



ADDRESS
TO THE
ALUMNI SOCIETY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE,
ON THE
STUDY OF THEOLOGY
AS A PART OF
SCIENCE, LITERATURE AND RELIGION.

DELIVERED
AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCTOBER 5, 1841,

BY THE
REV. LE ROY J. HALSEY, A. M.

WITH AN APPENDIX,
CONTAINING A CATALOGUE OF THE ALUMNI AND CERTAIN
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY.

NASHVILLE:
PRINTED BY CAMERON AND FALL—TENNESSEE AGRICULTURIST OFFICE.
1841.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NASHVILLE, Oct. 6, 1841.

REV. L. J. HALSEY:

Sir—The undersigned were appointed a Committee by the Alumni Society, to communicate to you a vote of thanks for the able and eloquent Address delivered before them on the 5th of October, and to request a copy for publication.

Hoping you will comply with the unanimous wish of the Society,

We are, respectfully, yours, &c.

RICHARD O. CURREY,
A. V. S. LINDSLEY,
WILKINS F. TANNEHILL.

NASHVILLE, Oct. 7, 1841.

GENTLEMEN:—It gives me pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your note of yesterday, and to comply with the wishes of the Alumni Society in sending you a copy of my Address for publication.

Yours truly,

L. J. HALSEY.

MESSES. R. O. CURREY,
A. V. S. LINDSLEY,
W. F. TANNEHILL.

young to students being in the same manner and
yearly, year after year, but the same will be
nevertheless a **ADDRESS.**

GENTLEMEN OF THE ALUMNI SOCIETY:

I trust you will demand of me no apology for bringing before you, as the subject of the present address, the study of Theology, considered as a part of science, a part of literature, and a part of religion; and consequently, as a part of all correct education in youth and of all sound learning in manhood.

The subject, though somewhat unusual and a little removed from the beaten track, is yet by no means irrelevant to the occasion which has called us together. The bare announcement of the theme carries with it its own apology, its own justification and defence: the simple statement of the proposition now to be discussed, is an argument in favor of its claim to a hearing, and of its adaptation to the present time and place. For if it be at all true, as this proposition sets forth, that Theology forms a part of the three great branches of human inquiry, science, literature and religion, and consequently, a part of all liberal education and sound learning; then is the study of Theology a subject fairly within the range of literary discussion, a subject in full accordance with all the objects of our Alumni Association, a subject most worthy in itself and most suitable to be presented at this our annual Festival of Letters.

As an Alumni Society we meet to-day, as we are accustomed to meet from year to year, in behalf of the interests of learning, in furtherance of the great cause of liberal, popular and universal education. There is no arrogance and no affectation in saying, that we, as members of this Association, together with all the members of all similar institutions in our country, are and ought to be, the appointed guardians, the public and pledged defenders, promoters and conservators of these great interests. As the associate Alumni of our respective Institutions, as the honoured members of the wide spread

Republic of Letters, as the united brethren of a great and growing intellectual Order and Fraternity, we may look upon ourselves, without offence or disparagement to others, as stationed on the high places of influence for the propagation of useful knowledge and general education, for the increase and diffusion in the community, of all sound doctrines in theory and all good principles in practice.

Such is our high vocation. Such ought to be our glorious work. Such has been, is now, and ever should be, the noble object which calls us together at each returning anniversary of our Society and University.

Nor is it in vain that we thus assemble for this most laudable object, that we thus associate in this most noble cause, that we thus labour in this exalted vocation. For if the current of opinion, in the intellectual and moral world, is always tending from the educated to the uneducated classes, if the streams of knowledge and virtue, like streams of water in the natural world, are unceasingly flowing from the higher to the lower, from the learned to the ignorant, from the good to the bad; then we do well not only to educate ourselves as individuals and thereby to increase the number of the wise and good, but to contribute the whole weight of our united influence to the education of others; and for this purpose, to assemble from year to year, in order to discuss, to compare, to modify, to correct, to enlarge, and to settle all our opinions on these important subjects, so that when we go hence, our opinions corrected, enlarged and confirmed, by collision, may go with us to exert a greater and better influence on the community.

Every man who holds and disseminates correct principles on any subject connected with morals, religion and education, and thereby contributes to form the public mind aright on these vital points, is a benefactor of his age and country; as much so as if he tilled the soil, or transported its produce. The labour thus bestowed is not labour lost. The opinions thus disseminated, are soon reproduced in practical good to the community: and the seeds of theoretical truth thus scattered abroad,

spring up and bear fruit a hundred fold. And thus every man of sound theoretical opinions becomes the author of solid and practical blessings to his age and country, just in proportion as he disseminates these opinions. Now it is the good fortune of our age and country, that every educated man has an opportunity and a facility of doing this on the largest scale. It is the glory of our age and country that all men are permitted to maintain and to propagate their opinions on all subjects, trammelled by no test but the test of truth, subject to no tribunal but the tribunal of public sentiment. It is the distinguished and inestimable privilege of our age and country, that every man's opinions, according to their truth and importance, not only form part and parcel of the public sentiment of the nation, but may obtain a hearing from all men and exert the full force of their merit on the opinions of all men. Just as in the boundless material universe, every particle of created matter, from Jupiter wheeling in his strength to the minutest atom floating in the sunbeam, exerts its appropriate influence of gravity on every other part of the system, and thereby contributes its portion to the order and perpetuity of the whole; even so in the world of intelligence, every particle of truth however minute, and every expressed opinion however insignificant, exerts its appropriate influence on the wide circle of human thought, and lends its aid to mould or modify, to accelerate or check every other truth in the comprehensive sphere of human knowledge.

Then it is not a vain or useless thing for us to stop occasionally even in the midst of our active pursuits, to turn aside for a while from the little practical details of daily business, and, assembled as we are here to-day to raise our minds to a higher region, to the contemplation and formation of correct speculative opinions on all questions touching the interests of learning, on any and every subject connected with education, morals and religion.

It may be laid down as a truth admitted by all men, that every complete and harmonious system of liberal

education, whatever else it may comprehend, ought at least to comprehend something of the study of science, literature and religion; because these three provinces cover the whole domain of human learning so far as this learning exists in books; these three divisions compose the entire circle of attainable knowledge, so far as this knowledge has been reduced to written language. The highest walks of intellect, the boldest excursions of imagination, as well as the sober deductions of reason and the collected facts of observation and experience, all have a "local habitation and a name," somewhere within the bounds of science, literature and religion. In one or the other of these three fields, may be found all the treasured riches of the human mind, the accumulated stores of ancient and modern learning. In one or the other of these three grand apartments of a universal library, might be arranged all the volumes which have been written in all languages, in all ages. And consequently these three departments, comprising the unexhausted and inexhaustible stock of human learning, ought to furnish the materials and the objects of study, in the most thorough and complete course of what is called liberal or classical education. And so has it been in every age. Science, literature and religion, one or all combined, have furnished the materials of study, the objects of investigation to each succeeding generation; and each generation in turn has added to the stock.

If now it can be shown that Theology forms a legitimate and important part of science, literature and religion; and thus of all written knowledge; then will the study of Theology, and its claim to be considered as a part of liberal education, be clearly vindicated and established.

This is the object before us: to show in what sense and to what extent Theology constitutes a part of science, literature and religion.

Much has been said and written respecting the connexion of science and literature with religion, and much too respecting the obligations of the former to the latter.

Much also has been well said about the important influence of Theological studies upon the cultivation of other branches of study. But the object now before us is distinct from all these: it is not to advocate the importance of Theological studies, because of their connexion with, and influence upon any other branches of study, however close that connexion, and useful that influence, but to show, that Theology deserves to be studied, by every man of liberal education, for its own sake; not as a means to any thing else, but as an end; because of itself, it is a most noble and legitimate part of learning; because independently of every other study, the study of Theology is, so far as it goes, the study of science, of literature, and of religion; or in other words, it is at once a scientific, literary and religious, and therefore most useful and important study; one, which belongs not exclusively to the divine, the religious teacher, the professional theologian, but alike to every educated man, to every scholar and man of letters.

It would be easy, indeed, to defend the study of Theology, on the ground of its utility; to show, that it has a good influence on society in general, and that it is indispensable to every religious teacher and minister of the Gospel. But this is not the true ground, on which Theology, or any other branch of study, ought to be defended. There is too great a tendency in our age and country to bring every thing, even religion itself, to the test of utility, to the standard of loss and gain. Utility has become the watchword of our times. Utilitarianism has grown to be one of the besetting sins of our countrymen. Men seem to think, that nothing is worth a farthing unless it is convertible into gold, unless it can be turned to some external practical advantage, some immediate tangible pecuniary profit. To such extent has this utilitarian spirit prevailed, that many amongst us believe, that learning consists in nothing but tact and skill, and that godliness is of no use except so far as it contributes to worldly gain. But it is time that this foul spirit should be rebuked, and its folly exposed.

