
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

dominions of the Greek empire, and as having been eventually defeated by the aid of their predecessors, relatives and ancient enemies, the Petshenegians.

For the advantage of students of Turkish history, I transcribe a passage on the "First Appearance of Ottoman Turks" from Lane Poole's new "History of Turkey," in the "Story of the Nations" series (Fisher Unwin), which, if correct, would seem to indicate a still closer relationship between the Ottoman and Cumanian Turks than is usually supposed to have existed:

> The thirteenth century had half run its course when Kay Kubad, the Seljuk Sultan of Iconium, was one day hard beset near Angora by a Mongol army. The enemy was rapidly gaining the mastery, when suddenly the fortune of the day was reversed. A small body of unknown horsemen charged upon the foe, and victory declared for the Seljuks. . . . Estoghrul, the son of Sulijman, a member of the *Oghuz* family of Turks, which the Mongol avalanche had dislodged from their old camping-grounds in Khorasan . . . was journeying from the Euphrates banks . . . to Anatolia, when he unexpectedly came upon the battle-field of Angora. . . . He led his four hundred riders pell-mell into the fray, and won the day.
>
> Kay Kubad rewarded his opportune ally, who thus planted his foot in Asia Minor, which has been under the sway of his descendants almost from that hour.

A. H. Wratislaw.

90, Manor Road,
Stoke Newington.

Review.

History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century. By F. Lichtenberger, Dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris. Translated and edited by W. Hastie, B.D., Examiner in Theology, University of Edinburgh. T. and T. Clark, 1889; pp. xxxix., 629.

This is a useful work, well worth translating; and the translator has done his work well. He has not only given us a very readable version of an instructive original, but has augmented its instructiveness by an explanatory preface, and by valuable additions to the bibliographical notes, which enhance the usefulness of the original.

We are now very far removed from the time when Dr. Tatham, Rector of Lincoln College, preached his famous sermon of two hours and a half before the University of Oxford, in defence of the spurious passage about the heavenly witnesses in 1 John v. 7. In this discourse (which is said to have been fatal to one Head of House, who was made ill by the long sitting, and never recovered), the preacher in his enthusiasm wished "all Jarman (German) critics at the bottom of the Jarman Ocean." That eccentric wish, which was perhaps only meant to apply to their works, and not to the critics themselves, was uttered in the University pulpit nearly ninety years ago; and not even the late Dean of Chichester would have gone quite so far as that. But there are still a considerable number of people to whom "German criticism" is a sound which inspires them with suspicion, if not with horror; and there are very many more who, without sharing these prejudices, are, nevertheless, altogether at sea as to

what has been done by German scholars in the sphere of theology during the present century, and to whom nine out of ten leading names are names and nothing more, conveying no meaning as to the tendencies, sympathies or achievements of the persons who bore them. All those who desire information respecting the principal representatives of the leading schools of religious thought in Germany during the last ninety years will do well to procure this volume. The book which perhaps comes nearest to it (although only to a limited extent do they cover the same ground) is Dr. A. S. Farrar's "Bampton Lectures." The present volume would usefully follow as a supplement to the other.

It is not only right that we should get rid of our prejudices respecting German theology; it is also true that we can afford to do so. It is no mere empty boast set to the flattering tune of "Rule, Britannia"; it is sober and serious fact, that—thanks to the labours of men like Lightfoot, Hort, Salmon, Westcott and others—the progress of theological learning in England during the last five-and-thirty years has a great deal more than equalled the progress made in Germany during the same period. It is true that England at the beginning of this period had much more to learn than Germany; but it is also true that she had much less to unlearn.

