

31.
Albrecht
Ritschl.

in Germany we may take these three definite points as guiding aspects. Thus we have in Albrecht Ritschl's theology a clear and distinct, almost an extreme, statement of the first point. Ritschl¹ starts from the

¹ Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) was the founder of a school of theology quite as prominent as the school of classical philology founded by his illustrious cousin, Friedrich Ritschl (see *supra*, vol. iii. pp. 136 *sqq.*). They both came, like so many others of the foremost thinkers and scholars in Germany, out of a Protestant pastor's family. Very unlike in their otherwise equally great personal influence they remind us of an earlier age, of the great classical scholar of the Renaissance, Jos. Justus Scaliger, with whom Friedrich Ritschl claimed, through Richard Bentley, a continuity of thought. The theologian Ritschl reminds us, in his valiant and forceful defence of the inherent truth of the Protestant faith, of the greatest figure of the Reformation—of Martin Luther himself; whose spirit he similarly claimed to represent in its original purity. It may surprise some of my readers that so much attention should be given to Albrecht Ritschl in the history of philosophic thought, his name hardly occurring in the leading histories of philosophy which have so far been written. The justification of this lies in the following consideration. As stated before (see p. 272 n.), there are two distinct problems involved in the philosophical problem of religion. The first is the psychological problem as to the nature and origin of faith—*i.e.*, of religious certainty; the second is the problem of theology as a definite science of religion. These two problems are analogous to the two problems dealt with in the theory of know-

ledge. The latter, following the mode of statement customary since the time of Hume and Kant, are—First: How is knowledge or experience possible? Second: How is scientific, *i.e.*, methodical systematic, knowledge possible? The two analogous problems referring to religious knowledge or faith were thrown into clearer prominence by Schleiermacher; they have since his time and through his influence formed the main subject of a philosophy of religion, as distinguished from religious philosophy or the various endeavours to formulate a reasoned (philosophical or scientific) creed. As the latter centre in Hegel, so the two former problems centre in Schleiermacher, who abandons the metaphysical problem and considers the subject of theology as a science to be the systematic development, the co-ordination and harmonising of religious beliefs as contained in historical, more especially in the Christian, religion. Of these two problems, Ritschl as a theologian has devoted his main attention to the second. The first of the two, the psychological one, does not receive adequate treatment; the philosophical interest was, with him, less prominent than with Schleiermacher. The latter lived in a philosophical age and surroundings; Ritschl, in the earlier part of his career, met the Hegelian spirit only in its extreme, and to him repellent, logical formulation, in its one-sidedly negative conclusions, its analytic and dissecting tendencies. The modern conception of philosophy as standing in the middle between