It is time men should begin to see, that education, that

knowledge, that truth, of every kind, ought to be pursued and acquired for its own sake, not as a means to some petty external good, but as a great end, a great good in itself. It is time they should begin to understand the proverb, "It is not good that the soul be without knowledge." The mind of man was formed for knowledge. Knowledge is nothing but known truth, and truth is the aliment of the mind, the food, the growth, the life, of the soul. To ask then why the mind should be educated with truth, to ask of what use is this and the other part of knowledge, is about as reasonable as to ask, why the body should be fed, and of what use will it be to eat and drink. The only answer that need be given to all such inquiries is this: the mind ought to be fed with all attainable knowledge, because there is a high positive pleasure in the bare act of knowing truth, and because the mind, like the body, cannot live and grow and discharge its high functions, without its proper aliment, the knowledge of truth. These are the true reasons for all education: and these are the grounds on which it is maintained that all men ought to study Theology, provided it can be shown to be an important part of known truth.

By this it is not intended that all men ought to pursue the study of Theology to the same extent. This would be impracticable and undesirable. The principle of the division of labour, is as proper in literary pursuits as in active life. But whilst it is important, that literary and scientific men should devote their chief attention, each to some one chosen branch, in order to acquire a thorough mastery of it, still, a general knowledge of all other branches is necessary to every man: not that he should excel in every branch, which is impossible, but that being an adept in one, he should know something of all others; so that his knowledge may be harmonious and comprehensive. This is all that is here claimed for Theology; that whilst some men, the ministers of the Gospel, should pursue it as a profession, and so carry it to the farthest depth of research, all other scientific and literary men should pursue it to some extent as a branch of general knowledge.

Now it must be confessed that our educated men have not done this. In our country such men have so long neglected, and so much underrated Theology, as a branch of knowledge, that it has not only been given up exclusively to the merely professional theologians, but what is worse, these imbued with the same spirit, have in many places banished it from their own studies, and even from the Pulpit. In the public estimation, there has thus taken place a sort of divorce, as unnatural as it is unhappy, between Theology and all other literary and scientific pursuits. Instead of holding that high rank which it held in Europe from the earliest ages of the church down to the sixteenth century, during which time it had entire possession of all the schools and Universities, and formed the principal study of the learned, Theology in our country, is looked upon as having small claims to the attention of educated laymen, and is thought to be fit only for the scholastic and controversial part of the clergy.

This is a grand mistake; a radical and pernicious heresy of our times; or rather of our American times; because in Germany and one or two other States of Europe, Theology still holds something of its ancient importance; and not only do most German scholars acquire some knowledge of Theology, as of every branch of learning, but in all the German Universities, nearly one third of the students are, at this time, pursuing the study of Theology as a profession.

Lord Brougham states in his Discourse on Natural Theology, that he was led to undertake the composition of such a treatise, in consequence of a fact which he had often observed, namely, that men of science, and even those of religious habits of thinking, were apt to regard the study of Natural Theology as little connected with philosophical pursuits; as a speculation built rather on fancy than on argument, and quite distinct either from physical or moral science. The object of his book is to show, that Natural Theology is a legitimate branch of the Inductive Philosophy, and as such ought to be studied by scientific men.

The object now before us is of a similar character: it is to show that the same is true not only of Natural but also of Revealed Theology.

1. In what sense, then, is Theology a part of science, and to what extent is the study of Theology the study of science?

Before this question is answered, let it be clearly stated and distinctly understood in what sense the terms science and theology are here used.

What is science? It is that form of knowledge in which all the known truths are classified, explained, and reduced to a systematic order.

All our knowledge is not scientific, because all known truths, all the facts, events or phenomena of nature, have not yet been classified, explained and reduced to a system, or systems. The knowledge of the untutored Indian, who treasures up the phenomena of nature, the knowledge of the rude artisan, who constructs his machinery by rule or imitation, is not scientific knowledge, because it lacks system, order, harmony and classification. And for the same reason, our knowledge of isolated facts is not scientific. But our knowledge, in every department of nature, is constantly becoming scientific, and so science is increasing, just in proportion as the long known facts or the newly discovered phenomena of nature, are classified and systematized; just in proportion as the minute particulars discovered and tested by observation and experiment, are referred to more general facts or principles, and these again traced up to still higher and more universal laws, and even these again to certain great first truths assumed as axioms: all together forming a regular gradation, a connected series, a harmonious system. This is science, or the scientific form of knowledge; not existing as such in nature, but originally derived from nature by the inductive process, and now found existing in the minds of men who have thus studied it, and in all books of science, from Euclid's Elements to Newton's Principia, and the immortal works of Cuvier and La Place. We are accustomed to speak of the different sciences as the natural and moral, the physical and metaphysical: but strict-

ly speaking, there is but one science, and all these are parts or branches of that one, the great science of nature, of God, of the Universe. Science, thus defined, is a unit: and all its parts, whether physical or moral, whether made known in nature or the Bible, by reason or revelation, constitute the one grand, harmonious, system of universal truth.

Is Theology one of these parts? Whether it is or not, will depend upon our ascertaining, whether its truths or facts, like the phenomena of nature, have been classified and arranged in systematic order, and are now found also existing in books, and in the minds of men.

But what is Theology? It may be briefly defined as that which treats of God and his relations with man, together with the doctrines and duties arising out of these. Thus defined, it includes the truths of natural as well as of revealed religion. But inasmuch as all the truths of Natural Theology, are recognized, sanctioned and more clearly taught in Revealed Theology, the latter will be taken as covering the whole ground; and the word Theology is here used with reference especially to all the truths of religion made known in the Bible.

Though Natural Theology is the foundation of Revealed Theology, and may be treated as a separate branch of science, yet, since the truths of both are of the same sort, are entirely coincident, and have reference to the same objects, and since the Bible either expressly or impliedly re-enjoins all the doctrines of the former; there is no impropriety in using the word Theology in its largest sense, as that which treats of God and his worship, as they are revealed in the Scriptures.

Is Theology thus explained then a scientific system, and if so, where can such a system be found? It is clear that such a system does not exist in the Bible; if Theology be a science or part of science, it is not because it is found in that form in the Bible. Though this book must furnish all the materials, or truths of Theology, yet these truths do not there present themselves in a scientific form, any more than the truths of physical or moral science do, in the great book of nature.

On the contrary when we open the sacred volume, we open into a world of phenomena, thrown together without apparent order or design, some new, some partly known, some natural, some supernatural, some mysterious and some incomprehensible; we behold causes and effects, facts and doctrines, narratives and commands, general principles and minute details, miraculous powers and human agencies, all existing together, like phenomena in the natural world, without the least scientific symmetry and connexion. Such is the first view, which the Bible presents to the philosophical student, to the man of science. And from this seeming confusion and disorder, from this abyss of chaos, this unformed world of mystery, he is ready to turn away and exclaim, "Here may be knowledge, here may be abundance of truth, but here can be no scientific knowledge, no philosophical truth."!

But such a conclusion is hastily formed; such a conclusion is as false and unphilosophical as would have been the conclusion of the first student of Natural Philosophy, who should have relinquished his studies in despair of finding any science in nature; or that of the student now, who, as soon as he should open his eyes upon the wondrous mingled and conflicting phenomena of the earth and heavens, should turn away in disgust saying "There can be no science, no philosophy in this confused and mysterious world."

Let the student look again, and he shall see, that as order is Heaven's first law, so order reigns amidst the diversity of nature and of revelation. And as in the one case, under the hand of the patient and laborious Natural Philosopher, following the Inductive process, he sees, a system growing out of this confusion, order and beauty springing out of this chaotic mass of materials, and a new world of science created out of these once commingled elements of nature; so in the other case, he shall see, under the patient and experienced hand of the Theologian, following the same Inductive process, the same order and harmony and well proportioned system of Theological truth springing out of the apparent confusion of the Bible. Just as the philosophical inqui-

rer, in every branch of physical and moral science, brings together, by the process of induction and classification, all the minute phenomena of nature, tracing all effects to their causes, all particular facts or events to general principles, and all these to a few universal laws, and these again to the great first Cause, thus forming an unbroken chain, and rising from every field of nature up to Nature's God: even so, the Theologian, following the same process of induction and classification, and taking the Bible, instead of nature, for his guide and his repository of truth, brings together all particular facts, all the minute details of duty, under more general facts or doctrines, traces these facts or doctrines to still higher principles, and these principles again to a few fundamental laws or first truths, and even these again, to the one great first truth and cause of all, the self-existence of Jehovah, thus forming an unbroken chain, and rising from every point of revelation, from every "jot and tittle" of the Bible, up to that same God, who is the God of nature. We see then, that Theology pursues the same method and reaches the same point, which every branch of Natural Philosophy, pursues and reaches.

Is there then no science in all this? Is there not as strict and legitimate a science in the one case as in the other; since both pursue the same method, both start from the same point, and both reach the same end?

But perhaps it may be said, both do not start from the same point; the field of inquiry in the one case, is the works of nature, in the other, it is the word of God; the Philosopher studies nature, the Theologian studies the written Bible.

As well might it be said, that Chemistry and Mental Philosophy are not common branches of science, because the field of investigation in the one case is the laws of matter, in the other, the laws of the human mind; or that the Astronomer and the Geologist are not equally scientific men, because one studies the earth beneath, the other the heavens above.