M. Lichtenberger has divided his work into two parts, nearly equal as regards material, although not as regards time. The first half is from Schleiermacher to Strauss, and ends about 1835. The second half is from Strauss to the present time. Slight sketches of the predecessors of Schleiermacher, both in philosophy and theology, are given, and rightly; for without them Schleiermacher could hardly be placed in his proper position. But is it not a little misleading to place De Wette among them? True that De Wette was born ten or twelve years before Schleiermacher; yet he outlived him by a still longer period; and, as the author himself tells us, "what acted most powerfully on his development was the sermons of Schleiermacher, which he had heard at Berlin." That was by no means a solitary instance of the younger man moulding the older. No less than 120 pages out of a total of 629 are given to Schleiermacher. This seems to be out of all true proportion, when only ten pages are given De Wette, "the Nathanael of modern theology," and only eighteen to Neander. M. Lichtenberger says of the former, that "the purity of his character, the sincerity of his convictions, and the scrupulous conscientiousness which he exhibited in his work . . . . recommend him to our attention as in some sort *the ideal type of the German theologian*." While of Neander, the author of the famous saying, *Pectus est quod facit theologum*, we are told that he corrects and completes his master; that what distinguishes him is a patient attention to facts, as distinct from bold and shifting speculation, and that "the research and the affectionate respect devoted to every individual feature which history reveals to us, joined to great largeness of spirit and to a true toleration, are the chief characteristics" of his great work on the history of the Church. It "is permeated throughout with the Christian spirit," as Neander himself was. And hence, "although of a feeble and sickly constitution, Neander was able to exercise an immense influence as a writer and as a professor. He has been a blessing to many souls." Bishop Lightfoot in this country and Dr. Schaff in America have avowed their great obligations to Neander, especially in the study of ecclesiastical history. Never to have worked with the help of De Wette's acute criticism and impartial judgment is a serious loss. Never to have been illuminated and instructed by Neander is a loss still more serious. Whereas of the writings of Schleiermacher one might almost ask the question, which Burke a century ago asked respecting the writings of the Deists, "Who ever reads them now?" He is best known in England by

his work on St. Luke's Gospel, which Thirlwall translated and published anonymously in 1825. It was dedicated to De Wette, and is now practically obsolete. Here, as in much else that he wrote, his mistakes have proved instructive. But now that we have reached sounder conclusions, it is somewhat dreary work to go back to the crude guesses which helped us to them. We could well have spared fifty pages of the account of Schleiermacher's flounderings, in order to have more complete accounts of those who were able to profit both by the inspiration and the warning afforded by his career. For certainly the warning is there as well as the inspiration. In the first of his Monologues he says, "Within myself I feel myself free; I am conscious of my creative power. What a consolation is it to feel myself liberated from all the unfavourable circumstances which check or chain my activity in the world! Thus *the contemplation of myself never leaves me sad!* Never do I give way to lamentation over my broken will and my abortive resolutions, like those who are unable to enter into themselves, and who recognise themselves only in their isolated and external actions." And in the second Monologue we find the explanation of this. "Since I found in myself the consciousness of humanity, I have never lost myself. *What men commonly call conscience I know it no more!* No feeling condemns me, none any longer forewarns me. I bear in myself, uninterruptedly and without effort, the consciousness of the whole of humanity." He died February 12th, 1834. Hegel had died three years before. And it was believed that through the efforts of the disciples of both something like a lasting peace had been effected between philosophy and religion, science and faith.

The year after Schleiermacher's death Strauss published his "Life of Jesus,"[1] and probably no book published in the present century has made so profound a sensation. It was "like a thunderbolt from a clear sky, dissipating the illusion of a reconciliation between science and faith. It marks the coming in of a new school, which, with singular ardour and varied chances of success, undertakes the struggle against orthodoxy now given up by rationalism. It is in the name of historical criticism that this school professes to storm the old theological system by concentrating its attacks upon its very foundations, the Bible, the New Testament, the Apostolic Christianity, the Epistles of St. Paul, the four Gospels, and the Life of Jesus."

