

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

boldness to the throne of grace on which he is seated, and lift up his voice before him, while pleading for mercy, and say: "O thou, who wast from everlasting with God, and wast God; thou, who art God manifest in the flesh; who art the great God and only Saviour; who art the true God and eternal life; who art the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who hast all power in heaven and on earth; who art God over all and blessed forever; who art therefore able to save, even to the uttermost, all who come to thee; thou Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon me!" And in a dying hour, what shall he do and say as his last decisive act, before he appears in the presence of his Maker? If he be full of the Holy Ghost as the dying Stephen was, he will look up to heaven, and see Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and like that martyr with his latest breath exclaim: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!"

Let me be one of those truly righteous, who thus feel and thus pray; and let my last end be like theirs!

[The remaining verses, 2-18, will be commented on in a much more brief and summary manner, in the next No. of this Miscellany, in case a kind Providence should permit the writer to continue his labors.]

ARTICLE III.

THE PROGRESS OF CHURCH HISTORY AS A SCIENCE.

By Professor Philip Schaff, Mercersburg, Pa.

CHURCH HISTORY, like every other branch of learning, has its own history, serving to bring its true object and proper method gradually more and more into view. It may throw some light on the nature of the science, and at the same time assist our sense of the necessary qualifications of a church historian, to trace its progress from the beginning down to the present time. In this sketch we shall pay particular attention to the Protestant historians.

I. HISTORIANS BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

§ 1. *The Fathers.*

Here, as in all other departments of theology, the *Greek* church leads the way. Leaving out of view the Acts of the Apostles by

LUKE, and the five lost books of Ecclesiastical Memoirs by HEGESIPUS, a Jewish Christian writer of the second century, the title 'father of church history' belongs undoubtedly to EUSEBIUS († 340), the learned and truth-loving bishop of Caesarea. In his church history, which reaches in ten books to the year 324, he has made faithful use of the libraries of his friend Pamphilus of Caesarea and Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, the canonical and apocryphal writings, the works of the disciples, of the apostles, the apologists and oldest church fathers, including many valuable documents which have since perished.¹ Less worthy of confidence is his biography of Constantine the Great; he was too much blinded by the favors which this emperor had shown towards the church, not to sacrifice the character of the historian frequently to that of the panegyrist. He was followed and continued in the fifth century, first by two jurists of Constantinople; SOCRATES, who carried forward the history of the church, in seven books, from the beginning of Constantine's reign (306) to the year 439, in unpretending, often careless style, but without prejudice and with more critical tact than Eusebius; and HERMIAS SOZOMENUS, of Palestine, whose nine books embrace the same period (323—423), but have more respect to monasticism, of which he was an enthusiastic admirer. Then comes THEODORET, bishop of Cyrus, who wrote his work, in five books (from 325—429), about the year 450, and excels both the last named in style and richness of matter. In his Lives of Thirty Hermits however (*φιλόθεος ἰστρογία*), he relates in part the most marvellous events of his heroes, without leaving the least room for doubt. While all these writers belonged to the Catholic church, PHILOSTORGIUS on the other hand wrote in the interest of Arianism; of his twelve books, however (from 300—425), we have only extracts, in the Bibliotheca of Photius. From the sixth century are to be named, THEODORUS of Constantinople, who continued the history to the year 518, and the Syrian lawyer, EVAGRIUS of Antioch, who brought it down to 594. Photius boasts of him, that he was more orthodox than all his predecessors.² The later Greek church, whose life altogether since its separation from the Latin may be styled a progressive stagnation, has accomplished but little for our science. In the fourteenth century NICEPHORUS CALLISTI, a monk of Constantinople (about 1333), compiled out of two older historians a new church history in twenty-three

¹ A detailed account of his sources, sixty in number, is given by *Flage*, Versuch einer Geschichte der theolog. Wissenschaften, Halle. 1797. Part II. P. 321 ff.

² All these seven historians have been published together, in Greek and Latin, with notes, by VALKSIUS, in three volumes folio (Par. 1659—1677, also Amst. 1695, and Cantabr. 1720).

books, of which, however, only eighteen (to A. D. 610) are preserved in a single manuscript of the Vienna library. From the close connection of church and State in the Byzantine empire, however, the so called *SCRIPTORES BYZANTINI* may also be reckoned in part to the literature of church history.

The *Latin* church historians were wholly dependent on Greek models. *RUFINUS*, presbyter of Aquileia († 410), translated the work of Eusebius, and added two books, carrying it on to the death of Theodosius the Great (395). *SULPICIUS SEVERUS* († about 420) wrote a *Historia sacra* from the creation of the world to the year 400, which however hardly deserves the name of a history. *CASSIODORUS*, consul and monk († about 562), towards the end of his life, from the works of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, which he had translated for him into Latin by his friend Epiphanius Scholasticus, composed his *Historia tripartita*, in twelve books; and this extract served the Latin church as a manual through the whole period of the Middle Ages.

§ 2. *The Middle Ages.*

This period furnished no independent exhibitions of general church history. For the *Historiæ ecclesiasticæ* of *HAYMO*, bishop of Halberstadt († 853), in ten books, are a mere extract of the translation of Eusebius by Rufinus; and the *Historia ecclesiastica*, or *Chronographia tripartita*, of the Roman presbyter and librarian *ANASTASIUS* († about 886), is partly a translation of the Chronography of Nicephorus, and in part an extract from the works of Syncellus and Theophanes. On the other hand, we have from this time a multitude of chronicles, biographies of saints, histories of single convents and monastic orders, which are mostly indeed simple, often uncritical narrations, but full of valuable material; and then, works on single national churches, as the church history of the Franks by *GREGORY OF TOURS* († 595), the old British and Anglo-Saxon church history by *VENERABLE BEDE* († 735), to the year 731, the four books of the canon, *ADAM OF BREMEN*, on the period from Charlemagne to the year 1076, which is important for the spread of Christianity among the Saxons and in Scandinavia, in particular for the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen. The revival of classical studies roused here and there the spirit of critical inquiry; of which we have an example in the Roman canon, *LAURENTIUS VALLA* († 1457), who ventured to prove the utter groundlessness of Constantine's donation to Pope Sylvester, and combated also the traditional opinion that the apostles had each composed a part of the Apostle's Creed.

In all these works from the time before the Reformation, invaluable as they are in their way, we have church history in its infancy or childhood. The church was not brought yet to reflect on her own existence, the power of tradition was unshaken. For this reason, the spirit of free inquiry and genuine scientific method, were almost entirely wanting. The whole apprehension of what history is was one-sided, as it embraced properly only facts, or the activity of the spirit in its outward direction. No real history of dogma had place at all, as implying the idea that the doctrine of the church itself goes through a living process of development. The only form in which this most important branch of historical theology existed, and made its first appearance, was the history of heresies, as may be seen in the principal works of ecclesiastical antiquity on this subject by EPIPHANIUS and THEODORET.

II. ROMAN CATHOLIC HISTORIANS SINCE THE REFORMATION.

§ 3. *General Character of Roman Catholic Historiography.*

From the old Catholic church historians, we pass forward directly to the *Roman Catholic* since the Reformation, as most nearly related to them in spirit and tendency. With these two the idea of development is wanting, and along with it all free and unbiassed criticism. Their position is settled for them beforehand; it is the position of *fixed orthodoxy* and *exclusive churchdom*. Their doctrine of the infallible authority of the papacy cramps inquiry on all sides, and since the conception of the church is for them that of the Roman church, they look upon all variations from this of course as apostasy and corruption, as damnable heresy and schism. Hence no justice is to be expected from them towards non-Catholic movements, and this exclusiveness stands out most harshly in the treatment of the last three centuries, which it is plain have been ruled predominantly by the spirit of the Reformation. The pure historical character is here troubled and disturbed by apologetic interest for the papacy, and polemic zeal against all that is anti-Roman. The endeavor is everywhere to carry up the Roman doctrines and institutions into the most gray antiquity, and to vindicate for them if possible apostolical authority, which of necessity involves the greatest violence in many cases to history. Still the Roman Catholic historians are not wanting in extensive learning. On the field of their own church they have gone into the most searching and profound investigations, moved to them mainly by the antagonistic force of Protestantism itself, and altogether deserve well, in many

ways, for what they have done to promote our science; in the nature of the case too they could not fail, particularly the most influential among them, to proceed more cautiously, giving up many manifest fables and superstitions which had been received before without question as historical facts, and accommodating themselves more to modern taste, both in matter and manner.

