

a system of thought, that it is and must continue negative in any and every Christian land, that it has no power but to paralyze and refrigerate, that it is dangerous not as an organization but only as a leaven in evangelical ranks.

The book is persuasive and well written, and one who wishes to know the fundamental beliefs of the Unitarians will find this work a valuable one.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

**The Theology of Schleiermacher:** A Condensed Presentation of His Chief Work, "The Christian Faith." By George Cross. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 344 Pages, \$1.65, postpaid.

No one can understand modern theological movements who is without a knowledge of Schleiermacher's system of teaching. Oman has given us a translation of Schleiermacher's "Speeches on Religion," in which one finds presented with much diffuseness, and yet in an engaging manner, Schleiermacher's fundamental religious and philosophic conceptions. Hitherto, however, Schleiermacher's development of his fundamental views into a dogmatic system in his monumental work, "The Christian Faith," has remained inaccessible to those unacquainted with the German language. Since Schleiermacher is today a very vital force in theology and influential in manifold ways Professor Cross has rendered a most timely and valuable service in giving to the general reader the translation in condensed form of Schleiermacher's system of theology.

There is first a sketch of Schleiermacher's life, covering 63 pages. This is followed by a section, from page 67 to page 113, on Schleiermacher's relation to earlier Protestantism. In the sketch of the life the influence of the Moravians upon Schleiermacher's development is quite properly emphasized. In fact, Schleiermacher drew from his Moravian teachers and environment during an important period, the most vital elements of his Christianity. In the section on Schleiermacher's relation to earlier Protestantism it is made clear that Schleiermacher does not belong among theologians to the line of succession produced by the prevalent scholastic Protestantism, but rather to that less conspicuous but far more significant and spiritual line which

arose out of the Pietistic and Anabaptist movement with its emphasis upon the direct relation of the soul to God and the inner life of the spirit.

Schleiermacher's relation to the thought of his time was very close, however, since his conception of religion as the feeling of absolute dependence was formulated in direct antithesis to the barren rationalism of the period. Protestantism in Germany had in large measure degenerated from its early spiritual energy into the unfruitful confessional state church in which the emphasis had been transferred from the spiritual life to the intellectual formulation of truth. At the same time the effort of reason to set up systems of natural religion had proven equally barren of practical results. Schleiermacher restored religion to the heart and showed its fundamental place in the life of man and reversed the conceptions of dogmatics. Henceforth doctrines are to be the expression of religion primarily and not systems to be imposed by institutional churches or other forms of ecclesiastical authority.

Schleiermacher was one of the greatest of systematic theologians if the consistent application in a large way of a single great conception may be taken as a criterion of greatness. His constructive power was remarkable, and his influence on theological thought has in large measure been due to the thorough-going manner in which he organized the material of theology around his fundamental conception. The type of thought which he represents found able advocates in the early centuries in Clement of Alexandria and other Greek theologians, but none of them dealt in so systematic a manner with the subject nor did any of them work with Schleiermacher's conception of religion. The Ritschlian school are the modern successors of Schleiermacher, broadly speaking. Yet his influence is felt in many ways apart from the Ritschlians.

Professor Cross in a closing section (pp. 297-334) gives an estimate of Schleiermacher which is suggestive and valuable. He points out the fragmentary and inadequate conception of religion set forth by Schleiermacher, and insists that religion includes, and must include, all the elements of our spiritual nature, thought

and will as well as feeling. Most of the replies which Professor Cross gives to the objections to Schleiermacher's views are forceful and strong although not always convincing. The charge of subjectivism which is made and justly made against Schleiermacher, Professor Cross seeks to meet by calling attention to Schleiermacher's insistence upon "the communion-forming power of the Christian faith." Through this it is held a normative character is given to faith which saves it from individualism and subjectivism. But this scarcely meets the objection from the Christian standpoint, although it helps so long as religion is conceived of quite generally and without particular regard to Christianity. And this suggests what, to the reviewer, is the fundamental criticism of Schleiermacher, viz., his vain attempt to combine Christianity with an essentially pantheistic fundamental conception. Schleiermacher's formal definition of religion as the feeling of absolute dependence, as well as his exposition of the definition in the "Speeches" and in "The Christian Faith," clearly show the pantheistic character of his thought. The denials of this character, when made, are all based on incongruous elements which Schleiermacher incorporated into his fundamental principle. Only by reconstructing his fundamental conception of religion could Schleiermacher have secured for Christianity a necessary and natural place in his scheme of thought. His Moravian training and deep spiritual life saved him from the intellectualism of his times and made him essentially Christian in his practical religious life. But in order to obtain a theoretical vindication of religion he resorted to an inherently non-Christian point of view. The result is that everywhere in his writings we observe a struggle between his Christianity and his pantheism. Schleiermacher, nevertheless, rendered a most signal service to the cause of religion and of Christianity in that he called the cultured classes of his day back from a barren intellectualism to a truly inward and essential conception of religion. We greatly rejoice in the publication of this translation and exposition of Schleiermacher by Professor Cross. His work has been admirably done and the volume will no doubt find a wide circle of readers among thoughtful ministers and laymen.

E. Y. MULLINS.