Some of the disciples of Schleiermacher had undertaken to show that legend and myth occupy an important position in the Old Testament. Strauss, who had attended some of Schleiermacher's lectures at Berlin, undertook to show that this is equally true of the New. The miraculous elements in the Gospel narrative are myths, which are simply the reflexion of the belief in the supernatural which animated the first Christians. These myths are to be explained as the outcome of two facts: the craving for the appearance of the Messiah, and the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Popular imagination invented details in confirmation of this belief.

How absolutely untenable this position is, has been shown again and again, and from different points of view. Chronology alone is fatal to it. Between the death of Jesus and the writing of St. Paul's four impregnable Epistles there is not sufficient time for the growth of myths so prodigious. But at the time Strauss was answered chiefly with wrath and abuse; and the feebleness of the attempts at critical replies was strong

[1] Our author is not quite correct in his chronology. He says: "Strauss completed his Tübingen studies by a visit to Berlin. Hegel had just died, but Schleiermacher was still lecturing, and Strauss followed his prelections with great interest. On his return to the south in 1830," etc. Strauss did not go to Berlin till October, 1831. He saw Hegel, and began to attend his lectures.

evidence that some such shock as this was needed in order to place the Christian faith upon a scientific, historical basis. We have been led to discard some things which are untenable, and to make critically secure many things which are fundamental, by the thoroughness of the attack led by Strauss and his allies. One of the most telling arguments against his original position has been furnished by Strauss himself in his last work, "The Old Faith and the New," published in 1872, two years before his death. It is his attempt at constructing something in place of what he had (for himself) destroyed. If such melancholy materialism is the alternative which reason offers to those who reject revelation, then, seeing that neither side can demonstrate its position, reason itself will approve our choosing that alternative which gives us hope rather than despair. M. Lichtenberger says with just enthusiasm: "We admit that these truths of the Gospel have never seemed to our eyes in stronger and purer splendour, never have they been seen by us surrounded with more convincing certainty, and we have never blessed God more for having revealed them to us, than after the reading of Strauss's last book. We thank him for the sincerity of his confessions."

The second half of the volume is somewhat sketchy. Even F. C. Baur receives no more than twelve pages, and a great many more are disposed of in a page or less. Some of the names might have been omitted altogether without much loss; but it seems strange that Ewald should be dismissed with three pages. The man who for fifty years was one of the first Orientalists in Europe, and whose vigorous and independent teaching, in spite of gross eccentricities, has been a quickening power to scores of the leading scholars outside Germany, and hundreds more in his own country, deserves something more than this meagre description. And it is with simple astonishment that one finds that his "History of the People of Israel" is passed over absolutely without notice, excepting that the title of it is given in a list of his principal works in a footnote. The translator here appears to fall asleep also. He makes no attempt to supplement his author, and does not even inform the reader that the "Geschichte des Volkes Israel" has been translated into English.

Rothe, as the most eminent representative of what is called "the School of Conciliation," receives more adequate treatment. The "mediating theology" (*Vermittlungs-theologie*) has been much laughed at and caricatured, but it has played an important part in the history of religious thought, and M. Lichtenberger has done well to devote a chapter to it. Then we have a chapter on the "New Liberal Schools" from Hase, the Nestor of liberal Lutheranism, who died quite recently at the ripe old age of eighty-nine, to Harnack, Holtzman, Hausrath, and Hitzig. And the work ends with sections on Roman Catholic Theology and on the Old Catholics. Frohschammer is placed among the former. But he had broken with Rome before he rejected the Vatican Decrees. He would need, and perhaps would like, a section all to himself.

The last name, which receives more than a few lines, is that of Döllinger. What is said of him is miserably inadequate; but there is no need to supplement it here. Readers of THE CHURCHMAN are not without information on the subject, and the periodicals of Europe have supplied much material during the last few months. Therefore M. Lichtenberger's shortcomings are the less to be lamented. What *is* said lacks sympathy, and even justice. But this defect detracts but little from the value of a really instructive and interesting work.

ALFRED PLUMMER.