It is true, that the Natural Philosopher and the Theologian are labouring in different fields, are studying dif-

ferent books. The one is studying the works of God, as they are spread out before the eye, in the great book of nature; the other is also studying the works of God, but these are spread out before him in another book, the Bible. There are indeed two books, in which the works of God may be studied: and both of these are recognized by Lord Bacon. In his *Novum Organum*, he speaks of all natural phenomena as forming a volume of the works of God, and as it were another Bible. "*Volumen operum Dei, et tanquam altera scriptura.*"

And if both of these are studying the works of God, one in the book of nature, the other in the Bible: both also may be said to be studying the word or revealed will of God. There is a sense in which even nature may be regarded as a Divine Revelation. For God has as certainly spoken to man, and to some extent as distinctly revealed his will in nature, as in the Bible.—What are the fixed laws of nature, her unvarying movements, her returning seasons, her undying powers, but ten thousand tongues, all teaching man his duty, all revealing to him the will of his Creator? And what are the planets wheeling in their courses, but so many harmonious voices, proclaiming the power, wisdom and goodness of God, and

"Forever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is Divine."

It has been said, not less truly than beautifully, "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

The books of nature and of revelation, then, are both alike in this; that both contain the works of God, and both contain the word or will of God. And they are both alike in this too, that each contains a world of mystery, of unseen and incomprehensible wonders. There is in each, a deep and wide ocean of unknown truth, which no human intellect can fully fathom; there is in each a broad expanse of undiscovered knowledge, which the loftiest genius can never explore. Into that

ocean reason may cast her longest line; into that boundless expanse science may stretch her mightiest telescope; and yet after all, there will remain both in nature and in Revelation, regions unfathomed and unexplored.

Thus we see, that the Theologian and the Natural Philosopher are not labouring in fields wholly dissimilar, though they are quite distinct. And if the inquirer into the laws of the human mind, is not less a philosopher than the Geologist, who explores the solid globe, neither does the Theologian cease to be a cultivator of science because he studies the Bible, instead of the book of nature. But even if it were so, still it is true, that both start from the same point of investigation, because both begin with an induction of particular facts or events; and it matters not whether these facts or events are received on the evidence of personal observation, and experiment, or on the testimony of others; provided only that the evidence be credible. The only difference is, that the Natural Philosopher receives his facts, partly on the evidence of his own senses, his own observation and experiment, and partly on the recorded testimony of others, who have made these observations and experiments; whereas the Theologian receives all his facts, as they are recorded in the Bible, depending on the testimony, on the observation, on the senses of others. Throughout this discussion the historical truth of the Bible is assumed.

Now it is the reducing of all these facts thus attested, recorded, and handed down in the Bible, to one harmonious and complete system, with all effects traced to their causes, with all the terms defined and explained, with all mysteries solved that can be solved, with all apparently conflicting facts, doctrines, and expressions, reconciled: it is this, that constitutes the science, the difficult, the divine science of Theology. We are now prepared to answer the question, whether the truths made known in the Scriptures, have been reduced to that systematic form, which constitutes science. The answer is at hand.

Such a system has been formed, and it is found exist-

ing in all the books of divinity which have been written, from the great works of Melancthon and Calvin down to the last which has issued from the Press. These systems, or rather, these varied forms of the same system, have all been based upon the Bible and formed out of it, just as, the various systems of Chemistry or Astronomy now existing in all our books, from the most elementary to the most comprehensive, have been based upon, and formed out of nature. And as the student, in the one case, must study Chemistry and Astronomy in the best of these books, always following nature for his guide and his fountain of truth, so the student must study Theology, in these most approved Theological systems, always careful to follow nothing but the Bible as his guide, and oracle of truth.

We are now also prepared to answer the question "In what sense, and to what extent is Theology, revealed Theology, as found in our best standard works, a part of science?"

It is a part of science, in the sense, that it presents all the known truths of the Bible, in a well arranged, consistent, systematic form; that in forming them into this system, and in studying them when thus formed, the student starts from the same point, follows the same philosophical method, and reaches the same end which he does in forming and studying every other branch of physical and moral science. And further it is not only thus a legitimate part, but it is the most extensive, the most important, the most exalted, the most soul stirring, part of science. This alone, according to Lord Bacon, forms one of the two grand divisions of all our knowledge. He divides all science into two parts, namely: Theology and Philosophy; the first comprehending only the truths of Revelation, the second all other truths.

Thus we have the authority of the greatest name in the history of Philosophy, for making Revealed Theology, both a legitimate and an extensive and important part of science. But perhaps it will be said in opposition to this systematic or scientific study of Theology, that, since the Bible is the only source and standard of religious

truth, it is best to lay aside all Theological systems, to take the Bible alone, and out of it to form a system, each man for himself.

Now this is precisely what most men in our times profess to be doing, and if they really did this, it would be just the thing desired. It would be just what Calvin did, and what Luther did, and what Turretin did, and what Fuller, and Dwight, and Dick, and Edwards and Watson, and every other great Theologian of every age has done. But alas! with most men, in their zeal to do away with all human creeds and commentaries and systematic treatises, and to study the Bible solely, the result is, that they know little or nothing either about the Bible or systematic Theology, and thus soon come to think, there is not much scientific knowledge to be found in the one or the other.

It is true, that the great object of the Theologian is to study the Bible. But what is the best mode of doing this? Has he no need of a Teacher: no need of the assistance of the great and good men who have been studying this same book in all ages: no need of the numerous translations, critical expositions, and systematic works, in which the original languages are explained, the facts illustrated, and the doctrines developed and harmonized? As well might you tell the student of Geology to go forth into the fields, or the student of Astronomy to gaze upon the stars, without apparatus, without a text book, without any knowledge of what has been written on these subjects, as to tell the Theologian to form his own system of Theology from the Bible alone, regardless of every thing which has ever been written.

And yet as the student in the one case is bound to follow nature only as his Oracle, so also, the Theologian is bound to follow the Bible. But can he not do this, when he consults all other books; can he not follow the Scriptures fully and implicitly, whilst seeking assistance from every other quarter? Let the student form his own system, but let him do it as Calvin, and Melancthon, and Luther, and Watson, and Fuller, and all

other systematic Theologians have done, by consulting the mighty dead of all preceding times.

These facilities of study, these standards of doctrine, these repositories of theological learning, these treasures of scientific truth, are to be received not as infallible oracles, but only so far as they are found to agree with the Bible; but then, they are no more to be despised and discarded by the student, than are similar books on other sciences. But perhaps it may be asked, why should there be so many different and conflicting systems of Theology, all claiming to be scientific and true, and all professing to be built upon the Bible?

This question deserves only to be answered by another: why should there be so many opposing books and systems in almost every branch of human knowledge, all claiming to be the true science, and all professedly drawn from, and based upon nature?

It would be no hard task to show, that the history of almost every human science, in proportion to its age and extent, presents as much diversity as the history of Theology; and that the systems of Theology have not been more numerous, nor diverse, than the systems in the single science of Mental Philosophy. In fact it might be shown, that these conflicting Theological systems, for the most part, have grown out of the numerous opposing schools and systems of Mental Philosophy.

And yet who discards the study of the human mind, from the list of useful and legitimate sciences, because of the endless controversies and conflicting views of all the Philosophers, from Locke to the present time? Who rejects Chemistry because of the foolish dreams of the old Alchemists? Who reproaches Astronomy with the discordant systems of Ptolemy and Copernicus? Who condemns the study of Geology because of the different theories of Hutton and Werner? And yet men will repudiate and denounce systematic Theology, because the old schoolmen could not agree, because Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas, could not see the same point alike; because Luther and Calvin differed a little

on some points; because the system of Dwight may not fully coincide with that of Watson.

But it is said, that as the Bible is the sole standard and fountain of truth, and as it has been the same in every age: men ought to have agreed in interpreting it, and to have so formed one and the same system. Well indeed, and has not nature been the same in every age, and always open to the eyes of men, and have not all the Philosophers been interpreting nature? And yet they have at times given different interpretations of her oracles.

Just so with the Bible. Our present systematic Theology as it now exists in all our standard works, is the combined result, the glorious and well formed offspring, of all these different interpretations, all these hard controversies, these conflicting schools and systems.

A beautiful analogy to this may be found in civil government. Under every free constitution, such as our own and the English, there are always two or more conflicting powers, two hostile parties, two counteracting forces, arrayed against each other, as Opposition and Administration: and the machine of Government moves on under the combined action of these two jarring forces. A casual observer might desire to see them either reconciled, or removed. He might conclude that they did nothing but retard each other, and that under this fierce collision, this constant struggle and shock of elements, the machine of Government must soon stop, or else suffer an explosion. But the Statesman, better acquainted with its nature and history, sees in this, its proper movement, and knows that good government is the result of both these parties.

Even so has it been in the scientific world. So has it been in Theology: and our present system has been formed not by the sole action of one party or the other, but by the combined action of both, and it has taken a direction, not in the line of either, but in the middle, the resultant of the two forces.

The Theologian then, is to use all these systems, not one creed alone, but all, because he may find the truth

scattered through all. The truth does not belong to any one writer solely, to any one party exclusively: and his work is to collect it out of all, from Origen to Augustine, from Augustine to Luther, and from Luther to our own writers.

