

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

practice was abandoned of rejecting passages only on the ground of inconsistency.

4. *Conclusions.*—In all deliberations as to the comparative wisdom of compromise or intransigence the question must first and always be asked, which course will lead most to the redemption or progress or lasting good of the cause or principles or persons concerned? The test of both acceptance and refusal of compromise is its real inner purpose, and the only finally Christian purpose is redemption in the widest sense.

Any decision made must further be followed out in the spirit of charity. It is possible to compromise from lack of zeal or loyalty or courage, from mere torpor of mind or spirit, from mere lack of interest. It is also possible to refuse to compromise in a spirit of self-assertive cocksure arrogance, to exalt precept into principle, to confuse zeal for truth with animal temper. The surest, keenest zealot can never afford to forget St. Paul's great warning, 'Though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.'

One principle, the principle of redemption; one spirit, the spirit of charity, these seem but a slender equipment for one of life's perpetual problems. Often men long for more; often they would like an unvarying formula, a 'slide-rule,' as it were, of wisdom and morality to produce the perfect decision

automatically and save them from the toilsome tasks of thought and resolution. Fortunately Christianity is not static but dynamic, not dead but alive. Not for nothing is the difficult teaching of the Gospels followed by the gift of the Spirit who shall guide men into all the truth. Happily men are under grace and not under the law. 'The golden rule is that there is no golden rule.' People and problems have to be met and weighed and judged one by one in the light of all the pertinent and attainable facts. At long last men have to say their prayers and make their choice and do their best—'*Veni Creator Spiritus.*'

Two pictures above all others have gripped the hearts of the Christian centuries. The first is the picture of the Madonna and Child, which suggests, perhaps fancifully, the accommodation, the adaptation of the Divine to human limitations, the compromise as it were of God with man, the mode of the Divine Immanence. The second is the picture of the Crucifixion, the Divine refusal to compromise with human sin, the mode of the Divine Transcendence. Each has its eternal message for varying human moods, the first tempering moments of hardness and impatience and superiority, the second healing cowardice and kindling courage. The messages vary, the word of appeal is for ever the same—'See that ye refuse not him that speaketh.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Recent Studies of Schleiermacher.¹

PFARRER LEHMANN-ISSEL has sat at the feet of Professors Troeltsch and Wobbermin; their influence upon him is evident in this study of the relation between the objective and the subjective elements in religion. The author's purpose is to present a detailed criticism of Karl Dunkmann's *Die theologische Prinzipienlehre Schleiermachers* (1916), but reference is also made to other works by Dunkmann, especially his *Religionsphilosophie*

(1917), which aims at showing the insufficiency of religious experience as a foundation for Christian theology. The contention of this work is that the respective conclusions of Dunkmann and Schleiermacher cannot be combined into one system, and in the course of an elaborate investigation much valuable information is given concerning the contributions made in recent years, by leading German theologians, to this ever-recurring theme.

The permanent value of Schleiermacher's writings is held to consist in his having been the first to direct attention to the new problems which the Renaissance made it incumbent upon theologians to face. He claimed that theology is entitled to a place within the circle of the sciences, and that Christianity is a religion among other religions,

¹ *Die Grenzen des objektiven Erkennens in der Theologie*: Eine Untersuchung über die Frage nach dem Wesen der Religion, von Lic. Kurt Lehmann-Issel, Pfarrer in Neuenweg (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; pp. iv. 208).

though with unique characteristics. The modern theologian has access to far more extensive historical material than was available for Schleiermacher, who did, however, show that, to understand Christianity, it is essential to take into account not only the Bible, but also tradition and experience. The reason why different theological schools claim him as their founder is that he did not offer final solutions, but supplied stones for later theologians to use in the construction of their various systems. His two basal principles were that, on scientific grounds, Christianity cannot claim to be the only religion, and that experience proves it to be unique among religions.

Dunkmann's main contention is that Christianity is the only religion, because all other historical religions fail to realize fully the true ideal of religion. Lehmann-Issel charges him with arguing in a circle: on the one hand, saying that Christianity is true, because it corresponds to the ideal of religion; on the other hand, urging that the true ideal of religion is only to be found in Christianity. He maintains that Dunkmann's appeal to Schleiermacher involves an interpretation of his views which is diametrically opposed to the generally accepted estimate of his teaching. Schleiermacher, who is the founder of modern theology, becomes a supporter of the old Protestant orthodoxy. Dunkmann understands by religion the *idea* of religion, by science the *idea* of science, and by experience the *idea* of experience; thus he gives to all these words a different meaning from that which they have in Schleiermacher's writings. 'The deduction of an idea can never determine the reality and the truth of a psychological fact, and the deduction can never be an "experience."' Unlike Dunkmann, Schleiermacher never attempted to *deduce* religion; he assumes religious experience as a psychological fact, and analyses the religious consciousness.

In Lehmann-Issel's summary of the important section in which he deals with the varieties of religious phenomena in history, the significance of religious experience, and cognate themes, he affirms that the question 'What is religion?' raises a problem which cannot be solved except by scientific methods; but inasmuch as religious experience is also an historical fact, it must be compared with other phenomena. What we understand by religion is, at the outset, determined by our own experience; but, as our historical knowledge increases, the richer in content does our conception of

religion become. In like manner, we discover what Christianity is from our own experience, as we compare it with the experience of the disciples of Christ as recorded in the New Testament, always bearing in mind that only when the Spirit of Christ pervades our own religious life can we truly know what is the essence of Christianity.

J. G. TASKER.

*Handsworth College,
Birmingham.*

Deissmann's 'Licht vom Osten.'

DR. DEISSMANN tells us in his preface that the first leisure at his disposal after the War and the pressing duties which followed it was devoted to a thorough revision of this well-known and highly valued treatise. Its recognition had been attested by the appearance of three German and two English editions. He was asked to reprint it, and he set himself to discharge his responsibility with what one can only call an astounding thoroughness. The present reviewer has only had the opportunity of comparing this new fourth edition with the first German edition. The comparison is extraordinarily impressive. Practically every page, more especially in its footnotes, reveals the bringing up to date of the minutest points.

The plan and character of the book have not been altered, but with colossal industry exercised in a most distracting period, Dr. Deissmann seems to have let nothing relevant escape his notice. It would be useless to give examples. For no single page of the earlier edition seems to have remained unaltered. Books, articles, dissertations, private letters from experts, all are used to illuminate the subject. Also, the illustrations are enormously increased. The indexes are immensely elaborated. So that from every point of view the earlier editions are genuinely enriched.

It is needless to remind readers of this Journal of the unparalleled services which Dr. Deissmann has rendered to the investigation of the language of the New Testament, more especially in the light of the Papyri, Inscriptions, and Ostraka, which have become available in recent times. These constitute a province of scholarship which may well be called

¹ Fourth completely revised edition, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1923. pp. xvii. 447; 15s. 3d., bound, 20s. 4d.