§ 4. (1) *Italian Historians.*

The first Protestant church history, the *Magdeburg Centuries*, created such a sensation, that the Roman Church was forced to beatir itself earnestly for its counteraction in the same form. This service was undertaken by the Neapolitan, CAESAR BARONIUS, properly BARONIO, at the instance of his teacher, Philip Neri, in a very learned and acute work, on which he labored for thirty years, till his death, (A. D. 1607,) with unwearied diligence, and for which he was rewarded with the dignity of a cardinal. His *Annales ecclesiastici*, which appeared first at Rome (1588—1607), and which have been since many times reprinted, as well as excerpted from, translated, and continued by other Italians, though with small skill, embrace in twelve folio volumes as many centuries, from the birth of Christ to the year 1198. They furnish from the papal archives, and from many libraries, in particular from the Vatican, a multitude of documents and public papers which were previously unknown, and contain so much that is valsalbe, with all their faults, that to this day it is not easy to dispense with them in a thorough course of study. The cardinal came forward with the feeling, that the first true church history was that offered by himself. He complains of Eusebius that he had favored the Arians, of Socrates and Sozomen that they had favored the Novatians, and of all his predecessors that they had gone to work without critical discrimination. The *Magdeburg Centuries* he styles up and down *Centuries of Satan*. He wrote in the interest unconditionally of the absolute Papacy, and endeavors to show that it was instituted by Christ, that it has remained always the same in doctrine and constitution, that the Reformation accordingly was an apostasy from the true Church, and an insurrection against the order of God. This purpose required however the help of many fictitious or corrupted facts and spurious documents, as well as the suppression or distortion, on the other hand, of important records. Hence he found opponents, not only among the Protestants, but among the Catholics also, above all in the profoundly learned French Franciscan ANTON PAGL.

For single portions of church history, valuable collections of docu-

ments and editions of older writers, distinguishing credit is due among the Italians to MURATORI, ZACCAGNI, ZACCARIA, MANZI and GALLANDI. The most genial and free-minded among the Italian church historians, is PAOLO SARPI, (1623) from whom it is to be regretted that we have only a history of the Council of Trent.

§ 5. (2) French Historians.

The first merit, among the Catholic writers in this department, belongs collectively to the *French*, whose free position over against the Roman See has here been in their favor. The defence of the Gallican church freedom indeed served itself to call forth, in part, the most interesting and thorough investigations. In this view wrote first Bishop GODEAU, of Vence, in popular form, (1635) coming down however only to the end of the 9th century, then the far more learned Dominican NATALIS ALEXANDER (*Noël*), whose work, in twenty-four volumes (1676—86) comes down to the year 1600. He defends, in direct opposition to Baronius, the rights of the Church and of the secular princes against the Popes, and declares the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance and Basel to be œcumenical; justifies still however the cruel persecutions of the Albigenses, and is full of zeal against the Protestant heretics. Innocent XI. prohibited this work, in 1684, under pain of excommunication; but thirty years later, Benedict XIII., also a Dominican, set it free again. In the year 1690, CLAUDE FLEURY, confessor of Louis XV., who lived however as an anchorite at court, began the publication of his *Histoire ecclésiastique*, which reaches in twenty volumes to the year 1414, and was continued by FABRE, though with no inward vocation, down to the year 1695. Fleury writes diffusely and in the spirit of a monk, but with taste and skill, in mild temper and strong love for the Church and Christianity, and with a view always to edify as well as to instruct. He follows the order of time, though not slavishly, prefacing some of his volumes with general characteristics. He also defends antiquity and the Gallican ecclesiastical constitution, without however surrendering at all the credit of the Church, its general tradition, or the necessity of the Pope as its head. His principal concern is with doctrine, discipline, and practical piety. The spirited and eloquent bishop, BOSSUET, in his universal history, (*Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, 1681), which reaches from the creation to Charlemagne, exhibits religion and the Church as the soul and centre of all history. The Jansenist TILLEMONT pursued a new plan, composing a church history of the first six centuries, in sixteen volumes, (1698—1712), from original sources purely, with the most

accurate and conscientious fidelity, and adding his learned investigations in the way of notes.

In addition however to these general works, great service has been rendered to the science by the learned monastic institutions of France, in single departments of church history, costly editions of the fathers, and other auxiliary apparatus. Special mention here is due to the St. Maur Benedictines, D'ACHERY, RUINAERT, MABILLON, MARTÈNE, DURAND, MONTFAUCON,³ and to the Jesuits SIRMOND and PETAU (*Petavius*), who by his celebrated work *de theologicis dogmatibus* (1644—50) forms an epoch in dogmatic history.

§ 6. (3) *German Historians.*

Among the Catholics of *Germany*, an independent and free interest in church history began to show itself first in the Josephine period, but still more through the stimulus of Protestant theology; so that the most has been done there for the science recently. General works, though in part unfinished, have been furnished by ROYKO, DANNE-MAYR, the well known convert, Count STOLBERG,⁴ RITTER, LOCHERER, HORTIG, ALZOG, DÖLLINGER; valuable monographs, by HURTER,⁵ HEFELE, and others. The fullest inward call must be allowed in

³ In the congregation of St. Maur, a complete system of studies prevailed. The general was authorized, in extensive literary enterprises, to assign their parts to the different members according to their talents and tastes, so that one collected material, another arranged, a third manufactured, a fourth finished off, a fifth took charge of the press, etc. Each was required to labor, without regard to his own credit, for the benefit of the world only, and the honor of the order. In many cases, the authors are not even named. By this coöperation of different scholars, who were at the same time free from all secular cares, and favored with wealth and the most ample literary helps, vast works were produced, such as an academy of sciences even could hardly undertake. The best edition of the church fathers, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux, etc., we owe to the diligence of the St. Maurists, which was not equalled, in a literary respect, by the Jesuits.

⁴ HASE says of him strikingly, that he has written and *composed* (gedichtet) the history of the Jewish nation, as well as of the ancient Church, with the zeal, the unction, and unreserved devotion of a proselyte, but with a heart also full of enthusiasm and love.

⁵ HURTER, it is true, when he wrote his learned and skilful work, (in four volumes) on Innocent III., was nominally still Reformed antistes in Schaffhausen; but the Roman Catholic tendency already shows itself, beyond all mistake, in his unqualified praise of his hero, and of the age to which he belonged, as also in his strongly marked partiality for a brilliant hierarchy and pompous ceremonial. It

favor of the ingenious and pious MÖHLER, († 1838), the greatest Roman Catholic theologian since Bellarmin and Bossuet. He has helped his Church again to self-consciousness, and breathed into it a new polemic zeal against Protestantism; although he betrays himself in truth throughout the influence, which the study of Protestant theology, especially that of Schleiermacher, and the whole modern culture, have exercised over his own idealistic apprehension and defence of the Roman dogmas and usages. He wrote indeed no church history; but his larger works (*Symbolik, Patristik, Athanasius M.*), and shorter tracts, (as that on *Anselm, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, Gnosticism, Monasticism, etc.*) have to do almost all more or less with the historical sphere, particularly with the history of doctrines, and in freshness of spirit and vigorous animated style surpass all the writers now mentioned.

III. PROTESTANT HISTORIANS.

§ 7. *General character of Protestant Historiography.*

With the Reformation of the sixteenth century commences a new era, as for the Church and theology in general, so also for our science in particular; yea, we may say that church history first became a free and independent science only by its means. The historian before was, so to speak, of one growth with his subject; but now he raised himself by reflection above it, and instead of accepting on mere authority whatever was catholic as at once true, and condemning everything non-catholic as false, began to subject the whole development of the Church itself to critical trial, making the word of God and common reason the measure of judgment, without regard to Papal decrees. This involved the possibility of a negative tendency, the contempt and rejection of all history, such as we meet with in Rationalism and among Sects; but at the same time the possibility also of such unprejudiced inquiry and free conviction, as should reconcile the subject in full with the objective course of God's kingdom, causing him to see in it the rational and necessary evolution of its inward sense or plan; and to this result the most important recent labors in church history, would seem continually more and more to lead.

is plain everywhere, that with the author, in his blind infatuation for the Middle Ages, the dome of St. Peter stands higher than the manger of Bethlehem, and the decretals of the Popes than the word of God. His dissatisfaction with the moral insecurity of the present age, and the politico-religious distractions of his own country, decided and justified to his conscience finally a transition which was inwardly complete long before.

