rationalism and unbelief; (2) a sentimental doctrine of divine love which obscures the sterner teachings of the Bible and minimizes the sense of personal responsibility for wrong-doing; (3) serious modification of historic views concerning the authority and the interpretation of the Scriptures, especially in reference to the incarnation, sin, redemption, and final destiny; (4) a somewhat inconsistent adoption of necessarian evolution joined with a recognition of God as Creator and ruler; (5) a tendency to regard Christ as a natural product.

In answer to the claim that the new theology is Edwardean, Dr. Boardman frankly admits that Edwards was "a thorough idealist, but was obliged to use language to be interpreted in accord with a different philosophy, so that his meaning is not always clear." Still it is maintained that Edwards' views of God's glory as the "last end in creation," of sin and redemption, and of grace, were eminently conservative, and deny beforehand the main positions of the "new theology."

BENJAMIN O. TRUE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

GESCHICHTE UND KRITIK DER NEUEREN THEOLOGIE, insbesondere der systematischen, seit Schleiermacher. Von FR. H. R. VON FRANK, † Geheimrath und Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers herausgegeben von P. Schaarschmidt, Pastor in Zeschwitz bei Leipzig. Dritte revid., mit einem Beitrag über die Frank'sche Theologie von Professor D. Seeberg vermehrte Auflage. Mit dem Bildniss des Verfassers. Erlangen und Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1899. Pp. 369. M. 6.25.

WE have here the *Grundstock* of a history of modern theology which Frank, should he live, intended to write. The manuscript, as he left it, gives his views to the public in an intelligible manner. The book is designed to be a "guide to the pilgrim along the path both of scientific theological knowledge and of that knowledge of God which accrues to faith." The introduction is devoted to the preconditions of entrance into modern theology, and, owing to its excellent discussion of method, reformation and subjectivism, the time of orthodoxy, and the historic relation between theology and philosophy, is an important piece of work. The first two chapters are given to the theology of Schleiermacher, and the theology dependent upon him. The

third is concerned with the theology determined by modern (especially monistic) philosophy; the fourth, with the theology allied again to the ecclesiastical faith. The last chapter reviews the most recent movements in the region of theology, criticising severely the Ritschlians.

Not the least important part of the book is Professor Seeberg's lecture (added in this edition) on "Die Theologie Frank's in ihren Grundzügen."

These lectures—for such they originally were—are brilliant and popular in style, suggestive for substance; but, inasmuch as all is judged from the Frankian point of view, lack much in scientific impartiality and objectivity.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY: Critical and Constructive. An Exposition and an Estimate. By ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A. (Oxon.), B.D. (Glasgow). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899. Pp. xxvii + 400. \$3, *net*.

THIS book contains the author's recent lectures in Mansfield College, Oxford, but "revised, corrected, expanded, . . . improved," and now published "in the hope that the wider public of theological readers may accord his labors the same generous recognition as was given by the students there." The book is not intended for theological scholars, but for students who do not know German very well; nor is it intended to be an exhaustive or a systematic account of the Ritschlian theology; rather, attention is concentrated on the few distinctive features and dominant factors of this theological movement. The book is limited to a study of the works of the recognized leaders of the school, Ritschl (mainly), Hermann, Kaftan, and Harnack.¹ As far as possible, the writer has allowed Ritschl and his followers to speak for themselves, presenting their own conclusions in their own way. Garvie characterizes his own spirit as follows: "As the writer is convinced that English theological thought can only gain by the hospitable entertainment of the religious teaching of other lands, and as the Ritschlian school has as yet not received a cordial welcome in Britain, he has sought to present this subject in as generous and sympathetic a spirit as he can," striving at the same time to recognize

¹ It is to be noted that critics do not relate Schultz very closely with this tendency, on the ground that he is a Schleiermacherite.