2. If from all that has been said we may conclude that Theology ought to be studied because it is a legitimate and important part of science, it is now an easier task to show that it should be studied as a noble part of Literature.

And what is Literature? In its most extensive sense it means learning in general. But in our country and in England it is most commonly applied to that branch of general learning, which is termed Polite or Elegant Literature. On the continent of Europe however it is used in another more specific and appropriate sense, viz: *that which is written*, or *composition* in itself considered. This last is the sense in which it will be used on the present occasion.

Literature then includes all written compositions viewed solely as a matter of style and diction, without reference to any knowledge they contain. Thus all that has been written on all subjects in all ages, aside from any claim to scientific truth, constitutes the universal literature of the world. Classical literature consists of all that the ancients wrote, and German literature is that part which the Germans have written on all subjects. Thus all scientific books, as well as others, belong to literature, and may be studied at the same time, as text books of science and specimens of literature. For example; the Lectures of Dr. Brown may be studied as a scientific work in which mental phenomena are classified and explained; or regarded as specimens of English literature, they may be studied as a matter of style and diction.

Thus then every branch of science has a literature of its own, even in its text books, its systematic treatises. But besides this, it also has a literature in its written history and in all other writings connected with it. Thus Medical literature includes all the books, whether scientific or not, written on Medical subjects. And so Theol-

ogy has a literature of its own, formed out of all the systematic treatises on Divinity, together with the innumerable writings of every sort on Theological subjects. For as Theology is a part of universal science, so all Theological writings form a part of universal literature, whether these writings be systematic or not, whether bodies of divinity or popular sermons.

These statements are made, that there may be no misconception as to what is here meant by the Literature of Theology, or Theology considered as a part of Literature.

The first thing that strikes our attention on entering the field of Theological Literature is its immense magnitude, its incalculable riches. The fashionable readers of Polite Literature, who have never traveled beyond the narrow precincts of modern poetry and fiction, would shrink back astonished, if the veil could once be lifted, which hides from their view this broad land of wealth unknown, this land of the intellectual giants of all ages, a land adorned with the choice productions of every order of genius, enriched by the contributions of every language of Christendom. For whilst, on one hand, it can boast of the learned labours of such men as Origen and Jerome, Eusebius and Augustine, Calvin and Beza, Erasmus and Grotius, Spanheim and Stapfer, Lightfoot and Lardner, Hooker and Stillingfleet, Walton, Mill and Kennicott, Mosheim and Turretin, Poole and Owen, Paley and Butler, Pascal and Fenelon, Prideaux and Usher, Michaelis and Rosenmuller, Calmet and Campbell, Fuller and Watson, Tholuck and Hengstenberg; on the other hand, it is adorned with all that remains of the burning eloquence, that glowed in the hearts and fell from the lips, of such as Tertullian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, Bossuet, Massillon, Howe, Barrow, Baxter, Sherlock, Whitefield, South, Mason, Chalmers, Jeremy Taylor, and Robert Hall.

The nucleus and starting point of all Theological Literature is the Bible itself, in its original languages and in its manifold translations. For although, as we have seen, the Bible is not to be considered as a scientific theo-

logical work, yet, viewed as a literary composition, or series of writings extending through fifteen centuries, it forms a large and choice part of Theological Literature. The Bible, indeed, does not belong exclusively to any one department of Literature, but having pervaded and moulded all others; it forms the richest, the most varied and the most wonderful part of universal literature which the world can boast. It belongs as much to Classical as to Theological Literature. It is in the Bible, that the long stream of Hebrew Literature, flowing down like a mighty river from the heights of Paradise beyond the flood, and sweeping across the vast plains of the oriental world, and bearing on its bosom the consecrated ark of primeval civilization, meets another noble stream, both deep and broad, coming from the west, the stream of classical antiquity flowing from the steeps of Parnassus and the cool groves of Arcadia, and bearing on its enchanted waters the fairy-like vessel of the Muses, richly freighted with the immortal monuments, of poets and orators, heroes and sages. It is in the Bible, that these two streams of Hebrew and Grecian literature meet and blend their currents, and flow on together for ages. And it is from the Bible again, that these two streams, having thus mingled and purified their waters, re-issue and go forth to the four quarters of the globe, spreading life and beauty over every country of Modern Europe, over the whole domain of Christendom. They have been flowing from the east in all time past, and are flowing yet: and they are destined to flow, until every nook and corner, every vale and mountain-top of this wide globe shall be washed by their fertilizing waters. They have reached us in these ends of the earth: and we can now trace back, on the bosom of classical and theological literature, the whole course of our learning and our religion; first, from our American shores to the states of Europe, thence back to the shores of Greece and Italy, from these again to the land of Patriarchs and Prophets, and from that chosen land up to the top of old Ararat and the ark of Noah, thence back to the Garden of Eden, and thence again to heaven and the throne of God. The richest treasures

of Theological Literature are to be found in the three classical languages of antiquity, the Hebrew, Greek and Latin, which have done more to spread knowledge and religion over the world than all others besides. The study of Theological Literature is at every step the study of these great languages, in which truth and beauty reached their highest perfection, and the human mind its highest development.

And what shall we say of these languages? Of Greek and Latin, what can be better said than has been done by Coleridge in the following unparalleled description?

“Greek—the shrine of the genius of the old world; as universal as our race, as individual as ourselves; of infinite flexibility, of indefatigable strength, with the complication and the distinctness of nature herself; to which nothing was vulgar, from which nothing was excluded; speaking to the ear like Italian, speaking to the mind like English; with words like pictures, with words like the gossamer film of the summer; at once the variety and picturesqueness of Homer, the gloom and the intensity of Æschylus; not compressed to the closest by Thucydides, not fathomed to the bottom by Plato, not sounding with all its thunders, nor lit up with all its ardors even under the Promethean touch of Demosthenes! And Latin—the voice of empire and of war, of law and of the state; inferior to its half parent and rival in the embodying of passion and in the distinguishing of thought, but equal to it in sustaining the measured march of history, and superior to it in the indignant declamation of moral satire; stamped with the mark of an imperial and despotizing republic; rigid in its construction, parsimonious in its synonymes; reluctantly yielding to the flowery yoke of Horace, although opening glimpses of Greek-like splendour in the occasional inspirations of Lucretius; proved, indeed, to the uttermost by Cicero, and by *him* found wanting; yet majestic in its barrenness, impressive in its conciseness; the true language of history, instinct with the spirit of nations, and not with the passions of individuals; breath-

ing the maxims of the world and not the tenets of the schools; one and uniform in its air and spirit, whether touched by the stern and haughty Sallust, by the open and discursive Livy, by the reserved and thoughtful Tacitus."

If such be the Greek and Latin, who can describe the stately and giant-built Hebrew! the most simple, the most philosophical and the most ancient of written tongues; with letters like blocks of marble, with words like kings' palaces, with sentences like cities walled up to heaven; though robed in the beauties of holiness, yet rugged as the mountains about Jerusalem; unchangeable in its idiom, unyielding in its structure, unvarying and solemn in its tone, from generation to generation the language of rigour and of judgment, of adoration and obedience; spoken first in the Garden of Eden, or by the builders of Babel, written first on tables of stone by the finger of Jehovah; forever preserving its awful dignity, whether sung by the Seraphim above or by the choirs of the Temple, whether carried to the highest heaven of sublimity by Isaiah or brought down to play amongst the roses of Sharon and the lilies of the valley by Solomon; and destitute alike of the elasticity of the Greek and the martial prowess of the Latin, unable to soar with the one or charge with the other, but ever marching with the slow and measured tread of an ancient army of elephants.

These three languages contain all the treasures of the ancient world; Hebrew, Greek and Latin, once reconciled at the cross, and brought into mysterious union around the head of the dying Son of God, have, from that day to this, formed the united repositories of classical and theological learning; the mines, out of which have been dug all the jewels of truth and beauty which adorn every language of Christendom.

Thus it appears that classical and theological literature are the two great sources of all modern literature; and if for no other reason, they should be studied on account of their immense magnitude. They have made the world what it now is; they have their hold upon the world; and

the world will not soon let them die. But of the two, theological literature is, by far, the most extensive. For beginning with the Bible in its original tongues with its countless versions, it includes all the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers, all the huge quartos and folios of the middle ages, all the apologies and defences of Christianity, all the systematic treatises written since Theology began to be studied as a science, all the critical commentaries, all the controversial tracts, all the published sermons and devotional works, with the myriads of Periodical works published since the invention of Printing.

The reason of this vast accumulation of Theological Literature is obvious. For not only has Theology exerted a greater influence over the human mind than any other subject during the last eighteen centuries, but besides its own professed writers the clergy, forming the largest class in every age, it has laid under contribution the writers of every other class. Even the province of poetry, the most distant from Theology, has acknowledged its sway. For example, take the noblest specimen of English literature, the one great Epic of modern times. And what is *Paradise Lost* but a magnificent theological work, theological in its conception, in its doctrines, in its imagery, in its characters, in its language. It is, from beginning to end, one unbroken commentary and even paraphrase of the Bible. The muse of Milton was distinctly a scriptural muse; no fickle goddess of the Aonian Mount, but that Eternal Spirit that directed the pens of Moses and Isaiah; he drank of no fancied Pierian spring, but of a purer and higher fountain, even of

“Siloa’s brook that flowed

Fast by the oracle of God.”