It required considerable time however to bring the Protestant science here to a clear perception of its mission, and it had itself to pass through different periods, which fall widely asunder from one another in the view taken of its object and proper method. We may distinguish five such periods, the *orthodox-polemic*, the *unchurchly pietistic*, the *pragmatic-supranaturalistic*, the *rationalistic*, and the *scientific*. Among these, the first and fourth are related to each other as extremes, the second and third as stages of transition from the position of church orthodoxy over to that of rationalism, while the fifth seeks to unite the advantages of all before, without their errors; falling itself again, however, into different schools, which makes it difficult to bring it under any general character.

§ 8. (1) *The Period of Polemic Orthodoxy.* -

This embraces the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Reformers themselves did nothing directly for church history, save only as they gave it new interest and roused a new spirit of inquiry; which however must be allowed to be itself a very great merit. They were mainly occupied with the settlement of points of faith and the exposition of the Scriptures. Argument from the Scriptures alone, however, could not permanently satisfy. As the Catholics appealed continually to the Fathers, and declared the Reformation to be a novelty, which had no ground whatever in the past, it became an object with the Protestants to wrest the historical argument out of their hands, and to draw ecclesiastical antiquity to their own side. For that pure Christianity had disappeared from the earth, and again come to light only in the sixteenth century, they could not admit, in face of their Lord's promise to be with his church to the end of the world; and they wished to be counted also, not heretics, but true catholics. It was an apologetic interest, then, and their conflict with Rome, that urged the Protestants into the study of history. Of course their first productions bore throughout, directly or indirectly, a polemic character.

The *Lutheran* church takes the lead; here too, not the moderate and irenic school of Melancthon, but that section which set itself stiffly against all attempts to come to an agreement with the Catholics and the Reformed, and which came to its symbolical expression afterwards in the Form of Concord. MATTHIAS FLACIUS, one of the most zealous controversialists of his age, composed, A. D. 1552 and onwards, while settled at Magdeburg, in connection with several rigid Lutheran divines, (Wigand, Judex, Faber, Holthuter,) and younger assistants, the celebrated *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, as the work is called, making use of

published and unpublished sources for the purpose, with the liberality of princes and cities to support his undertaking. This work, which forms an epoch, exhibits in thirteen volumes as many centuries of the Christian era, each century in sixteen sections, with the express design of justifying the Reformation and confuting the Papacy. The Centuries found such approval, that for a hundred years after, it was counted sufficient to compile text-books out of their material and in their spirit. In the dogmatic works of the seventeenth century however, particularly in GERHARD'S *Loci theologici*, and in QUENSTEDT'S *Theologia dogmatico-polemica*, we find collected, under the same controversial view, a vast mass of material for dogmatic history, which is still in part of great worth; while among works treating of single periods, the most important place belongs to SECKENDORF'S History of the Reformation.

In the *Reformed* church, JOHN H. HOTTINGER of Zurich, proposed to furnish a counterpart to the Centuries. His work⁶ shows great knowledge, particularly of the East, also order and love for truth, but is unequal, five volumes being given to the sixteenth century alone, and drags in much foreign matter according to the taste which then prevailed, the history for instance of Jews, Pagans and Mohammedans, notices of remarkable natural phenomena, as foretoking the fortunes of the church, earthquakes, locusts, famines, floods, monstrosities, eclipses of the sun and moon, etc. FREDERICK SPANHEIM, of Leyden, grounded his *Summa historiae eccl.* (A. D. 1689) on an accurate use of sources, and searching criticism, having in view also the confutation of Baronius. The two Frenchmen, JAMES BASNAGE,⁷ minister at the Hague, and SAMUEL BASNAGE,⁸ minister in Zütphen, wrote with controversial reference, the first to Bossuet, the last to Baronius, both proposing to show, but especially James, that the true church of Christ has never failed, and that it has had true witnesses at all times.

With far better success, however, the Reformed church, the French especially, cultivated during the seventeenth century, in controversy with the Roman Catholic theologians, *particular parts* of history, shedding light on patristic antiquity, the course of the Papacy, and the period of the Reformation, with profound learning and keen penetration, though not indeed without some controversial bias. Such monographies, still of great value in part, reflect credit on the names of HOSPINIAN and HEIDEGGER among the German Swiss; BEZA, DU PLESSIS MORNAY, PETER DU MOULIN, DAVID BLONDEL, JEAN DAILLÉ

⁶ In 9 voll. Tig. 1655—67.

⁷ Histoire de l'église depuis Jésus Chr. jusqu'à présent. Rotterd. 1699.

⁸ Annales politico-ecclesiastici, etc. 1706, 3 voll. (reach only to A. D. 602).

(Dallaeus), CL. SAUMAISE (Salmasius), JEAN CLAUDE, ISAAC BEAU-SOBRE, among the French; archbishop USHER, H. DODWELL, J. PEARSON, W. BEVERIDGE, GILBERT BURNET, JOSEPH BINGHAM, GEORGE BULL, W. CAVE, J. E. GRABE,⁹ and later the Dissenter NATH. LARDNER, among the English, who directed their main attention to the government and antiquities of the church, with an eye to the Presbyterian controversy, as well as to that with Rome.

§ 9. (2) *The Pietistic Period.*

The next epoch after the Magdeburg Centuries was produced by GOTTFRIED ARNOLD (†1714), a friend and follower of SPENER, for a short time professor at Giessen, by his "Impartial History of the Church and of Heretics from the beginning of the N. Testament to the year 1688," (Frankf. 1699 f.), which precisely reverses the principle that reigned before. Instead of the prevailing church, he made the *sects* rather to be the channel of progress for the Christian life, and is the historian accordingly of *unchurchly separatistic religion*. This grows out of the decided practical tendency of Pietism, and the resistance it suffered from Lutheran orthodoxy. Arnold placed the essence of Christianity in experimental personal piety, which seemed to him at home with the oppressed and persecuted minority, while the reigning visible church, Protestant as well as Catholic, was felt to be more or less an apostasy. The orthodox church historians of the seventeenth century also took part, indeed, with the Albigenses and Waldenses, with Wickliffe, Huss, and other "witnesses of the truth," in the Middle Ages, against the reigning Catholicism. Arnold, however, carried the same way of thinking back also into the first six centuries, or at least to the age of Constantine, as well as forward into the Protestant church; which of course made a very material difference. Still he could not carry out absolutely his own principle. Being a pious man, and holding fast to the essential doctrines of the Reformation, he stood more in harmony at bottom with the ancient church orthodoxy, than with the Gnostics, Arians, Pelagians, and other such sects, although he espoused their cause as far as possible. Thus bent on showing fair play however, as no historian before, to all sorts of heretics and schismatics, particularly to the Mystics, for whom he had a special predilection, Arnold fell into the most gross wrong towards the representatives of orthodoxy, ascribing to them the basest motives, and aspersing their character in

⁹ A German Lutheran originally, who passed over to the Episcopal church (†1711).

every possible way ; so that his work, in contradiction to its own title, is a passionate party interest against the Catholics, and still more against the orthodox Protestants, most of all the Lutheran church. It makes a most gloomy impression, and is adapted to upset all faith in one holy apostolical church, to undermine confidence in God's presence in history, and in the ultimate triumph of good, and to promote in this way a hopeless skepticism. Many Pietists indeed were highly pleased with the History of Heretics, and the celebrated THOMASIUUS of Halle, who stands halfway between Pietism and the "Aufklärung," proclaimed it the best of books next to the Bible. SPENER however was by no means satisfied with it, and the orthodox Lutherans, CYPRIAN, for instance, VEIEL, CORVINUS, GÖTZ, LÖSCHER, FAUSTKING, WACHTER, exposed a mass of perversions and errors in it, matching its intemperance in some cases however with the intemperate passion of their replies.¹⁰

Arnold at all events has the merit of having introduced a new way of looking at the sects, and of having laid special stress on the relation of church history to the purposes of piety. He was the first also, who wrote in the German language instead of the Latin, though in that tasteless periwig style, it must be confessed, full of half and whole Latinisms, which characterizes the period after Mitz down to Bodmer, and makes it the most gloomy in the history of German literature.

