

have their hearts in the world and, though well-instructed in the letter of Christian truth, have yet to react on the religious influences brought to bear upon them from without, and to make a personal decision for the Saviour.

In the end of his book Monsieur Bois discusses with great fulness the question whether a revival can be expected to accompany the teaching of the more modern theology which he represents; and then it comes out that in the French Church there is a section which not only holds by a very old type of theology, but claims that it is only under such teaching as its own that revivals ever develop themselves. With so much feeling does the author here write as to create the impression that he has been himself the victim of some reproach as an innovator, if not a heretic; so that, as he somewhere remarks, there are many 'new theologies.' Monsieur Bois would hardly pass by such a name in this country; unless it were for the vehemence with which he asserts a number of negatives in face of the older school. He claims Professor Drummond as an evangelist of his own type of belief; but Drummond was too 'canny' a Scot to deal extensively in theological negatives, emphasizing always the positive side of his message.

There is no other Church in Christendom at present that more attracts the attention of thoughtful observers than the one to which Monsieur Bois belongs. It is happy in having among its teachers a man of so high a type—so warm in his evangelical sympathies and yet, at the same time, such a loyal servant of science and of truth—and it is profoundly to be hoped that, at the present crisis in her history, the Reformed Church of France may enjoy such an outpouring of the Spirit of God as Monsieur Bois and others like-minded among her members are longing for.

JAMES STALKER.

Aberdeen.

German Christology.¹

THIS is an exceptionally clear, terse, and informing survey of German Christology in the nineteenth-century, to which the author has added a brief exposition of the lines on which he thinks the

¹ *Die Christologie seit Schleiermacher, ihre Geschichte und ihre Begründung.* Von Stadtpfarrer Lic. Dr. S. Faut. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1907. Pp. viii, 102.

modern view of Christ ought to shape itself. Dorner points out that the doctrine of Christ's Person has counted for more in theology from 1800 on than at any time since the Council of Chalcedon. The modern period, therefore, merits the closest scrutiny, and the student may be assured that with Faut as guide he will really be taken to the important places, and have their historical significance appraised justly. The two things Faut aims at proving are these. First, that all recent schools of theology, orthodox, liberal, and mediating alike, have been too apt to take as their point of departure in Christology the decisions of the Ancient Church, thus entangling themselves needlessly in initial difficulties of a speculative kind, whereas Schleiermacher and Ritschl give us the right lead by setting out from the historic Jesus and His import for saving faith; secondly, that faith in Christ is an absolutely essential part of Christianity, for which the so-called 'Jesus religion' cannot possibly be admitted as a substitute. As for the second point, it may strike us as odd that it should even require to be argued. What interest can a theory which repudiates faith in Christ have in claiming to represent the Christian religion? To paraphrase the words of Mr. Arthur Balfour in another context, who would pay the slightest attention to this modern upstart if it did not force itself into the retinue of historic Christianity, assume its livery, and claim, as the true heir of the ages, to represent its authority and to speak with its voice? Of itself it is nothing. It neither ministers to the needs of the Church of God, nor does it satisfy our reason. As for the first point, we can have no motive for refusing to go along with Faut in giving the formulas of Chalcedon a subordinate, not a supreme place. It can never be wrong to start with the New Testament, least of all when trying to understand our Lord.

It is scarcely needful that the details of the book should be recounted. The speculative Christology of the Hegelian school, Biedermann's distinction between the redeeming principle and the historic Jesus, Dorner's impressive attempt to combine faith and metaphysics, the work of renovation, as Faut regards it, begun by Schleiermacher, and carried far towards completion by Ritschl; all these divisions of the subject are treated carefully and with real knowledge. A brief passage on the Kenoticists is less satisfactory.

Faut's criticisms of Thomasius and Gess may be quite valid; but he fails to notice that the basal idea which they were trying to get expressed has roots—a good many of them—in the New Testament itself. It is not uncommon to depreciate the Kenotic conception as mythology; but as long as the Christian mind is convinced of two things, that Christ lived in the Godhead before He was born at Bethlehem, and that His life after Bethlehem was genuinely human, so long Kenoticism, as a general hypothesis, will keep its influence, and will deserve to keep it.

Faut's independent statement is coloured, more rather than less, by a tendency to simple theological positivism. These are the facts, he would say, as to what faith actually feels Christ to be, but no theory of them can be given; and that which is impossible cannot be necessary. What Christ must always mean to the believing consciousness he sees clearly enough, and states it unambiguously. 'As the ground of our salvation, He is the object of our faith; we believe in Him, not as we believe in a man or a prophet, but as we believe in God.' Yet on the next page he declines to follow Kaftan in affirming, *doctrinally*, the divinity of Christ. That, he fears, would make the historic Jesus unintelligible, and might impair the truth of monotheism. One may suggest that if faith speaks thus unequivocally as to Christ's true place, we must even take our courage in both hands and insist on Dogmatic making room for what faith has to say. H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

A Moravian Teacher of the New School.¹

NOT the least remarkable feature in this remarkable work is that it comes from a tutor in a Moravian theological seminary. It is written on Ritschlian lines, although that name does not occur in the work. The centring of God's revelation of Himself to man in the person of Jesus, which is the thesis of the book, is a fundamental principle of the Ritschlian school. Herr Steinmann's treatise is one of remarkable originality and strength. Its negative and positive sides alike are reasoned out

¹ *Die geistige Offenbarung Gottes in der geschichtlichen Person Jesu.* Von Th. Steinmann, Docent am Theol. Seminar in Gnadefeld. Göttingen. 3s. 9d.

with unflinching consistency and compressed force. However much we may disagree with the argument as a whole, we must admire its great earnestness, its clearness of thought, and, above all, its positive aim. The negative part, which is, of course, implied in the main thesis, is brief, and is only preliminary to the exposition of the writer's own faith, which is given at length. The author knows what and why he believes.

At the outset, it is startling to find that the writer refers only to modern authorities on the negative side of New Testament criticism, from J. Weiss to Wernle. Their positions seem to be admitted without question. The reason, no doubt, is that they support the negative part of the writer's argument. Still, we were not prepared for such complete acquiescence in negative criticism in a Moravian circle. Whether all the critics would agree with the positive side of the argument is not clear. Herr Steinmann evidently believes that J. Weiss would not. At least he finds that his theory and Professor Weiss' position do not harmonize.

In the first place, the author insists, in the plainest terms, that the element of mystery and miracle is essential to religion, because religion begins with the intervening of a higher, spiritual world in the present life, and such intervention is revelation. 'Miracle is essential to religion, because it is nothing else than the manifestation of the other world in the present world; and this we may call revelation, for revelation just means that what belongs to that world is made known to this.' The negative part of the argument is the contention that this element of miracle and revelation cannot consist in anything external. Evidence consisting in external miracle would need to be demonstrated by conclusive historical and logical proof, and no such proof is forthcoming. This is asserted in relation both to Old Testament prophecy and the teaching of Jesus Himself. It is argued that it cannot be proved beyond possibility of doubt that these might not have their origin in natural causes. We must say that the author here rather asserts than proves his case. He also minimizes the strength of the evidence, and assumes that without demonstration faith is out of the question; anything short of absolute certainty is no certainty.

True miracle, it is argued, appeals to the heart, not to the intellect. It is something felt, in-