distinct from each other as the study of the general history of mankind is from the study of the history of England.

Hence arise a number of problems. How are the theological sciences related to the non-theological sciences and to one another ? How are they located in the vast organism of science as a whole? and how are they connected with one another so as to form a smaller organic whole in themselves? What principles have they in common, and what tasks are proper to each ? Wherein do they agree and wherein do they differ in their methods of research? These are very important questions. There cannot be an earnest and scientific study of theology where they are overlooked. It is the special task of the theological discipline called “encyclopædia of theology” to discuss and answer them,—or, in other words, to determine the boundaries of theology, to exhibit and explain its inner organization, to indicate its component parts, and to trace their relations both to one another and to the theological system as a whole. This discipline is, therefore, the appropriate scientific approach and introduction to theology and to the various theological sciences.

It is of comparatively little importance whether or not it be itself called a theological science. Strictly speaking, perhaps, it is rather a section or prolongation of that division of general philosophy which treats of the relations of the sciences. One of the tasks of philosophy is to define and distribute, classify and co-ordinate, the sciences, so as to exhibit them as parts of an har­monious cosmos or members of a well-proportioned corpus. But philosophy, when in the pursuit of its merely general ends, cannot be expected to go into details and to concern itself with all the subdivisions and ramifications of science. It will be content to trace main lines, to appreciate leading principles, processes, and results, and, in a word, to exhibit the organic unity and variety of science as a whole. It will leave the exact and exhaustive dis­tribution and survey of any particular kind or group of sciences to those who are extensively and minutely acquainted with that kind or group of sciences. The comprehensive philosophic survey of any order or department of studies is the encyclopædia thereof. Hence there is encyclopædia of mathematics, of physics, of philo­logy, and of jurisprudence, as well as of theology. Encyclopædia of philosophy, however, comprehends all the departmental encyclo­pædias of science. And this for the simple reason that philosophy is inclusive and unitive of all science. As scientia scientiarum philosophy is, as Hegel has aptly said, “ wesentlich Encyclopädie. ” Hence theological encyclopædia—the encyclopædia of the sciences conversant with religion—may reasonably be held to be essentially a prolongation, a direct continuation, of philosophy.

Theological encyclopædia has had its course determined by the general movement of theology. The various theological disciplines required to be evolved before they could be co-ordinated. The designation “ theological encyclopædia” first occurs in its current technical sense in Mursinna's Primæ Lineæ Encyclopædiæ Theologicas (1764). It was only with the publication of Schleiermacher’s Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums in 1811 that the full scientific importance of the discipline was made evident. It has since been diligently cultivated in Germany, and is at length find­ing recognition in other countries.

There are, however, serious defects even in the latest and best expositions of it. Two of these may be noted as being so serious that, owing to their prevalence, theological encyclopædia can hardly be said to have even yet entered a truly scientific stage. One is the virtual or express identification of theology with Christian theology. All the chief theological encyclopædists of Germany—Hagenbach, Lange, Räbiger, Rothe, Von Hofmann—follow Schleiermacher in this amazingly absurd procedure. Logically the Brahmanist, Buddhist, and Mohammedan might with equal justice identify all theology with their own. The superiority of Christianity to other religions, the uniqueness of Christianity among religions, does not alter the nature or lessen the magnitude of the error. Every ency­clopædia of theology which confounds the general with the special so completely as to identify theology with Christian theology for­feits its title to recognition as scientific ; and almost all, even of the latest and best theological encyclopædias, do so. The other fault referred to is that, even in the latest and best of theological ency­clopædias, the constituent sciences of theology are not so co­ordinated with reference to a centre as to render apparent their organic connexions. The German encyclopædists since Schleier­macher claim, indeed, that they so distribute the various disciplines of theology as to exhibit its natural organization. But the claim is not well founded. In reality, their schemes of distribution have no real unity. They are simply arrangements of the various theo­logical disciplines in a fourfold, threefold, or twofold manner, i.e., for example, as exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical, or as historical, systematic, and practical, or as didactic and practical. But this is merely external classification. It may be faultless of its kind, but it cannot of itself yield more than a superficial and mechanical arrangement of the theological sciences. Theology, to be scientifically surveyed and distributed, must be viewed as a unity, and all its parts must be shown to be included in it, and to have a definite place in it from its very nature and definition, as the science or philosophy of religion. Their relationship to one another must be determined by their relationship to the whole of which they are parts, to that science or rather philosophy which treats of religion as a whole. They can only be unified and co­ordinated in a truly organic manner by their due reference to religion, and consequently proper inclusion and location in the philosophy of religion. This necessity has as yet been only verbally acknowledged by theological encyclopædists.@@1