By the side of Arnold may be placed, in some sense, the later English historian JOSEPH MILNER, († 1797), a pious minister of the English Episcopal Church. His Church History, in five volumes, reaches to the Reformation, on which he is specially full, and follows the current division by centuries. He too saw in the sects, even in the Paulicians and Catharists, the main bearers of piety, and in the Middle Ages accordingly, which find very poor favor at his hands, by far the most room is given to the Waldenses. He too wrote for edification, in the spirit of Methodistical piety, which is intimately related to that of the Pietists, though it has less sympathy with the inward contemplative life and the different forms of mysticism. Greatly surpassed by Arnold in learning and original research, Milner excels him on the other hand in popular style and in fairness towards the reigning Church of the first six centuries. Pope Gregory, the Great, for example, fares much better in his hands. His aim moreover is *exclusively* practical, leading him thus to pass over entirely all subjects that serve not the purpose of edi-

¹⁰ These writings may be found quoted in the third volume of J. G. WALCH'S *Bibliotheca Theologica selecta*. Jenae. p. 129, sqq. They appear at large, with replies and illustrations, in the third volume of the Schaffhausen edition of Arnold's History (1742).

fication, after his own narrow view, such as church government, most theological controversies, the scholastic and mystical divinity, sacred art and learning. He proposes to exhibit only the spiritual *life of the invisible church*.¹¹ Milner's work accordingly is almost entirely free from controversy, which abounds with Arnold, and is so far much better suited for practical and popular use, a work still worthy indeed of recommendation. Nay, we may even say that it was the best church history of *this sort*, till NEANDER again raised into credit the interest of practical piety, the truth in Pietism and Methodism, only on a vastly more liberal scale indeed and with immensely greater knowledge, without consigning other interests for this reason to omission or neglect.

§ 10. (3). *The Pragmatic Supranaturalistic Period.*

The third form of Protestant church history, here named, resulted from the conjunction of the two previous principles, the Old Orthodox and the Pietistic. By *supranaturalism* in the historical sense,¹² we un-

¹¹ Or as he himself says in his introduction: "Nothing but what appears to me to belong to Christ's kingdom, shall be admitted, *genuine piety is the only thing, which I intend to celebrate.* He was right so far in styling his work, "An Ecclesiastical History on a new plan." How onesided his views of piety were, however, may be seen in his judgment, for instance, of Tertullian, of whom he says: "Were it not for some light which he throws on the state of Christianity in his own times, he would scarcely deserve to be distinctly noticed. I have seldom seen so large a collection of tracts, all professedly on Christian subjects, containing so little matter for useful instruction." (Vol. I. Boston ed. p. 220). When on the other hand, he exalts Cyprian so high, defends him against the reproaches of Mosheim, and places him far above Origen, he is inconsistent with himself, since Cyprian was formed throughout on Tertullian's writings, making them his daily food, and contributed more than any of the older fathers to the development of the principle of Catholicism, the hierarchy in particular. He was in fact the first who saw in the Roman See the *cathedra Petri*, and the centre of church unity (*unde unitas sacerdotum exorta est*.) or at least the first who distinctly spoke of it in this way. Augustine, Anselm, and Bernard, Milner owns as truly pious men, and dwells upon them with delight; but still he presents them only on one side, so far namely as they seem to agree with *his own* theory of religion; their decidedly Catholic features, he either overlooks altogether, or else treats them as accidental, merely outward appendages, which are to be excused in them on the ground of the reigning spirit of their age, whereas in truth they enter most intimately and influentially into their whole system of teaching and manner of life.

¹² For in the doctrinal and philosophical sense the old orthodoxy, and every Christian theology indeed, is also supranaturalistic; that is, it rests upon the view that Christianity is a supernatural revelation; while Rationalism allows no such revelation, either declaring it impossible, or else in its undue estimate of man's powers, his reason in particular, holding it to be of no use.

derstand the last outshoot of the Protestant orthodoxy, that tendency namely in theology, which under the influence of Pietism and Liberal Christianity relaxed considerably from the strict and exclusive orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, took refuge in the Bible simply instead of the church symbols, and in a number of its representatives approached itself, the very threshold of Rationalism. The church historians also of this period accordingly, including some who date before the proper supernaturalism, show no longer the old stiffness and severity; confessional controversy and horror of heretics, in whom Arnold had found so much good to celebrate, fall more and more into the background, and make room for a conciliatory irenical spirit, of which an example had been previously given, in several monographies, by CALIXTUS, that man so actively persecuted by the orthodox zealots of the seventeenth century. The effort prevails to do justice to all parties; and in truth the works of a Mosheim, Schröckh and Walch, must be allowed the praise of an *impartiality*, which belonged to neither of the schools before noticed. This virtue however, it must be owned, loses itself at times in doctrinal indifference and latitudinarianism. We style the period *Pragmatic*, in view of its reigning method. It had come to be required of the historian namely, from the time of Mosheim and Walch, that he should proceed pragmatically; that is, that he should not simply relate events, but investigate also their causes psychologically in the secret springs and inclinations of the human heart, for the purpose of making history practically useful. This gave the treatment of it a very subjective character, especially in time under the hands of the Rationalists, the reference of events being for the most part to very external, accidental and arbitrary causes, as their supposed principle and reason. In the diligent explanation of these subjective factors, sight was lost of the claims of the objective idea, and in the end, of the highest and most sacred power in history, the all-ruling providence of God, the spirit of Jesus Christ immanent in his own Church.

Here it is to be remarked, that since the middle of the last century our science has been cultivated and advanced almost exclusively in Germany, by the Lutheran or more lately the United Evangelical Church especially, whilst in other Protestant countries it has made no progress whatever.

Among works of a universal character is to be mentioned first, CHR. E. WEISMANN'S *Introductio in memorabilia ecclesiastica historiae sacrae N. T. etc.* (Tübingen, 1718), distinguished for its pious, mild spirit, its quiet, moderate tone, its predilection for the school of Spener and the better Mystics, and its regard to practical ends in the selection of its matter. He was soon eclipsed however by the celebrated chancellor of

Göttingen, JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, († 1755,) who holds the first place among the church historians generally of the last century. His *Institutiones historiæ ecclesiasticæ* (Helmstadt, 1755), in four books, translated into German also, and continued by SCHLEGEL and VON EINEM, gained in England and North America a still greater authority than in Germany, being used even to this day as a text book in most Seminaries. But little known on the other hand out of Germany are his valuable monographies, on the Period before Constantine, on the History of Heretics, (the Ophites, Apostle-Brethren, Michael Servetus,) and his *Institutiones H. E. Majores*, of which however only the first volume (sæc. I.) was published. Mosheim distinguishes himself in all these works, by his thorough use of sources, his critical acuteness, his large culture and knowledge of men, his bold combinatory skill, at times inordinate, his power of historical contemplation, and his mastery beyond all his predecessors and contemporaries of a clear, tasteful and agreeable style, both Latin and German. The practical element, on the other hand, falls with him into the background. He too takes the side of heretics frequently; not however by praising them enthusiastically and heaping reproaches on their orthodox adversaries, like Arnold, but with calm and dignified criticism, showing the sense and inward connection of their systems; as he was the first, for instance, who felt in the Gnostic speculations the presence of the deep sense which they derive from the philosophy of an older time. It is strange that he did not abandon the current division by centuries, and that he should have adopted so mechanical an arrangement, as that of external and internal, prosperous and adverse events. His contemporary, PFAFF of Tübingen, was equally learned indeed, but his *Institutiones* are not so clearly and interestingly written, and are too much burdened with citations. The indefatigable scholar S. J. Baumgarten brought down his "Abstract of Church History" only to the end of the ninth century. COTTA's "New Testament Church History in detail," (1768—78), remained also incomplete. The most extensive work from this school, showing also its gradual transition over into latitudinarianism and rationalism, is the Church History of J. M. SCHRÖCKH, Prof. in Wittenberg († 1808), which makes with TZSCHIRNER's continuation forty-five volumes, and was published between the years 1768 and 1810. In spite of its wearisome diffuseness, its want of right proportion and its wholly injudicious method, it is still invaluable for its faithful transcriptions from the original authorities, and will long remain a real mine of historical learning. Smaller text books were published by SCHRÖCKH, SPITTLER and STÄUDLIN, the last in the interest of Kant's moral philosophy. J. F. ROOS wrote popularly for a larger public.