The whole history of mental and moral philosophy is but the history of Theological writings. The long reign of the Aristotelian Philosophy was but the reign of Theological discussion, the accumulation of Theological literature. During the middle ages there was scarcely any thing studied and written but Theology. According to

Hallam, "It was the Christian religion alone which made a bridge across the chaos of the middle ages, and linked together the two periods. Over this bridge were conveyed the materials which fed the flame of the Protestant Reformation in every country of Europe."

Do you ask for additional authority? A competent witness is at hand. M. Guizot, in his lectures on Civilization, speaking of this period uses the following language:

"The intellectual and moral progress of Europe has been essentially theological. Look at its history from the fifth to the sixteenth century, and you will find throughout that theology has possessed and directed the human mind: every idea is impressed with theology; every question that has been started, whether philosophical, political or historical, has been considered in a religious point of view. So powerful indeed has been the authority of the church in matters of intellect, that even the mathematical and physical sciences have been obliged to submit to its doctrines. The spirit of theology has been as it were the blood, which has circulated in the veins of the European world down to the time of Bacon and Descartes. Bacon in England, and Descartes in France, were the first who carried the human mind out of the pale of theology. We shall find the same fact hold if we travel through the regions of literature; the habits, the sentiments, the language of theology there show themselves at every step. This influence taken altogether has been salutary. It not only kept up, and ministered to, the intellectual movement of Europe, but the system of doctrines and precepts, by whose authority it stamped its impress upon that movement, was incalculably superior to any which the ancient world had known." It is Theological Literature that arrays before us the champions, the master spirits, who have held the sceptre of thought, and sat behind the oracle of opinions in the intellectual and moral world.

Suppose it were possible for us, by making a pilgrimage to some distant region of the earth, to get a view at

once of the whole army of Theological writers; the long line of illustrious authors of every age and clime. Suppose we could then take our station in some great amphitheatre of nature, whilst this immense host of the mighty dead, one by one, with slow paced and solemn tread, should pass in review before us; and suppose we were permitted to gaze, for days and months, on that august and glorious scene. Who would not make the pilgrimage of earth, to witness such a spectacle, such an assemblage of genius, such a personification of all history, such a panorama of past ages, such a resurrection of all antiquity from the dead?

Is there any scene on this wide globe, any landscape in nature, any dark cave of ocean, any monument of art, any wonders of the inanimate creation, to which the living world would crowd with so much intensity of desire, as to a scene like this? No, neither Babylon with her gorgeous palaces and cloud-capt towers, nor Egypt with her solemn pyramids and obelisks, nor Greece with her marble monuments of Gods and heroes, nor Rome with her proud Cathedrals, nor Etna with all its fires, nor Niagara with all its thunders, could equal a scene like this—this glorious drama of history, this living and breathing representation of the intellectual and moral world.

Now it is the study of history, the study of Theological Literature, which, in some good degree, brings before us, this delightful vision of the past. It is this that unbars the gates of death, that throws open the tomb of centuries, that raises the coffin lid of time and from the sleeping dust of antiquity calls forth these noble forms, once more to tread the theatre of life and action, for our instruction.

It is in their writings, that these venerated forms do pass in review before us, not indeed before the mortal eye, but before the intellectual vision. It is in their works, that we see them again, acting their part, in the world's affairs. It is in their works, which fill every library of Christendom, that "they being dead yet speak," speak to us and to all coming ages.

And we cannot stand in their august presence, we cannot tread thoughtfully amidst those shelves where they repose in solemn grandeur, we cannot listen to their voice, though uttered in an old and foreign tongue, without feeling, that it is good to be there, good to imbibe their spirit, good, to learn from them, these truths, which are none the less true, for being long taught and long believed. In every age of the world, the study of the past history of man, the study of antiquity, has been the great and most important study of man. If a man may be said to double his knowledge with every additional language which he acquires, he may also be said to extend his term of existence, just in proportion as he becomes acquainted with the past. It is not given to mortals to know much of the future: we cannot acquire certain knowledge of even a day to come; so that the only fields of certain knowledge and of legitimate study are the past and the present. But the man whose study is confined to the present, whose knowledge lies only in the term of his own lifetime, is restricted to a most insignificant world, and lives and moves in a narrow circle; even though he should fill up his three score years and ten and should have the most perfect knowledge of every thing he has seen and heard in all that time. You may suppose such a man to have kept all his senses wide awake, and to have remembered every fact he has seen, and every word he has heard for seventy years past, and to have acquired all the knowledge of men and things which such a mind as his can hold, and yet if he has never heard or read of a single deed which has been done, of a single event which has come to pass, of a single opinion which has been held by any of the human race before his day, that man's mind is still in its infancy, unenlightened, unenlarged, uninformed, and though his knowledge may be useful and interesting to others, yet as an intellectual discipline, to enlarge, to elevate and invigorate his own mind, it has not done so much as the reading of an Almanac for the last seventy years would have done.

The past then is the largest field of human inquiry.

And the man, who is most deeply read in the history of the past, whose mind has been schooled in the literature of all ages, and has held converse with the mighty dead of antiquity, is best prepared to take a large and comprehensive grasp even of the present.

This will serve to explain an observation, which has often been made, that a man illiterate in all other respects, but well acquainted with the Scriptures, "who knows his Bible true and knows no more," often shows a degree of intelligence, of intellectual vigour and enlargement, which almost supplies the defect of early education. And why? The reason is plain. For not to mention the grand and ennobling moral truths, with which he is familiarized, the mind, well versed in the Scriptures, is transported back into the very midst of antiquity, it communes with the spirits of the old world; it walks amongst the giants of our race, it learns lessons from men who lived a thousand years; generation after generation, and empire after empire rises and falls around it, the whole panorama of the world's history passes in review before it. And thus it is, that the history contained in the Bible, will do more to give mental vigour and comprehensiveness to a mind otherwise illiterate, than the bare experience of the longest lifetime.

If the study of the written history of the past is thus important as an intellectual discipline, it is Theological literature which presents this history in its most interesting, its most comprehensive, its most philosophical form. It is the student of Theological literature alone, the Christian philosopher, who gains an insight into the great movements of Providence, and thereby can see and appreciate the history of our world as one grand whole, harmonious in its parts, glorious in its design, perfect in its end. The Christian philosopher can take his station on the hill of Calvary, and from that central point of all history, from that vantage ground of the moral world, he can reconcile all the events of anterior and posterior times. For with a mind fully versed in all the records of Theological Literature, with the telescope of history in hand, he looks back and sees all the

myriads of events, both great and small, of the ancient world, for four thousand years pointing their courses, and converging their rays upon the wondrous and amazing spectacle, that heaven and earth then witnessed; and then turning his telescope down the vista of all subsequent time, he sees all the rays of light which had converged on that point, and all the dispensations of Providence which had then met and been accomplished, going forth again in ten thousand directions for the illumination, for the conquest, for the emancipation of the modern world. And seeing all this, he can believe that there is a God who governs in the affairs of men, and he can adopt and understand the words of the writer last quoted.

“The movements of Providence are not restricted to narrow bounds; it is not anxious to deduce to-day the consequences of the premises it laid down yesterday. It may defer this for ages, till the fullness of the time shall come. Its logic will not be the less conclusive for reasoning slowly. Providence moves through time as the gods of Homer through space,—it makes a step and ages have rolled away.”

Thus it appears then, that inasmuch as antiquity opens the principal field of human learning; inasmuch as this learning is to be found in the written history, or universal literature of the past; and inasmuch as Theological Literature, forms the largest, the most substantial, and most philosophical part of this Literature, if any thing ought to be studied as a part of a full and liberal education, it is Theological Literature.

3. If we may now conclude, from what has been said, that Theology ought to be studied as a part both of science and of literature, it will require but few words to show, that it deserves to be studied as a part of Religion.

It must here be assumed, as a thing too evident to require argument, that every man ought to have, and that every reflecting man must have, a religion of some sort, not merely a religious feeling or instinct, but a religious belief, as the rationale or exponent of this inward feeling. There seems to be a sort of necessity arising out of man's

natural constitution, which not only makes him always and everywhere a religious being, but leads him to adopt and settle down upon some form of a religious creed, as the outward symbol or expression of his religious nature. Men, indeed, may be so ignorant as not to reflect at all on their relations to the Deity, and even reflecting men may be so completely engaged in other pursuits as to give no attention to the study of religion, and, consequently, may have no religious creed, and no religion except the vague instinct of nature; but still every educated man, who takes the time to reflect deeply on the subject, must feel the importance, the necessity of adopting some sort of religious belief. It was this feeling, that led an eminent philosopher of our own times, Sir Humphrey Davy, to utter the following just and beautiful sentiment: "I envy no endowment of mind or body in others, no gift of fortune, genius, wit or fancy; but if I should ask any one thing as most desirable and most likely to make me happy in life and happy in death, it would be a firm and settled religious belief." It may be further assumed, that every man in this Christian country, who takes the time to think much about religion, will adopt some form of Christian doctrine, which he professes to derive from, and to base upon, the Bible.

