mitglieder und die Leitung des Berliner Konsistoriums vom Regierungsantritt des Kurfürsten Johann Sigismund 1608 bis zur Aufhebung des königlichen preussischen Oberkonsistoriums 1809', *JBBK* 41 (1966), 52–111.
- THIEL, JOHN E., 'J. S. Drey on Doctrinal Development: The Context of Theological Encyclopedia', *HJ* 27/3 (1986), 290–305.
- 'Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Schleiermacher's Theological Encyclopedia: Doctrinal Development and Theological Creativity', *HJ* 25/2 (1984), 142–57.
- THIEß, JOHANN OTTO, *Gelehrten-geschichte der Universität zu Kiel*, 2 vols (Kiel, 1800–3).
- THOLUCK, F. A. G., *Das akademische Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Beziehung auf die protestantisch-theologischen Fakultäten Deutschlands*, 2 vols (Halle: Anton, 1853–4).
- *Geschichte des Pietismus und des ersten Stadiums der Aufklärung* (Berlin: Wiegandt, 1865).
- TIEMANN, HANS-HERMANN, 'Hermann Süskind, Otto Lempp und die Anfänge der theologischen Schule Troeltschs', in Horst Renz (ed.), *Ernst Troeltsch zwischen Heidelberg und Berlin* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 2001), 266–89.
- TILLIETTE, XAVIER, *Schelling: Un Philosophie en Devenir*, 2 vols (Paris: Vrin, 1970).
- TOEWS, JOHN E., *Becoming Historical: Cultural Reformation and Public Memory in Early Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- *Hegelianism: The Path toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805–1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

- TRILLHASS, WOLFGANG, 'Emanuel Hirsch in Göttingen', *ZTK* 81 (1984), 220–40.
- TROELTSCH, ERNST, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1902).
- *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998 ff.).
- *Protestantism and Progress: The Significance of Protestantism for the Rise of the Modern World*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Williams & Norgate, 1912).
- *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Johann Gerhard und Melanchthon* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891).
- TURNBULL, G. H. (ed.), *The Educational Theory of J. G. Fichte* (London: University of Liverpool Press, 1926).
- TURNER, R. STEVEN, 'The Growth of Professorial Research in Prussia, 1818–1848—Causes and Context', in Russell McCormmach (ed.), *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, iii (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), 137–82.
- 'Historicism, *Kritik*, and the Prussian Professoriate, 1790–1840', in Mayotte Bollack and Heinz Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 450–78.
- 'Ideas, Institutions, and Wissenschaft: Accounting for the Research University', *MIH* 4/2 (2007), 367–78.
- 'The Prussian Universities and the Concept of Research', *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 5 (1980), 68–93.
- 'The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative, 1806 to 1848', Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1973).
- 'University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany, 1760–1806', in Lawrence Stone (ed.), *The University in Society*, ii (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 495–531.
- VALERA, GABRIELLA, 'Statistik, Staatengeschichte, Geschichte im 18. Jahrhundert', in Hans Erich Bödeker, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte: Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 119–43.
- VIERHAUS, RUDOLF, '1737—Europa zur Zeit der Universitätsgründung', in Bernd Moeller (ed.), *Stationen der Göttinger Universitätsgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 9–26.
- 'Wilhelm von Humboldt', in Wolfgang Treue and Karlfried Gründer (eds.), *Wissenschaftspolitik in Berlin: Minister, Beamte, Ratgeber* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1987), 63–76.

- VIETZ, K. J., *Das Studium der allgemeinen Geschichte: Nach dem gegenwärtigen Stand der historischen Wissenschaft und Literatur* (Prague: Haase, 1844).
- VOIGT, FRIEDEMANN, *Vermittlung im Streit: Das Konzept theologische Vermittlung in den Zeitschriften den Schulen Schleiermachers und Hegels* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- WAGNER, FALK, *Die vergessene spekulative Theologie: Zur Erinnerung an Carl Daub anlässlich seines 150. Todesjahres* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1987).
- WALLMANN, JOHANNES, *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961).
- WALTER, PETER, *Theologie aus dem Geist der Rhetorik: Zur Schriftauslegung des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1991).
- WARD, ALBERT, *Book Production, Fiction, and the German Reading Public, 1740–1800* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974).
- WARD, W. R., *Victorian Oxford* (London: Frank Cass, 1965).
- WEHLER, HANS-ULRICH, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte, 1770–1990*, 5 vols (Munich: Beck, 1987–2008).
- WEIR, TODD H., *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- WEISHEIPL, J. A., 'Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought', *Mediaeval Studies* 27 (1965), 54–90.
- WEIZSÄCKER, CARL VON, *Lehrer und Unterricht an der evangelische theologischen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Tübingen: Fues, 1877).
- WELCH, CLAUDE, 'The Problem of a History of Nineteenth-Century Theology', *JR* 52/1 (1972), 1–21.
- *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972–85).
- WELLENREUTHER, HERMANN, 'Von der Manufakturstadt zum "Leine-Athen": Göttingen, 1714–1837', in Elmar Mittler (ed.), *'Eine Welt allein ist nicht genug': Großbritannien, Hannover und Göttingen 1714–1837* (Göttingen: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2005), 11–28.
- WHITE, HAYDEN, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- WILLIAMSON, GEORGE S., *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