After these general works, however, a number of others deserve honorable mention, produced by Lutheran theologians in the service of particular parts of church history. J. A. CRAMER, chancellor, in the end, of the university of Kiel († 1788), in his continuation of Boesuet's *Universal History*, has thoroughly investigated the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and was the next German after Mosheim who wrote history with elegance and force in his vernacular tongue. J. GEORGE WALCH, Prof. in Jena († 1775), and still more his son, W. FRANCIS WALCH, Prof. in Göttingen († 1784), belong to the most industrious, solid and honest inquirers who have ever lived. The last gave himself mainly to the history of heresies, divisions and religious controversies, and his work on this field, in eleven parts, is still indispensable. He occupies Lutheran ground fully indeed in his own mind, but shows no polemic zeal, being conscientiously intent throughout on understanding and representing his sources, in a critical pragmatic way, without sympathy or antipathy. The historical sense is already so far matured with him, that he cannot conceive of history without change, while he distinguishes properly between the immutability of the Christian truth itself and the changing form of its apprehension among men. He lacks however organic sense and graphic life. The elder PLANCK († 1833), who has immortalized himself especially by his learned and able history of Protestant Doctrine,¹³ stands at the extreme end of this school, where it is just ready to pass over into Rationalism. He carries the subjective view, pragmatism, to its highest pitch, and sees in history already the dry theatre only of human interests and passions. To the contents of the doctrinal strifes which he relates, he holds himself quite indifferent; his interest in them is not religious or theological, but psychological only and formal.¹⁴ With such indifference to church doctrine, it is truly marvellous indeed

¹³ Six volumes, 2nd ed. 1791—1800.

¹⁴ Comp. e. g. his preface to Vol. IV., which brings him to the dogmatico-historical part of his work, where he candidly allows, p. 6, that the subject is one in which even the theological public of his time can hardly take any more a real interest, inasmuch as most of the doctrinal questions about which our fathers contended, "have lost for our present theology not only the importance once attached to them on their own account, but even the negative interest which their history had for the spirit of our age formerly, in its gradually ripening and advancing aversion to them. Ten years ago it might have dwelt upon them with some interest, since ten years ago it had not still cleared itself of their power. . . . Now, however, this bond also is gone. A wholly new theology is founded. Not only those forms, but many also of the old fundamental ideas, are left behind. There is no fear besides that the spirit of our theology can ever return of itself, or be forced back thither, and they are viewed accordingly as an indifferent antiquation." No Rationalist could well express himself more unfavorably on the doctrinal controversies of the church.

that such a man should expend so much toilsome study and learned industry on subjects so "fully antiquated" as the theological contentions of the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course this work, with all its great and enduring merits, could not fail to have a bad effect, in assisting to sunder the doctrinal consciousness of its age fully from the position of the older church orthodoxy, and to justify such rupture also as an imaginary progress or advance.

The *Reformed* church produced, in this period, but one work of considerable size, the *Institutiones h. eccl. V. et N. T.* of the learned Hollander, VENEMA, carefully drawn from the sources and reaching down to the year 1600. It had become the fashion in Holland, from the time of Cocceius, to place church history in close connection with the exposition of the Scriptures, especially of the Apocalypse, where the picture of Popery was seen clear as the sun, also with systematic theology, which of course destroyed its independence as a science and put an end to its progress. The popular and edifying work of the English MILNER has been already noticed. Smaller text-books, good in their kind, were furnished by the Genevan divine, TURRETIN, A. D. 1734, by P. E. JABLONSKY, professor in Frankfort on the O., A. D. 1755, and by MÜNSCHER, professor in Marburg, A. D. 1804. The last has still more reputation from his *Dogmatic History*, but belongs rather of right already, like Planck, to the Rationalistic school, to which we now pass.

§ 11. (4) *The Rationalistic Period.*

Arnold's *unchurchly* view of history, and his defence of all sorts of heretics and schismatics, as well as the confessional laxness and doctrinal indifference of the last representatives of the Supranaturalistic school, had already prepared the way fully for Rationalism; so that we are forced to admit for this a certain historical necessity. While however Pietism loved the sects for their real or supposed piety, Rationalism was pleased with them for their heresies, and the dogmatic indifference of a Planck and Münscher advanced into formal hostility against the doctrine and faith of the church.

Now Arius, with his denial of Christ's divinity, was right against Athanasius, Pelagius with his doctrine of an undepraved human will against Augustine, the Paulicians, Catharists, etc., against Catholicism, the Socinians against the Reformers, the Arminians against the synod of Dort, the Deists against the English church. They were in truth only congenial forerunners of Rationalism, in its contest with the church doctrine, nay in the end with the revelation of God in the Bible itself. For the unprejudiced must allow that at least the main sub-

stance of the church doctrine is grounded in the Bible; and hence Rationalism in its last phases has rejected, consistently, not only the material principle of Protestantism, but its formal principle also, taking for the source and measure of truth and faith, or of unbelief rather, instead of God's word, human reason (thus *Rationalism*), and this not as it actuates history and the church, but the subjective reason of the reigning spirit of its own age, at bottom the every day finite understanding, what we call "common sense" in its baldest form. This tendency is constitutionally unhistorical in full; it takes no interest in history as such, but only the negative satisfaction of practising upon it its own destructive criticism. It denies the objective forces of history, and expels out of it, not only Satan, who is for it the phantom only of a superstitious, heated fancy, but what is of course far more serious, God himself, changing it thus into an eyeless monster, a labyrinth of human perversions, caprices and passions. All is referred to a subjective ground. Rationalism fancies itself to have grasped the greatest and most lofty facts, when it derives them out of the most accidental and external, or even the most common and ignoble causes and motives; the doctrine of Christ's divinity, for instance, and of the Holy Trinity, from the active fancy and Platonism of the Greek fathers; the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace, from Augustine's restless metaphysics; the papacy of the Middle Ages, from the trick of the false Isidorian decretals and the ambition of the "rascal" Hildebrand; the Reformation from the pecuniary embarrassment of Leo X., and the impudence of Tetzal; Luther's view of the Lord's supper, from his own stiff and stubborn humor, etc. This way of looking at history, so supremely subjective, not only cast censure on God, as having made the world so badly that it went to ruin in his hands, or as having no more care of its history than a watchmaker for a watch long since finished and sold, affording rich matter thus for full skepticism and *nihilism*; but it put at the same time the greatest possible dishonor on our human nature also, which was robbed in this way of all its dignity and higher worth. That so much diligence and learning should have been expended still on so heartless a work would be incomprehensible, were it not explained by the interest of opposing the church, and the indomitable tendency of the German mind to theory and speculation.¹⁵

And yet Rationalism, on the other side, has also its undeniable merits, in regard to church history. In the first place, it has exer-

¹⁵ The greatest English master of history, however, GIBBON († 1794), in his celebrated *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, has also often noticed the history of the early church, and with a bitterness too towards Christianity, with which hardly any German Rationalist can be charged.

cised the boldest criticism, setting many things thus in a new light, and opening the way for a more free and unprejudiced judgment. Then again, it served to advance the conception of history itself, though rather in a merely negative way. Almost all earlier historians, Protestant as well as Catholic, saw movement and change only in the history of *heresies*, while they regarded the church doctrine as something once for all done, fixed and unchangeable, a view which cannot possibly stand before impartial inquiry. For although Christianity itself, the divine plan of salvation, is always the same and needs no change, the same thing cannot be affirmed at all of its apprehension in the different ages of the church, as is sufficiently shown at once by the great distinction of Catholicism and Protestantism, and in this last again by the differences of Lutheranism, Zwinglianism and Calvinism. Rationalism now saw, however, in the church as well as in the sects, change, movement, alteration, and prepared the way thus for that idea of organic development which lies at the ground of the latest German style of history. Still it went not beyond this vague notion of change. It overlooked in it wholly the truth contained in the old view, namely, that there is something enduring also with all this change, and that the church in the midst of it remains always in her inmost life one with herself. Church history became, under its hands, a storm-lost vessel, without helmsman or rudder, a wild chaos, without unity or living order, the play of chance, without any divine plan or definite end. It knew of no such development, as proceeds by necessary, rational laws, remains in its progress identical with itself, preserves the sum of every preceding stage, and though it be through many obstructions and much opposition, and in perpetual conflict with the kindgom of evil, makes its way still forward always towards a better state. Rather it took the course of history for a steady deterioration, or more accurately speaking for a process of continuous rarefaction and dilution, in which the church loses her doctrinal and religious substance more and more, till at last the age of Illumination makes the happy discovery that the whole of Christianity may be resolved at last into a few common-place moral maxims and notions of virtue.

