

7-1-1993

Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums, edited by Günter Meckenstock

John E. Thiel

Fairfield University, jethiel@fairfield.edu

© 1993 by University of Chicago Press.

Peer Reviewed

Repository Citation

Thiel, John E., "Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums, edited by Günter Meckenstock" (1993). *Religious Studies Faculty Publications*. Paper 50.

<http://digitalcommons.fairfield.edu/religiousstudies-facultypubs/50>

Published Citation

Thiel, John E. "Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums, edited by Günter Meckenstock." *Journal of Religion* 73.3 (1993): 419-420.

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Religious Studies Department at DigitalCommons@Fairfield. It has been accepted for inclusion in Religious Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Fairfield. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@fairfield.edu.

standing the ways Schleiermacher responded to his critics and thus throws a helpful light both on Schleiermacher's development and on the final edition.
WALTER E. WYMAN, JR., *Whitman College*.

MECKENSTOCK, GÜNTER, ed. *Schleiermacher und die wissenschaftliche Kultur des Christentums*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991. xvi+521 pp. DM 198.00 (cloth).

This collection of twenty-seven essays includes a remarkable diversity of topics and approaches, ranging from such thematic staples of Schleiermacher interpretation as christology (G. Ebeling, M. Ohst) and pious self-consciousness (D. Lange, F. Wagner); to hermeneutical studies of less examined but nonetheless important works such as the lectures on practical theology (W. Gräß), on psychology (E. Herms, T. Tice), and the early *Confidential Letters on Lucinde* (R. Richardson); to detailed textual histories and analyses of the lectures on dialectics (A. Arndt), the *Speeches* (R. Crouter), and the *Soliloquies* (G. Meckenstock); to a number of comparative studies on Schleiermacher's (usually intellectual but at times personal) relationships with contemporaries or past figures such as Hans Lassen Martensen (A. Blackwell), Christlieb Julius Braniss (G. Scholtz), Nicholas of Cusa (M. Eckert), Wilhelm von Humboldt (J. Ringleben), and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (H. Patsch). These comparative studies render the editor's presentation of all the essays under the three rubrics "Relations with Contemporaries" (*Zeitgenossenschaft*), "Theology," and "Philosophy" somewhat artificial since the first rubric includes essays that might just as well have been included under the second, and the third rubric includes essays that would have been at home under the first. In the end, of course, the ordering of a collection like this matters less than the substance of the contributions, and, overall, the quality of the essays is high indeed.

Like the essays in the last published collection devoted to Schleiermacher's work, the two-volume *Internationaler Schleiermacher-Kongress* (1985) (reviewed in *Journal of Religion* 68 [1988]: 291-94), these pursue the style of Schleiermacher interpretation begun in the early 1960s with the work of a generation of scholars represented best of all by Hans-Joachim Birkner. The essays here are free of the theological agendas that often made Schleiermacher studies prior to World War II exercises in dogmatic controversy rather than in the scholarly analysis of texts in historical and intellectual context. The ongoing work of the *Schleiermacher Kritische Gesamtausgabe* seems to have influenced the way many of the contributors go about their interpretive business. The textual-critical fieldwork required for that venture has certainly prompted Schleiermacher scholars to look more widely than they have in the past for literary clues to his thought. H. J. Adriaanse's "Der Herausgeber als Zuhörer," for example, uses Ludwig Jonas's student notebook on the 1816/17 lectures on theological encyclopedia to explore Schleiermacher's division of labor among the theological subdisciplines. A number of essays, especially H. Pieter's "Heterodoxe Bemerkungen zur Befreiung Schleiermachers aus seiner liberalen Wirkungsgeschichte," employ W. Sachs's recent edition of D. F. Strauss's 1831/32 notebook on the *Brief Outline* (*Theologische Enzyklopädie [1831/32]*, *Nachschrift David Friedrich Strauss*, ed. Walter Sachs [Berlin and New York, 1987]) to further the understanding of Schleiermacher's published work. The concerns of the critical edition project surface again in the efforts of G. Scholtz, H. Traulsen, and W. Virmond to con-

The Journal of Religion

sider the “small” names and faces that nonetheless are important for a fuller understanding of Schleiermacher’s life and thought.

F. Wagner’s essay, “Funktionalität und Positivität der Frömmigkeit,” offers an insight on Schleiermacher’s theology that might be extended to depict the general tenor of this collection’s critical perspectives. Schleiermacher, he argues, constructs a “positional” theology, one defined by the historicity of its claims, its commitment to the positive content of the religion it serves, and the functional task of interpreting Christian self-consciousness in a manner adequate to its experience. The essays of this volume suggest that Schleiermacher scholarship has by now become “positional” in its approach—defined, to paraphrase Wagner, by the historicity of its interests, its commitment to the entire content of Schleiermacher’s literary corpus, and the functional task of interpreting the texts in a manner adequate to their nuances, interrelations, and cultural settings. Schleiermacher interpretation is well served by the hermeneutical intentions of these essays, and by the ways they are enacted.

JOHN E. THIEL, *Fairfield University*.

O’MEARA, THOMAS FRANKLIN, O.P. *Church and Culture: German Catholic Theology, 1860–1914*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991. 260 pp. \$35.95 (cloth).

Intended as a continuation of Thomas O’Meara’s study *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1982), this work is a welcome contribution to a period of Catholic theology much neglected, especially in the English literature. As in his earlier work, the author here ably refutes the “false historical myth” that prior to the advent of neoscholasticism, nineteenth-century Catholicism “either lacked creative theology or . . . unwittingly sold out to idealism” (p. 56). In so doing, his work accomplishes two important tasks: It adds to the growing body of scholarship that redresses the tendency of scholars to equate “nineteenth century Christian theology” with “nineteenth century Protestant theology,” and it fills a lacuna in Catholic intellectual history.

That is not to say, however, that this is an exhaustive study. Repeatedly, O’Meara emphasizes its “overview” character. He often employs artistic images to convey how he envisions this study—it presents the “shape,” the “contours” of an age. There are, of course, inherent limitations in this approach, but O’Meara acknowledges these and for the most part succeeds in his aims. In one passage, he compares this work to a “triptych” (p. 4). This is an apt metaphor, not only because this book is composed of three sections, but also because of how these sections function in relation to one another. As with a triptych, the middle “panel” displays his central interest and the two side “panels” serve to illuminate this primary subject.

In part 1, O’Meara presents a synopsis of German culture and intellectual life during the second half of the nineteenth century. An especially valuable aspect of part 1 is the attention he accords to centers of neoscholasticism outside the universities, such as the seminaries and religious orders (pp. 40–44). Also of interest is a methodological shift from a concentration on individual figures in his discussion of the “Old Theology” (i.e., romantic idealism) to a focus on collectives in his discussion of the “New Theology” (i.e., neoscholasticism). This shift in methodology underscores the disparities of power and resources which proved so crucial in the later conflict between these two theological directions. With this