These things being assumed, the only point now before us is this; that his religion, whatever it is, his religious belief thus derived from the Bible, is a thing which must be studied in order to be known; which ought to be profoundly studied; which, as man is originally ignorant of it, and cannot know it intuitively, he must of necessity learn, precisely as he learns every thing else, viz: by hard study, by careful investigation, by the patient exercise of his intellectual faculties. The pursuit, the acquisition of religious truth is a part of man's duty, a part of man's moral probation on earth, and as such constitutes a part of his religion. His religion is therefore a lesson to be learned. Now the lesson may be hard to learn; it may require much time, much labour, much docility of mind, much submission of the will, much subjection of the feelings; but nevertheless it is a lesson which must be learned

by every man who forms a rational religious belief according to the Scriptures. Inasmuch then as the first great duty of man in religion is, to search after, and to find out the truth in order that he may believe it, and believing may reduce it to practice, the study of the Bible for this purpose is at once a religious duty, and the patient application of a man's intellectual powers to the formation of his religious belief is strictly a part of his religion. And thus Theology, which requires this study, which gives this religious knowledge and leads to the formation of this consistent religious creed may truly be called a part of religion itself.

Let there be no misunderstanding of the language here used. It is not maintained, that Theology alone is religion, or that the study of Theology constitutes the whole of religious duty. By no means; it is not the whole, but only a part; a part necessary to the right formation of a consistent creed; a part so essential, that a religion without it is a religion without knowledge, and consequently a religion without any solid basis. Whilst Theology alone then is not religion, there can be no true religion without Theology. It must be obvious to all, that the only correct view of religion is that which makes it correspond with the moral and intellectual constitution of man. Now just as every sound and rational human mind consists of two distinct classes of powers harmoniously combined, viz: the powers of knowing and of feeling, or the intellectual and the moral powers; so also every true and rational religion must consist of two parts corresponding with, and adapted to these powers, that is, a part to be studied, to be learned, to be known, addressed to the human understanding, and also a part to be felt, experienced and practised, adapted to the feelings of the human heart. These two, though distinct, are forever inseparable. There can be no religion without knowledge; and no religion without feeling; just as there can be no rational human soul, where either the intellectual or the moral faculties are wanting. A religion without feeling is a mere abstraction, a dead formality, a shadow without substance, a body without soul. And a religion

without knowledge is a religion without sense or reason, a superstructure without foundation, a chimera of the fancy, a gross and palpable superstition, a downright absurdity. But a religion of knowledge and feeling united, is the only true religion of the Bible and of human nature, the only religion worthy of the wisdom of God, and suited to the necessity of man.

Every man then, who pretends to have a consistent religion founded upon the Bible, must study the Bible in order to understand and embrace that religion; and the study of the Bible, for this purpose and in this way, is neither more nor less than the study of Theology.— Thus the study of Theology, viewed as that part of our religion which calls into exercise our intellectual powers, must at the same time be regarded as an important branch of education. For if, as we have seen, every reflecting man will find it necessary to form, for himself, some settled religious creed, and if the forming of this creed from the Bible requires much study, much knowledge of the Bible, and if this knowledge can be gained only as all other knowledge is gained, by the patient and continued application of the mind, then it is clear that Theology, which gives this knowledge and requires this study, ought to be considered as a part of religious education. And if it be thus a branch of education, fairly and legitimately, there is no reason why it should not be begun in early life, just as soon as any other branch of education. On the contrary, there is every reason, drawn both from the nature of man and the importance of the subject, why it should be begun with the first dawn of reason and conscience, and should grow with the growth and strengthen with the strength of the intellectual and moral powers.

It would be an easy task to show, that this view of religion is not new nor unauthorized; but that it is as old as the creation, and authorized from the beginning to the end of the Bible. The Bible throughout exhibits religion as knowledge, as known truth, as a thing which parents are commanded to teach their children, and their children's children, from generation to gen-

eration. It is true, that this is not the popular view of it in our country at present. The most prevalent opinion is that which makes religion merely a matter of feeling and impulse, having little or nothing to do with study and education. And consequently from our Common Schools up to our Universities, the Bible is seldom seen as a text book and the systematic study of Theology is almost unheard of. Nevertheless we all know that it is the study of the Bible and of Theology, during our early history, both in the family, in the school and in the college, which has made our country what it now is, the most religious, free and happy nation on the globe. "There is no country in the whole world," says De Tocqueville, "in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men, than in America; and there can be no greater proof of its utility, and of its conformity to human nature, than that its influence is most powerfully felt over the most enlightened and free nation of the earth."

And if the Bible has made our country what it is, it is the continued study of the Bible in the family, school and college, which must keep our country at what it is, in all time to come, or raise it still higher in the scale of religion. There is a strong tendency in the religion of our country to degenerate into animal excitement and popular enthusiasm. There is a disposition to discard every thing venerable and long established in religion simply because it is ancient; to make novelty the sole condition of truth, and to look upon the field of new discovery, as the only field which promises any good. Now we need something to correct, to counteract this extravagant and innovating spirit, which has already done its good and legitimate work, but which, if carried any farther in our country, will henceforth bring upon us nothing but evil. The surest and the best corrective for this tendency is to return to the good old maxims and usages of our ancestors. Let all our youth be thoroughly educated in religion as a branch of knowledge: let our men of science and literature study the Bible as a part of their learning and their religion: let all our ministers

of religion be fully versed in Theology, in its systematic treatises, in its literature, in its practical principles.

The diligent, the well read Theologian will always be a modest man, and being such, will not become an innovator in religion, a new founder of Theological systems, a reviver of long exploded heresies. For whilst he makes the Bible his only infallible rule of faith, and his own reason sole interpreter of its oracles, yielding no blind credence to any human oracle, he will not be ashamed to avail himself of the labours of all his predecessors. He will not therefore, fancying himself the only man in the world of intellect, study the Bible as if no one else had ever studied it before. He will not attempt new discoveries of what has never been unknown, nor parade before the world anew some crude system of the dark ages, which has been dead, buried and forgotten long ago. He will not vainly set about the work of setting the world aright on questions which all the world have been discussing for the last eighteen hundred years, and will, in all probability, discuss for eighteen hundred more. He will not go forth to enlighten the world on "free will, fate and providence," as the novice in Astronomy, alike ignorant of the known and the unknown, would go forth, with telescope in hand, to re-discover and teach the world afresh, that the planets differ from the fixed stars, and that the moon is larger than it seems to be. No, he will first modestly and patiently learn what is already known and what others can teach him, and then, if need be, he will push his inquiries into the unknown. He will see that truth, like the light of heaven, does not grow obsolete by age. He will find that a doctrine or system of doctrines, is none the worse for being old; that its age, so far from being an argument against it, is rather a reason in its favour. He will find too that the cause of the endless divisions, controversies, and heresies in the church, is not the study of Theology, but the want of it. He will see that a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of Theology would prevent these abuses; and that ignorance of the Bible, of Theology, of

history, the reputed mother of devotion, and the actual mother of all superstition, has been the prolific mother of all false systems in religion.

From all that has been said, it must be evident that the study of Theology ought to form an essential part of religious education; seeing there can be no rational religion without knowledge, and no religious knowledge without a Theology of some sort, and no Theology without study. Its importance might be inferred from a variety of considerations; but only one more can now be presented. There is one view, which transcends all others, and which cannot be passed over in silence, without doing injustice to our theme and falling infinitely below the true dignity of the subject.

Is Theology indeed a part, a necessary part of our religion? If so, then is the study of Theology as important, as unspeakably important to us and to all men, as our religion itself. If so, then does Theology outweigh all other knowledge together; then does the study of Theology as much transcend every other study, as the value of the undying spirit within us transcends the value of this material body, or as the duration of eternity transcends the duration of the present life. For it has been well said, that if religion is worth any thing to us, it is worth every thing; if it is worth a farthing, it is worth the Universe.

When therefore the study of Theology, which is the study of the Bible, comes to us indissolubly joined to our religion, it comes not merely as a matter for literary leisure, or scientific research: it comes not simply as an affair of the present life: it comes with a higher sanction and for a more glorious purpose: it does not indeed divest itself of the sober garb of science, and the flowing robes of literature, but over all these, it puts on the sacred vestments of religion, and speaks to us as a messenger from heaven. And it claims our attention not merely as scientific and literary men, placed here to watch the progress of events, but as immortal men placed here to prepare for our immortality, not merely as citizens of

earth but as citizens of the universe whose destiny begun here is linked with eternity, as beings who feel that,

“ 'Tis not the whole of life to live
Nor all of death to die.”

If, as we all believe, our present existence is but the germ of an endless existence, if our present life contains a future life, as the seed contains the future plant; then is it the first and highest duty of every rational and immortal man to receive that culture, and to gain that knowledge here, which shall prepare him to enter upon a more glorious career in the world to come. Now it is the study of Theology, of the Bible, of religion alone, which can furnish that knowledge, and that intellectual and moral culture, which shall fit the soul of man for this high and unending destiny. And we have reason to believe, that every expansion of the human faculties in the present life, every acquisition of truth which can be made here, will not be lost, but will be so much added to the felicity of all the good and true, who shall reach that high world above. As the pursuit of truth is a part of man's moral probation here; so the possession and enjoyment of truth will be part of man's everlasting reward and blessedness hereafter. Thus we have reason to believe, that the grand themes of which Theology treats, of God and his works, of his relations to man and to the Universe, the subjects which are now seen through a glass darkly, will furnish themes of study, of contemplation, of ecstatic delight to the enlarged and untrammelled and immortal spirit of man.