The man by whom this great revolution in the idea and treatment of church history was mainly brought about, and who deserves with full right the title, father of neology, was JOHN SOLOMON SEMLER, Professor of Theology in Halle (†1791). He had been educated in the bosom of an anxious and pedantic Pietism, and retained from this his "private piety," which he held to be independent of all theory, and in virtue of which he opposed the appointment of the notorious Bahrdt, and wrote against the Wolfenbüttel Fragments. To Arnold's "*Kaiserhistorie*" he

was early indebted for a considerable amount of dislike to orthodoxy and partiality for heretics, to Bayle's Dictionary for all sorts of doubts, and to his preceptor Baumgarten for the conviction, that, the church doctrine as it then stood "had by no means carried always the same form." His own studies showed him more and more, that all is flow and motion, all in transition or past, that every time has its particular veins and modes of thought, a consciousness of its own, into which a man must set himself beforehand in order to understand it. He was endowed with a rare inventive quickness, but without system or method, tasteless in style, unsteady and impulsive, the very embodiment indeed of his own favorite notion of change. With gigantic diligence and insatiable curiosity, he traversed the most retired works of history, particularly too the Middle Ages, everywhere trying to see if things might not be different from the common previous acceptation. Everywhere he made new discoveries, and roused the spirit of inquiry, without however bringing anything solid and enduring to pass.¹⁶ "His whole activity is merely preparatory, laying the ground, an agitation of all possibilities, a perpetual raising of doubts and suspicions, conjectures and combinations, a vast working up of material. His writings on dogmatic history resemble an unbroken field that is yet to be tilled, a building place where, amid rubbish and ruins, the materials for a new edifice lie still in endless confusion."¹⁷

The most characteristic and energetic work from Semler's school, is HENKE's "General History of the Christian Church," in eight parts (1788. ff.) He aims mainly to show the mischief, which religious despotism and doctrinal constraint, as he supposes, have produced everywhere through all ages, and presents a flaring, keenly sarcastic picture of enthusiasm, superstition, stupidity and wickedness. VATER, in his continuation and fifth edition of the work, has softened considerably its sharp features, and breathed into it a more kindly spirit.

After Henke and others had thus let out their hatred towards the ecclesiastical past, in full measure, there succeeded a complete indifference to the religious import of church history. In such spirit SCHMIDT of Giessen compiled his instructive work, continued by RETTBERG, purely from original sources. DANZ pursued a similar course.

They were all surpassed, however, by GIESELER, in the skill of his

¹⁶ Of his 171 works, hardly one is now read, except by historians of profession. They comprise, among much else, treatises also on the habit of snails in winter, and on making gold, his interest in which however was owing not simply to his literary errantry, but as Tholuck at least suspects. (*Vermischte Schriften*, Th. II. S. 82.) to his devotion to the god Pluto.

¹⁷ Thus is he described very characteristically by Dr. F. C. BAUR, who himself greatly resembles him in many things, (*Lehrb. d. Christl. Dogmengesch.* 1847. S. 40.)

extracts and his judicious criticism. In his indispensable, though yet unfinished Church History, Rationalism appears still more cool, and falls into the background behind the interest of learned inquiry and purely objective narration.

§ 12. (5) *The Scientific Period.*

As different causes, the English Deism, the French Materialism, the Popular Philosophy of Wolff, Kant's Criticism, etc. conspired to raise the vulgar Rationalism, towards the close of the last century, into general power, so men like Herder, Hamann, Jacobi, the Romantic School, and still more Schleiermacher, Schelling, and Hegel, contributed each his part to overcome it scientifically, and to make room for a theology full of spirit and faith. Thus begins the fifth and last period of Protestant church historiography, in which we ourselves still stand. This has done vastly more than any other for the advancement of the science, both materially and formally. In Germany, during the last thirty years, an active emulation has displayed itself in this sphere, as in science generally; whose results will yet long be felt, and redound to the benefit also of other nations.¹⁸ Here we must distinguish, 1. Works embracing the whole range of church history, as besides that of GEISELER already named, those of NEANDER, ENGELHARDT, HASE, SCHLEIERMACHER, (published after his death, from manuscript sketches,) GUERICKE, NIEDNER, GFRÖRER; 2. Such as relate to dogmatic history, as those of BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, ENGELHARDT, HAGENBACH, BAUR; and finally, 3. The almost countless monographies, devoted to a single dogma, or to some one branch of church polity, or worship, or Christian life, or to an important individual, or to a particular period, or to a national church. The relation of the general works to the special is that of reciprocal completion. The first, as *Dr. Kliefoth* strikingly observes,¹⁹ have a double task: "first to go before the monographies and show the chasms that still need to be filled by such special labor; and then again to come after the monographies, and incorporate their results properly into the living organism of history."

¹⁸ WINKER, in the first supplement to his *Manual of theological literature*, mentions not less than five hundred works pertaining to the sphere of church history, which appeared in two years only (between 1839 and 41). In addition to this, the theological journals of Germany, such as Ilgen's "*Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*," Ullmann's and Umbreit's "*Studien und Kritiken*," contain a multitude of historical tracts; while almost all the later exegetical and dogmatic works are interwoven with rich historical material throughout. More on this point may be found in the first section of the author's tract: "*What is Church History?*"

¹⁹ In Reuter's *Repertorium* for 1845, p. 106, where the reader will find several instructive and spirited essays from the pen of Kliefoth, on "the later ecclesiastical historiography of the German Evangelical Church."

The latest style of history may be designated formally *scientific*, inasmuch as its leading representatives at least, in distinction from the mode before prevalent, propose always to *comprehend* truly the events, ruling ideas and actions of a period, and to unfold them before the eyes of their readers just as they have had place. The object is not merely to know *what* has been and come to pass, but also *how* it has come to pass. To be a historian, it is no longer enough to collect learned material, however faithfully, in an outward and aggregate way, nor yet, in the pragmatic style, to investigate psychologically the simply subjective causes and motives of events; but he is bound now to apprehend history as *spirit* and *life*, and this as *rational* spirit, the manifestation of *eternal, divine ideas*, and so to reproduce it also in a spiritual and living way. Only thus can the study or the exhibition of church history have a deep and abiding interest. For it is spirit only that can speak to spirit, and life only that can produce life. But all life is essentially process, development, which runs through different stages, ascends always to a higher position, and yet remains identical with itself, so that the end is only the full evolution of the beginning. Church history thus becomes also an organism, springing from the person of Jesus Christ, as the author and progenitor of the new humanity, extending itself outwardly and inwardly always more widely, engaged in perpetual conflict with sin and error from without and from within, moving forward through all sorts of difficulty and hindrance, and still surely tending always towards a definite end. This idea of *organic development* unites what is true in the Orthodox notion of something constant and unchangeable in church history, with what is true also in the Rationalistic notion of a perpetual movement and flow, and is the only view that makes room for any deep apprehension of the life of Christianity in time. It is a rich gain, never to be given up, which we owe to the later German Philosophy since Schelling, and which the most opposite schools of our time, those of Neander and Baur, though under different modification, alike appropriate to their use. With this view of church history, as an inwardly correct whole, pervaded with a common blood and reaching towards a common end, is intimately associated as a farther characteristic of the works in general now noticed, the spirit of genuine *catholicity* and *impartiality*. They show a like interest in almost all the portions of this vast organism, the fulness of whose inward life is thus unfolded in the flow of time; though with due subordination, of course, of the less essential and important, always, to what is of main significance and weight. Christianity is not shaped on the last of a fixed human formula; its own inward boundless and inexhaustible fulness is acknowledged. A Neander

kisses the footprints of the Lord, and bows before his Spirit, wherever he finds him, and he finds him of right in all ages and among all nations, though it be with widely different displays of his glory. Church history is now more regarded from a central and universal position, and is exhibited *sine ira et studio*, for its own sake, and just as God has allowed it to come to pass. A onesided apologetic and polemic interest is no longer suffered to prevail, allowing only a troubled view of the Saviour's majestic person through the colored spectacles of a particular sect or party, but the spirit of truth is followed without bias, under the conviction that the boundless life of the Church can be fully represented only through the collective Christianity of all periods, nations and persons, and with the persuasion that the truth finds its best justification in the simple dispassionate exhibition of its own historical course. In this respect, in general, the spirit of the later evangelical theology of Germany is already raised, principally, above the existing divisions of Christendom, and occupies the position of a union, which carries in itself the pledge of its own full accomplishment in time to come. The later church history in fact, as is already shown by many works of the popular sort, among which BÖHRINGER'S Biographies are the most thorough, will win thus a practical influence on life, and from the old foundations of the Church sketch forth the plan for its new structure.

