

many others. The Ritschl is decidedly the school of the aggressive young and talented men who, with some show of reason, can unfortunately make the boast that in their ranks are found nearly all the available ability and fine scholarship that Germany at present possesses. It is decidedly "the new theology" of the land of Luther, and present indications point to a determined struggle between it and the positive orthodox theology of the confessional school, in which the mediating and half-measure men of the other schools will have little to say. What the outcome may be, only a prophet or a prophet's son could foretell. The issues at stake are the very fundamentals and essentials of faith, the life principles of the Church of God.

From these data it appears that the debatable ground between the various theological clans of Germany is the foundation and basis of the Church. Such problems as the certainty and sources of religious knowledge, the basis of Christian faith, the character and reliability of Revelation, are the topics that divide the Protestant clans of the Fatherland. While a large number of the literary and educational representatives of the Church are pronounced advocates of positive Christian standpoints, a large number also have declared in favor of views which, in the convictions of the evangelical circles of America, are subversive of the very foundations of Christian theology and of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth.

The reasons why in Germany the divisions in the Protestant theological world are of such a serious character lie largely in the conceptions there entertained of theology as a science pure and simple, and of its relations to the practical needs of the Church, as also in separation between the theological teaching at the universities from the Church and her proper representatives. The "scientific" character of the theology is the ideal and aim of the modern scholar of Germany, which, ideally, is a high and noble standard in so far as it seeks to develop truth absolutely and uninfluenced by a traditional or philosophical bias—in reality, however, it is little more than a phrase, as those claiming this prerogative most loudly are themselves the clearest demonstrations that this ideal has not been attained or maintained. The Ritschl reconstruction scheme is plainly controlled by the Kantian philosophy, as were the speculations of Baur by that of Hegel.

That Germany is the source and fountain of nearly all the new departures in the theological thought of the age is owing largely to the canons of scholarship there prevailing, according to which only he is a scholar who adds something new to science, either by new discoveries and results, or by the correction of old errors. Naturally, in not a few cases, a tendency toward the destructive and sensationalism will be developed by such a spirit, the advocacy of new views simply because of their novelty. The annals of modern biblical criticism abound with illustrations of this fact. The temptations in this direction are all the greater, because even the most silly proposal of a novel theory is