There is an all-comprehensive science of religion,—one which treats of religion in its unity and entirety. It alone completely answers to the idea and definition of theology. It is the one general theological science, comprehends and dominates the special theological sciences, so as to be the science of these sciences, and hence, in accordance with the true distinction between philosophy and science, is properly called philosophy rather than science—the philosophy of religion. All philosophy is science, but all science is not philosophy. Philosophy, as distinguished from science, is general or universal as distinguished from particular or special science. This distinction is, of course, not an absolute one, but of degree—of more or less ; every other distinction between them, however, is positively erroneous. The one general theological science is appropriately, therefore, termed philosophy. It is the philosophy of religion as there is a philosophy of nature and a philosophy of mind, each inclusive of various sciences. It is of the very nature of philosophy to be both before and after the sciences to which it relates,—to be at once their root and result, and at the same time their bond of union and source of life. And the general theology which may justly be identified with philosophy of reli­gion has undoubtedly held this relation to the special theological sciences. It preceded them, being the germ from which they evolved, the root from which they have sprung ; it has grown up along with them, permeating them as their common life ; and it also succeeds and transcends them, basing itself on them and per­fecting itself by means of them. It is the one generic science of the object with which it deals, and vast enough to comprehend a whole group of sciences, because its object—religion—is so rich, complex, and varied.

The primary task of a philosophy of religion is to ascertain and exhibit the nature of religion. Now, a general theory of religion is the natural introduction to all special religious studies and theo­logical sciences, and yet can itself only be brought to perfection through the advancement of these studies and sciences. For example, we can only adequately understand the nature of religion through study of the history of religion, and yet we cannot trace the history of religion at all unless we know generally what religion is. Again, in such works on Christian dogmatics as those of Schenkel, Kahnis, Biedermann, and Lipsius, we find a consider­able place assigned to an investigation into the general nature of religion. The investigation is manifestly not there strictly appro­priate ; its true position can only be in another and wider science. At the same time, it is undoubtedly a necessary antecedent to the investigations of Christian dogmatics, from the very fact that Christianity is a religion. On the other hand, Christianity is not only a religion, but a religion which claims to be the perfect or absolute religion ; and, clearly, if the claim be well founded, the complete nature of religion can only be understood through that full knowledge of Christianity which Christian science may be expected to give.

From the very nature of religion the science or philosophy which treats of it as a whole must obviously be most comprehensive. Religion is a relation between a worshipping subject and a wor­shipped object. It implies both distinction and unity. Were there no distinction between the subject and the object there would be no religion, whether the self-identical unity were named God or man. Were there only distinction between them—were God and man absolutely separate from and indifferent to each other,— religion must be in this case also impossible. Religion thus supposes two factors, which are different yet related, so far distinct and so far akin ; and our views of religion must depend on our views of these two factors. It involves still more. God does not

@@@1 The best account of the history of theological encyclopædia is that given by Räbiger in his *Theologik oder Encyclopädie der Theologie* (1880), of which there is an English translation, with notes which considerably increase the value of the work, by the Rev. J. Macpherson (2 vols., 1884). The account in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften,* i. 87-111 (1885), is also good. The fullest account of the history of attempts to classify the sciences is that of the present writer in *Presby. Rev.* for July 1885 and July 1886. The following may be specified as among the most useful of theological encyclopædias :—Schleiermacher’s *Kurze Darstellung des theol. Studiums,* 1st ed., 1810,2d ed., 1830 ; Staudenmaier’s *Encyclopädie der theol. Wissenschaften,* &c., 1834; Hagenbach’s *Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der theol. Wissenschaften,* 10th ed., 1880; Crooks and Hurst’s *Encyclopædia and Methodology, on the Basis of Hagenbach,* New York, 1884; Doede’s *Encyclopedie der Christelijke Theologie,* 2d ed., 1883; Lange’s *Grundriss der theol. Encyclopädie,* 1877; Von Hofmann’s *Encyclopädie der Theologie,* 1879; Rothe’s *Theologische Encyclopädie,* 1880 ; Drummond’s *Introduction to the Study of Theology·,* and Cave’s *Introduction to Theology,* 1886. See also the article of Willibald Grimm, “ Zur theol. Encyclopädie,” in *Ztschr. f. wissensch. Theol.,* 1882, i.; and Gretillat’s *Exposé de Théologie Systématique,* vol. i., “ Propédeutique," 1885.