These merits do not hold indeed of all later works, and still less of all in the same degree. In a theological view especially the difference among them is considerable. Looking away from those theologians who present no distinct theological character,²⁰ or who belong still in substance to a former period,²¹ we meet mainly two schools, which are related to each other partly in the way of complement, but still more in the way of antagonism, with equal claims to spirit and learning; that namely of SCHLEIERMACHER AND NEANDER, to which belong in a wide sense such men as HOSSBACH, RHEINWALD, LIEBNER, VOGT, SEMISCH, HENRY, PIPER, JACOBI, BINDEMANN, and others; and that

²⁰ As for instance ENGELHARDT, who in his thoroughly learned historical investigations makes it his business simply to report, with scrupulous exactness and monotony, from the sources, withholding all judgment of his own. NIEDNER'S "Geschichte d. Christl. Kirche" too, (1846), with its strange terminology, offers us no clear theory. Its value consists mainly in the richness of its single views.

²¹ As GUERICKE, where he is independent, falls back to the polemic method of the 17th century. GFRÖRER is in the commencement of his work rather rationalizing, afterwards catholicizing. The manuals of HASE and HAGENBACH, full of spirit and taste, remind us often of Herder's humanism, the tinge of which is more æsthetical with the first, more practical with the other.

of HEGEL, which however falls again into two essentially different branches, the one *unchurchly* and *destructive*, with BAUR at its head, the other *churchly* and *conservative*, of which DORNER may be taken as the most learned representative. In attempting briefly to characterize these tendencies, we will not forget the personal respect and gratitude we owe to their leaders, *Neander*, *Dorner*, and even *Baur* himself, who were all formerly our teachers, the first at the close, the other two at the commencement of our university studies.

§ 13. *Neander and his School.*

NEANDER has himself admirably described his immortal work, when, on his first presentation of it to the public,²⁹ he declared it to be the grand aim of his life to exhibit the history of the Church, "as a speaking argument of the divine power of Christianity, as a school for Christian experience, a voice of edification, doctrine and warning, sounding through all centuries for all who are willing to hear." Like Spener and Franke, he looks upon theology as a business of the heart, and has chosen for his motto accordingly the words: *Pectus est quod theologum facit*. This causes the treatment of history of itself to assume a practical and edifying character, and to turn with preference to the revelations of the interior religious life, the actings of Christ's Spirit in his genuine followers, whilst those relations in which the Church touches the world and its politics are less, and often indeed quite too little, regarded. Neander has served thus by his writings to bring thousands of youth to Christ, and has contributed largely to the revival of religious life in Germany. His religion however is by no means of the narrow pietistic sort, but possesses rather a broad and liberal character, which owns sympathy with the most different forms of the Christian spirit, shows great leniency of judgment, often perhaps too great, even towards heretical aberrations, while however it finds most delight in contemplative inward tendencies like that of John. As little is he opposed in any way to science, being distinguished rather for profound inquiry, and a great talent for the organic exposition of different theological systems. Hence dogmatic history fills a very considerable space in his work, especially in the patristic period, where he feels most at home and has been most extensive in his studies. His scientific position in theology may be characterized as that of *subjectivity*, which belongs to the Schleiermacherian system in general, making it just the contrary pole to Catholicism, in which the individual is

²⁹ In the Preface to the first volume, 1st ed. in 1825.

absorbed by the general spirit. We do not mean by this that Neander wholly loses sight of the objective forces of history; on the contrary, he speaks very frequently of universal spiritual tendencies, revealing themselves in individuals; and the contrasts of idealism and realism, rationalism and supranaturalism, dialectic understanding and mystical contemplation, belong to the standing categories of his historical thinking. But he refers these tendencies themselves to a psychological basis only, to the peculiarity of the human nature, still in a certain sense thus to a simply subjective ground. The predominant view with him is, that the kingdom of God forms itself out of individuals, and so in some sense up from below, and that, as Schleiermacher once says, "the doctrine of the Church is composed from the opinions of single Christians." No theologian has had so high a conception of the worth of the person, so fine a feeling for individual peculiarity, as Schleiermacher; and what he brings out thus in a more speculative and doctrinal way, is turned to account historically by Neander. Hence he so often urges the thought, that Christianity, the leaven which is destined to pervade our entire humanity, does not destroy the natural capacities and peculiarities of men, but only purifies and sanctifies them; hence his great concern to secure for the personal, the individual and particular, the acknowledgment of its full right; hence the powerful impulse given by him mainly, also, through his monographies on Julian the Apostate, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Bernard of Clairvaux, to the culture of ecclesiastical biography, that most valuable species of literature, in which the mirror of a single great personality is made to reflect in concrete view the spirit and sense of a whole age.

Just in this preponderance however, which is allowed to the subjective interest, is found, along with its strength, the weakness also of the Schleiermacher-Neandrian school. It has an excessive sensibility, where the rights of the individual are laid under limit for the sake of the general welfare, and an undue repugnance towards all law, the distinct assertion of the principle of authority, whether in theory or in practice. In all this it sees at once "bondage to the letter," the "mechanism of forms," "dry scholasticism," "symbololatry," and the like. It does not always distinguish sufficiently the idea of freedom from that of vagueness and arbitrariness, and seems at times to forget that true liberty can prosper only in the sphere of authority, the individual only in due subjection to the general or universal. Christianity and churchdom are taken by it more or less for opposites, which explains how it is that the Rationalists have affected to find an ally in Neander, in their war upon the dogma of inspiration and confessional orthodoxy, although the fundamental principle of their theology is totally different. We

cannot deny, therefore, that over against these *faults a relative and partial* right belongs, in a scientific respect, to the Hegelian scholasticism, in a practical respect, to the *unionistic* church tendency of Hengstenberg's "Kirchenzeitung," and the rigid Lutheranism of a Harless, Rudelbach, and Guericke, particularly in these times of fluctuation, distraction and disorder.

§ 14. *Baur and his School. Logical Pantheism.*

In direct opposition to the Neandrian method of history, stands the new *Tübingen* school, in the most close connection with the *Hegelian Philosophy*. This philosophy, which properly carries out only and completes on all sides the principal views of Schelling, is characterized primarily in distinction from Schleiermacher just by its objective spirit. It was in a certain sense a philosophy of restoration, in full antagonism to the revolutionary, self-sufficient "aufklärung" of the previous century. In arbitrary self-will it opposed the earnestness of law, to subjective opinion the general reason, as being alone true. History throughout is, for it, something essentially rational, not the sport of accident and caprice; it sees in it, everywhere, the movement of higher powers, not indeed the Holy Ghost in the biblical sense, but a rational world spirit, that makes use of single men for the accomplishment of its plans. Christianity is recognized by Hegel as the absolute religion, whilst he ascribes to the ideas of the Incarnation and the Trinity, in a sense very different it is true from the church doctrine, a deep philosophical truth, comprehending for instance the whole universe, external nature as well as the human spirit, under his trinitarian view. These general principles, however, allowed room for wholly opposite tendencies, accordingly as true objective forces, from which the process of history according to Hegel, is derived and constituted, might be taken to be essential realities or mere abstract conceptions, accordingly as a living faith in Christianity or a one-sided philosophical interest might lead the way. We notice first the destructive tendency, which has proceeded from the pantheistic elements in Hegel's system.