GENTLEMEN:—

Shall this be our portion, shall these be our studies in that better world of light and love? Whether they shall or not, depends upon the use we make of such studies now. We have the Bible. We are voyagers on life's great ocean. Some of our brethren and companions have been called to pass this ocean during the year which is now closed; and we may have to pass it soon. Our only chart and compass are in the Bible, and our final resting

place will depend on our use of them. We are like those described in the Course of Time, by one, who having gained the portals of the skies, thus looks back, and “justifies the ways of God to man”—

“They might have understood, the bard replied;
 They had the Bible. Hast thou ever heard
 Of such a book, its author God himself:
 Its subject God and man, salvation, life
 And death; eternal life, eternal death?
 Dread words! that have no end, no bound.
 Most wondrous book! bright candle of the Lord.
 Star of eternity! the only star
 By which the bark of man could navigate
 The sea of life, and gain the coast of bliss
 Securely: only star that rose on time,
 And on its dark and troubled billows, still,
 As generation, drifting swiftly by
 Succeeded generation, threw a ray
 Of heaven’s own light, and to the hills of God;
 The eternal hills, pointed the sinner’s eye.”

CATALOGUE OF ALUMNI.

ART. 2. Constitution of the Alumni Society of the University of Nashville.—“This Society shall consist of the Graduates, proper and honorary, of Cumberland College and of the University of Nashville, and of the Trustees and Faculty of the University.”

GRADUATES PROPER.

1813.

*Lemuel Donelson,
Ephraim H. Foster,
William Graham,
John H. Lewis,
*Constantine Perkins,
William Priestly,
*Benjamin B. Wills.

1814.

John Bell,
*John Fisher,
Robert C. Foster, 2d.

1815.

Leonard P. Cheatham,
William A. Cook,
James H. Foster,
Francis McGavock,
*George W. Owen,
William B. Turley,
Edward D. White.

1816.

*David Barrow,
*John O. Ewing.

* * * * *

1826.

Washington Barrow,
*George W. Cook,
Isaac H. Erwin,
Albert G. Ewing,
Orville Ewing,
Benjamin F. Foster,
Joseph W. Horton,
Ebenezer J. Hume,
William Park,
John H. Walker.

1827.

*Wilds K. Cooke,
David W. Dickinson,
Peter Donnan,

George L. Douglass,
*Davis Eastland,
Edwin H. Ewing,
George W. Foster,
Thomas J. Foster,
James Manning,
*Patrick D. Neilson,
Gideon J. Pillow,
Ebenezer J. Shields.

1828.

Thomas Bibb,
James Percy Brown,
William R. Caswell,
John Donelson,
*Nicholas P. Edmiston,
*Andrew J. Hoover,
Andrew Jackson, Jr.
*Josiah Nichol, Jr.
*Erasmus P. McDowell,
William Overton,
John D. Phelan,
William H. Pope,
Henry B. Shaw,
James M. Tilford,
Richard C. Whiteside,
Thomas C. Whiteside.

1829.

Andrew F. Goff,
*George W. Keeton,
*James B. McClure,
*Thomas B. Reed,
John Trimble,
John Wharton,
Samuel M. Witherspoon.

1830.

George W. Allen,
John W. Dancy,
James T. Leath,
Amos R. Manning,
*Charles L. Savage,

William R. Saunders,
Lewis F. Wilson,
*Valerius P. Winchester.
1831.

Robert W. Bedford,
James R. Burrus,
David M. Dancy,
Francis W. Dancy,
*Richard H. Hayes,
James F. Henderson,
Abraham R. Herron,
*Thomas T. Hogg,
*James D. Jennings,
Adrian V. S. Lindsley,
Abram Litton,
*Albert T. McGavock,
Albert T. McNeal,
Joseph W. Perkins,
Anson N. Robinson,
Richard Shepherd,
*John H. Sumner,
James L. Talbot,
*Thomas W. Talbot,
Wilkins F. Tannehill,
Morgan B. Vance,
James E. Wendel.
1832.

Oscar F. Bledsoe,
Joseph E. Craighend,
*Alphonso Gibbs,
John W. Goode,
Thomas M. Hardeman,
Isaac H. Hilliard,
Albert G. Perkins,
Marius R. Robinson,
David Shelton.
1833.

Charles R. Bedford,
George C. Childress,
John L. S. Davis,
William R. Elliston,
George Ely,
Andrew J. Groer,
Franklin Hardeman,
George W. Hoover,
Russel Houston,
Stephen B. Johns,
Charles B. Mitchel,
Alexander Porter,
Thomas T. Smiley,

*Abednogo Stephens,
Samuel P. Walker,
William Yerger,
1834.

John P. W. Brown,
William H. Carroll,
Robert S. Currin,
*Francis De Graffenreid,
Andrew Ewing,
Joseph B. Hadden,
Le Roy J. Halsey,
Joel A. Hayes,
Thomas J. Wharton,
Van Porkins Winder.
1835.

Robert A. Anderson,
William C. J. Burrus,
John J. Chandler,
Alexander Donelson,
Andrew H. Edgar,
Tolbert Fanning,
Quesncy D. Gibbs,
James Huling,
Alfred Hume,
Georgia W. Kelse,
Thomas J. Kilpatrick,
Alney W. Martin,
*James W. Netter,
*Thomas O'Riley,
John D. Perryman,
George M. Porter,
Richard Poston,
John Reid,
Lewis Troost,
Almarion W. Young.
1836.

Isaac F. Anderson,
Charles E. Boddie,
Richard W. H. Bostick,
Richard O. Currey,
Francis Dancy,
Samuel M. Edgar,
Thomas Fletcher,
Robert C. Foster 3d,
Nathaniel L. Lindsley,
*James H. Mancy,
William L. Murfree,
James C. Patterson,
Robert M. Porter,
William H. Stephens,

Samuel N. Stephens,
Josiah W. Stout,
William H. D. Wendel,
Joseph R. Williams.

1837.

Edward Bradshaw,
Hardy M. Burton,
Samuel E. Hogg,
John M. Lea,
Nicholas Long,
Charles B. Percy,
Edwin Polk,
Alfred Robb,
Lemuel Smith,
William H. Stevens,
George C. Weller,
George W. White.

1838.

Gilbert T. Abernathy,
Josiah N. Armstrong,
Charles M. Carroll,
Fielding N. Ewing,
William L. Foster,
Jesse W. Humo,
Hudson A. Kidd,
Willie J. Littlejohn,
Thomas H. Maney,
G. W. H. Marr,
Robert H. Marr,
Leonard H. Milliken,
Anthony C. Patterson,
William K. Poston,
Carlos G. Smith,
William J. Sykes,
Abram J. Walker,
William Walker,
William L. B. Vance.

1839.

Alfred H. Abernathy,
David Bailey,
John M. Bright,
Napoleon B. Burrow,
Algernon S. Currey,
Thomas Ewell,
William D. Gale,
Michael C. Goodlett,
George B. Goodwin,
Robert M. King,
John B. Lindsley,
George P. Massey,

Alexander F. Pugh,
John C. C. Sharp,
Samuel H. Stout,
*James M. Taylor,
Thomas C. Trimble,
Beverley H. Washington,
Arthur C. White,
William Williams, Jr.
Robert K. Woods.

1840.

Roger P. Atkinson,
John R. Bedford,
William R. Blackwell,
Rufus K. Cage,
Samuel W. Davis,
John R. Eakin,
Ephraim H. Foster Jr.
Turner S. Foster,
*Risley P. Lawrence,
Benjamin W. McCulloch,
Moses W. McKnight,
Andrew J. McLemore,
John Overton,
Arthur S. Rucks,
James D. Todd,
George W. Winchester.

1841.

Nathan Adams,
Jasper R. Ashworth,
William N. Bilbo,
Charles Bosley,
John E. Davis,
Robert J. Farquharson,
William S. Glass,
John A. Goodlett,
William H. Gordon,
John H. Huggins,
James H. Mallory,
John L. McEwen,
John S. Minor,
William G. McKnight,
William H. Muse,
Joseph Norvell Jr.
Alexander J. Porter,
Edward C. Robb,
Joseph V. Smith,
J. Hugh Smith,
Lucian M. Temple,
William E. Watkins,
John C. Wobb.

GRADUATES HONORARY.

1813.

Rev. William Sinclair.

* * * * *

1826.

*Samuel B. Black, A. M.

Rev. Philip S. Fall, A. M.

Rev. Robert Paine, A. M.

Levi D. Ring, A. M.

*Moses Stevens, A. M.

William L. Williford,

*Hon. John Haywood, LL. D.

*Hon. John Overton, LL. D.

Rev. Isaac Anderson, D. D.

Rev. Duncan Brown, D. D.

1827.

Hon. Aaron V. Brown, A. M.