- ‘What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789–1819’, *JMH* 72/4 (2000), 890–943.
- WISCHMEYER, JOHANNES, ‘Protestant Katechetik—Institutionelle Kontexte und wissenschaftliche Profile im langen 19. Jahrhundert’, in Bernd Schröder (ed.), *Institutionalisierung und Profil der Religionspädagogik: Historisch-systematische Studien zu ihrer Genese als Wissenschaft* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 53–88.
- *Theologiae Facultas: Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).
- WOLFES, MATTHIAS, *Öffentlichkeit und Bürgergesellschaft: Friedrich Schleiermachers politische Wirksamkeit*, 2 vols (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).
- WUTTKE, ADOLF, *Zur Geschichte des theologischen Seminars der Universität Halle: Aus den Acten des Facultätsarchiv* (Halle: Plötz, 1869).
- WYMAN, JR, WALTER E., ‘The Historical Consciousness and the Study of Theology’, in Barbara G. Wheeler and Edward Farley (eds.), *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 91–117.
- YASUKATA, TOSHIMASA, *Lessing’s Philosophy of Religion and the German Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- YEO, RICHARD, *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- ZACHHUBER, JOHANNES, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- ZAHN-HARNACK, AGNES VON, *Adolf von Harnack* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1951).
- ZALAR, JEFFREY, ‘The Process of Confessional Inculturation: Catholic Reading in the “Long Nineteenth Century”’, in Helmut Walser Smith (ed.), *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany, 1800–1914* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), 121–52.
- ZAMMITO, JOHN H., *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).
- ZANDE, JOHAN VAN DER, ‘Statistik and History in the German Enlightenment’, *JHI* 71/3 (2010), 411–32.
- ZEDELMAIER, HELMUT, *Bibliotheca universalis und bibliotheca selecta: Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1992).
- ‘Lesetechnik: Die Praktiken der Lektüre in der Neuzeit’, in Helmut Zedelmaier and Martin Muslow (eds.), *Die Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001), 11–30.

- ZICHE, PAUL, “‘Die Welt der Wissenschaft im Innersten erschüttern’—Schellings Vorlesungen als philosophisches Programm zur Wissenschaftsorganisation’, in Paul Ziche and Gian Franco Frigo (eds.), *‘Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften’: Schellings ‘Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums’ als Wissenschafts- und Universitätsprogramm* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2011), 3–26.
- ZICHE, PAUL, and FRIGO, GIAN FRANCO (eds.), *‘Die bessere Richtung der Wissenschaften’: Schellings ‘Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums’ als Wissenschafts- und Universitätsprogramm* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2011).
- ZIEGLER, HOWARD J. B., *Frederick Augustus Rauch: American Hegelian* (Lancaster, PA: Franklin and Marshall College, 1957).
- ZIESACK, ANNE-KATRIN, ‘Entrepreneurial Spirit and Liberal Values: The Publisher Georg Reimer’, in Anne-Katrin Ziesack (ed.), *Walter de Gruyter Publishers: 1749–1999*, trans. Rhodes Barrett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 1–53.
- ZIMMER, OLIVER, *Remaking the Rhythms of Life: German Communities in the Age of the Nation-State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- ZIOLKOWSKI, THEODORE, *Clio the Romantic Muse: Historicizing the Faculties in Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).
- *German Romanticism and Its Institutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- ZSCHARNACK, LEOPOLD, ‘Das erste Jahrhundert der theologischen Fakultät Berlin’, *Chronik der christlichen Welt* 20 (1910), 469–73, 484–5, 492–8.
- *Lessing und Semler: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Rationalismus und der kritischen Theologie* (Giessen: Töplemann, 1905).
- ZUCK, LOWELL H., ‘Heinrich Heppe: A Melanchthonian Liberal in the Nineteenth-Century German Reformed Church’, *CH* 51/4 (1982), 419–33.