Hon. William E. Kennedy, A. M.

Hon. Francois X. Martin, LL. D.

Rev. Joshua Soule, D. D.

1828.

*Thomas A. Duncan, A. M.

Gen. Edmund P. Gaines, A. M.

*David M. Saunders, A. M.

Wilkins Tannehill, A. M.

*John Thomson, A. M.

T. Vaughan, A. B. & A. M. in '31.

Dr. Lunsford P. Yandell, A. M.

1829.

Asbury M. Coffey, A. M.

James G. Martin, A. M.

*

1831.

Rev. John Chilton, A. M.

*William G. Hunt, A. M.

1832.

Thomas J. Lacy, A. M.

David Craighead, A. M.

Henry A. Rutledge, A. M.

*

1834.

John M. Bass, A. M.

John P. Erwin, A. M.

Allen A. Hall, A. M.

Charles Ready, A. M.

Rev. John T. Edgar, D. D.

Rev. George Weller, D. D.

Thos. Murray, LL. D., Scotland.

1835.

Dr. Thomas R. Jennings, A. M.

James C. Luttrell, A. M.

James H. Thomas, A. M.

*Richard Winn.

* * *

1839.

Rev. Robert B. C. Howell, A. M.

1840.

Rev. Peter Crawford, A. M.

Eben L. Crocker, A. M.

1841.

Hon. Edmund Dillahunty, A. M.

Deceased Alumni are denoted by stars.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

PHILIP LINDSLEY, President of the University, and *ex-officio*
President of the Board. Elected in 1824.

ROBERT C. FOSTER, Esq.

FELIX ROBERTSON, M. D.

ELIHU S. HALL, Esq.

Hon. EPHRAIM H. FOSTER,

Hon. JOHN BELL,

JAMES OVERTON, M. D.

FRANCIS B. FOGG, Esq.

LEONARD P. CHEATHAM, Esq.

ANDREW JACKSON, LL. D. Ex-President of U. S. A.

BOYD M'NAIRY, M. D.

THOMAS WASHINGTON, Esq.

Hon. GEORGE W. CAMPBELL,

HENRY M. RUTLEDGE, Esq.,

DAVID CRAIGHEAD, Esq.

JOHN L. HADLEY, M. D.

JOSEPH W. HORTON, Esq.

JOHN M. BASS, Esq.

RETURN J. MEIGS, Esq.

ROBERT H. M'EWEN, Esq.,

EDWIN H. EWING, Esq.

JOHN TRIMBLE, Esq.

THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE, for the time being, is *ex-officio* a
member of the Board.

FACULTY OF ARTS.

PHILIP LINDSLEY, D. D. *President.*

GERARD TROOST, M. D. *Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy and
Geology.*

JAMES HAMILTON, A. M. *Professor of Mathematics and Natural
Philosophy.*

NATHANIEL CROSS, A. M. *Professor of Ancient Languages.*

ALEXANDER S. VILLEPLAIT, A. M. *Professor of Modern Languages.*

J. H. PATTON, A. B., *Senior Tutor.*

_____ *Junior Tutor.*

TO THE ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE.

The ALUMNI SOCIETY of the University of Nashville, was formed the 2d of February 1830, and consists of the "Graduates, proper and honorary, of Cumberland College and the University of Nashville and of the Trustees and Faculty of the University." The design of the Association, as set forth in the Minutes of its first meeting, was "to promote the interests of the University of Nashville, and to further the cause of literature in general;" and one of the first Resolutions adopted by the Society makes it the duty of its members "to study to promote a sound elementary, scientific and literary education."

To this end the Constitution directs that an Oration shall be delivered at each annual meeting (the first Tuesday in October,) by an Alumnus previously elected. At eight of the twelve Anniversaries that have occurred since the formation of the Society, this duty has been discharged with distinguished ability; at the other four, the orators, selected for the occasion, declined or failed to fulfill their appointments.

Addresses have been delivered as follows:

In 1830, By John Bell.

In 1831, No address was delivered.

In 1832, No address.

In 1833, By Washington Barrow.

In 1834, By Edwin H. Ewing.

In 1835, By Valerius P. Winchester.

In 1836, By Ebenezer J. Shields.

In 1837, No address.

In 1838, By Abednego Stephens.

In 1839, No address.

In 1840, By Thomas T. Smiley.

In 1841, By Le Roy J. Halsey.

At the semi-annual meeting of the Society, held in the month of April 1834, the number of the Alumni, amounting at that time to upwards of one hundred, was deemed sufficiently large to demand from them some public demonstration of attachment to their Alma Mater, and to justify a joint effort to promote its permanent prosperity. A committee was accordingly appointed to take the subject into consideration, to devise some plan of action and report the same to the Society at its next annual meeting.

At the appointed time, the committee, in a report of considerable length and of much interest, brought to the notice of the Society, the noble efforts, which had then recently been crowned with success, of the Alumni of Yale College in Connecticut and of Amherst College in Massachusetts, the former of whom had evinced their grateful attachment to their Alma Mater in the free-will offering of \$100,000, and the latter to theirs in the sum of \$25,000. The committee considered this example as worthy of imitation and earnestly recommended that an effort should be immediately made to raise the sum of \$10,000 to

endow a Professorship of Modern Languages in the University of Nashville. "Less than this sum," it was urged, "would not consist with the liberal feelings of the bestowers of the bounty, or with the dignity of the Institution proposed to be benefited."

This recommendation was received and adopted with great unanimity by the few that were present at the meeting, several of whom pledged themselves to raise each the sum of \$100, and subsequently redeemed their pledges. A circular letter was also prepared, and addressed to the absent Alumni, containing the proceedings of the Society, and inviting their co-operation in the endowment of the contemplated Professorship. The number of the regular Alumni at this time, was reported to be one hundred and twenty-nine, and it was hoped that these, with the aid of the honorary members of the Society and other friends of the University, would have succeeded in the course of the then ensuing year in securing the required sum. The result proved, however, that the expectations of the friends of the measure were too sanguine.

In April 1837, the Society directed, that the portion of the fund, then on hand, should be invested in stock of the Tennessee Marine and Fire Insurance Company, which at that time paid from 40 to 50 per cent. per annum. Twenty-Five shares, of one hundred dollars each, on which one thousand dollars had been paid in, were accordingly purchased for nine hundred dollars. Although the dividends on the stock have greatly diminished since the investment was first made, owing to the pressure of the times and other causes, the \$900 have nevertheless in four years and a half increased to \$1450—equivalent to 13½ per cent. per annum on the amount originally invested.

This fund has also been considerably augmented, by legacies from two deceased Alumni—Nicholas P. Edmiston and John H. Sumner, both of Davidson County, Tenn. These lamented young gentlemen, whose worth will be remembered by their classmates and associates, bequeathed to the Society, each \$500, and thus evinced their attachment to their Alma Mater and to the cause of letters, in the solemn and honest hour, when they were setting their house in order and preparing to appear at the bar of their Judge. Many, the recipients of their bounty, will rise up in future years and call them blessed. Nor should the names of Winchester and McDowell, be passed over in this connexion, both of whom, cut down as they were in early youth, with bright prospects of usefulness and distinction opening before them, have nevertheless enrolled their names conspicuously among the friends and benefactors of their Foster Mother.

The Sumner legacy has been received entire; from the Edmiston legacy, which was residuary, only \$180 have been realized. Other sums have lately been contributed by individual Alumni, so that the entire fund now amounts to \$2318,87. The portion of this sum, not invested in Insurance stock, viz: \$868,87, is securely loaned at legal interest. As an additional means of securing this fund, it is proper to state, that at the late Anniversary, a committee was appointed to apply in the name of the Society for an act of Incorporation.

At a meeting of the Alumni Society, held April 1st 1835, the enterprise not having succeeded as had been expected, it was supposed

that some of its friends, becoming discouraged, might relax their efforts. It was therefore Resolved, "That it is not the intention of this Society, at any time, to abandon the design of establishing a Professorship of Modern Languages in the University of Nashville." This resolution has been, and, it is believed, will be rigidly adhered to, till the object contemplated is fully achieved.

The Alumni, therefore, to each of whom a copy of this appeal will be addressed, are respectfully and urgently solicited to take up this, their own enterprise, anew, and not to relax their efforts until it is consummated.

By referring to the Catalogue prefixed, it will be seen that the number of Alumni proper, has doubled since the enterprise was first engaged in, and nearly a fourth part of the required fund has been obtained; the balance (\$7,681 13,) would therefore require from the Alumni now living, a contribution of less than \$35 each. This quota, it is believed, can be contributed by the majority without inconvenience, and by the rest may be easily obtained from the friends of education in their respective neighborhoods. It will be encouraging, moreover, to learn, that inquiry has lately been made as to the condition of the fund, and a willingness expressed to contribute the quota originally assigned to each member, viz: \$100.

The Alumni, therefore, proper and honorary, and all other friends of education, that may be disposed to give any sum to the proposed object, will please forward it to the Rev. Philip Lindsley, D. D. Receiver, or to A. V. S. Lindsley Esq. Treasurer of the Society.

NATH'L. CROSS, *President*

Of the Alumni Society of the University of Nashville.

October, 1841.