Dr. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR of Tübingen, a man of imposing learning, bold criticism, surprising power of combination, and restless productivity, but we may say too philosophical to be a true historian, and too historical to be an original philosopher, has founded within the last twenty years a formal school, which in the negation of the positive has gone still farther than the vulgar Rationalism, and brought forward a wholly new view of primitive Christianity. *Baur* is totally destitute of the fairest ornament of the Neandrian style of history, its active

sense namely for living, practical Christianity. He is a pure theorist, and a true representative thus of a leading disease among German scholars, the one-sided unpractical intellectualism of the study. He has confined himself, accordingly, almost altogether to the history of *doctrines*, and particularly to such as possess a philosophical interest. Thus he has investigated Manichaeism, Gnosticism,²² the history of the dogma of the Atonement, still more the dogma of the Trinity and the Incarnation, (in three large volumes,) and produced works which make an epoch in their way, and altogether are uncommonly suggestive and instructive. Such dogmatico-historical monographies fall in with his taste much more than biographies, which require a living interest in real persons. Besides this, he has written a great many tracts on primitive Christianity, in which the process, (applied by his more consistent disciple Dr. DAVID FR. STRAUSS to the Life of Jesus, so as to turn the evangelical miracles into a mythical picture of the idea of the Messiah, as it grew from the unconscious imagination of the early church,) is so tried upon the history of the apostles and the age following, as wholly to revolutionize the view previously taken of the first two centuries. This new construction of early Christian unity appears most fully in BAUR'S "*Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ*" (1845), and in SCHWEGLER'S "*Age after the Apostles*" (1846). Christianity as we now have it is here taken to be a product first, from the middle of the second century. In the mind of Jews and the first Christians it existed simply as a perfected Judaism, or Ebionitism, or, what is counted much the same, in the form of Petrinism. Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, first emancipated Christianity from Judaism, and apprehended it as a peculiar and new system. Of the thirteen epistles, however, which are ascribed to him, only four are genuine, that namely to the Romans, that to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians; the rest were fabricated, and put forth under his name, in the second century. The Acts of the Apostles, falsely ascribed to Luke, is written from an apologetic position, and misrepresents the apostle of the Gentiles. It is proposed namely to defend him against the reproaches of the Jewish party, and this is done by bringing Paul as nearly as possible to Peter, that is to Jewish Christianity, in the second part, and Peter as nearly as possible to Paul, that is, to the free position of Gentile Christianity, in the first. The final reconciliation of this antagonism of Petrine and Pauline Christianity, and with it the establishment of the church faith, is the work of the fourth Gospel, which, however, flows not from the

²² Under this term he understands, not merely the proper Gnosticism of antiquity, but all attempts to reduce Christianity to a philosophical form. *Gnosis* is, for him, thus the same as the philosophy of religion.

apostle John, although the author so pretends, but from some unknown person in the middle of the second century — the most profound and spiritual of all productions thus from an obscure nobody, the most sublime and ideal portrait of the Saviour from an impostor — and is not to be considered an actual history, but a sort of philosophico-religious romance, the offspring of the speculative fancy!! The critical acuteness and constructive method of this panlogistic school has reached a point thus, where, by its contempt for all outward historical testimonies and by the most palpable extravagance, it confutes itself, so that nothing more is needed than a simple exhibition of this last result, to repel every unsophisticated mind from its method.

But wherein consists now the fundamental fault of this whole historical method of Baur? We find it in *logical pantheism*, the denial of the *personality* both of God and of man. Baur finds fault with Neander as recognizing the single only, and nothing general, in the history of doctrine, and claims for himself the merit of having raised it from an empirical to a speculative view, and of having found in the conception of *spirit* the ruling principle of the historical process.²⁴ But what at last is this "spirit," the "dogma," which in his ever recurring terminology, "comes to terms with itself," (*sich mit sich selbst vermittelt*), which "unfolds itself into the boundless multiplicity of its predicates and there gathers itself up again into the unity of self-consciousness?" Is it the personal living God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Of that this philosophy knows nothing. Are the objective forces, which Baur declares to be the factors of history, substantial essences at all or living realities? No! They are bare forms of the understanding, abstract conceptions, shadowy phantoms. The entire history of doctrine is nothing more, according to this school, than a dialectic process of thought, which thinks thought itself, the tedious mechanism of method, "reeling off of a thin logical thread," that runs out always again at last into Hegelian pantheism. The efforts of the most profound and pious minds for centuries, on the incarnation and the atonement, result simply in formulæ at last of the identity of thought and being, the finite and the infinite, subject and object. Thus withers beneath the simoom breath of a purely dialectic process, the garden of the Lord, with all its endless wealth of flowers, its innumerable fruits of love to the Saviour, of faith, of prayer, of sanctification, the whole transformed into a metaphysical desert, without green oasis or refreshing fountain. Of course this method fails most in those parts of church history, where practical interests take the lead, as in the apostolical and next following periods, falling over

²⁴ Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, S. 52 and 53.

here from a pretended objectivity into the most wretched subjectivity of a hypercriticism, that rests on no ground and sets at defiance all the laws of history. But even the purely doctrinal investigations of Baur need a complete revision, as from his one-sided position he turns also the church fathers and the schoolmen, Calvin and Schleiermacher, into mere "speculators on the dry heath," sunders their thinking from its religious life-ground, and so not unfrequently loads them with opinions that never in dream even entered into their heads.

§ 15. *Merheinecke, Leo, Dörner, Ullmann and others.*

Along with this however, the Hegelian philosophy, even before the appearance of the famous "*Leben Jesu*" by Strauss (1835), called forth other wholly different tendencies, which have sought to keep terms with history as it is, and with the Christianity of the Bible and the Church, though some of those Christian Hegelians, as MARHEINECKE, DAUB, GÖSCHEL, have frequently spiritualized it, and at times inflicted arbitrary violence upon it by the logical process. MARHEINECKE, the theological head of the "right" wing of this school, exhibited the German Reformation under a purely objective form, from the sources, in genuine German nationality. This work, unsurpassed in its kind, is fortunately besides free altogether from the heavy dialectic accoutrement in which his "Dogmatic" is made to move. HEINRICH LEO, an original, vigorous mind, not without tendency also however to excess and rudeness, threw off it is true in later life the strait-jacket of the Hegelian logic altogether, but the influence of it is seen in his *Universal History*, where religion and the church are also very carefully noticed, but always with the entire subordination of the subject to objective powers, of the individual to the general. These objective powers with him however are not dialectic forms and conceptions, but concrete realities, laws and institutions of the personal Christian God, which to resist is sin and guilt, which to obey is man's true freedom, glory and honor. History in his view forms itself downward from above; God's will, and not popular will, least of all individual will, is its moving force. Hence his favorable treatment of the Middle Ages, and his unfavorable, nay, one-sided and unjust, judgment of the Reformation. Leo's view of history is out and out ethical, churchly, conservative, absolutely anti-revolutionary, we might say catholicising, did we not know that he has too much historical sense to believe in the possibility of restoring an antiquated position, and that just in relentless opposition to the unbound and dissolute habit of the present time he heeds it for his duty to lay the sharpest emphasis on the side of positive authority and law. In the

case of so violent, excitable and uncalculating a polemic as Leo, who often falls on his opponents like a bulldog, we must never take single utterances too strictly, as little as with Luther, whose posture also under different circumstances he would make his own.

Finally however there are dogmatic historians, who stand in direct opposition to the new Tübingen school, on decidedly believing and churchly ground, and still have appropriated to themselves all the formal helps that are offered by the Hegelian logic. To this class belong such theologians as TH. KLIEFOTH, G. A. MEIER, but above all Dr. DORNER, formerly of Tübingen, now in Bonn. This last, in his History of the Development of the Doctrine of Christ, a great work which however is not free from scientific pretension and stiffness, has furnished a positive refutation of Baur's work on the Trinity and of his views in regard to primitive Christianity. He is not a whit behind his opponent in learning, acuteness and speculative talent, whilst he excels him far in sound comprehension, and writes in the service not of science merely but also of the Church.

Whilst Leo is a man of the extreme, Kliefoth and Dorner may be styled on the other hand men of the mean or middle, in whom the different elements of modern culture seek to come to a reconciliation. Still more may this be said of RANKE, whose History of the Popes and of the German Reformation entitle him to a place also among theologians, but especially of ULLMANN and HUNDESHAGEN, although with the two last the influence of Schleiermacher carries the ascendancy. They belong, beyond doubt, to the most complete and influential historians of our time. The work of Ullmann on the Reformers before the Reformation is a real masterpiece of thorough, mild, and clear historical representation; and Hundeshagen's Review of German Protestantism reveals likewise a heart-sound universal insight into the defects under which it is suffering at this time, while it points with right to the practical path which German theology is called at once to pursue, if that country is to be rescued from the evil consequences of a one-sided literary existence.

Thus then we find mirrored in the latest literature of church and dogmatic history, in Germany, all the manifold elements of modern culture, as they severally repel or attract one another, or seek to come together in a common whole, at one time bound in full or in part by the fetters of a system, at another with free untrammelled spirit taking all according to its own nature and allowing to it its separate right. Unite the pious feeling and tender conscientiousness of a *Neander*, the sober investigation of a *Gieseler*, the speculative talent of a *Baur* and a *Dorner*, the energetic decision of a *Leo*, the fine diplomatic wisdom of a *Ranke*,

the quiet mildness and clear representation of an *Ullmann*, the spiritual vivacity and comprehensive brevity of a *Hase*; unite all this, we say, in one person, actuated at the same time with the spirit of genuine faith and love, and wholly devoted to the service of the Church, and we have, so to speak, the true ideal of a church historian in full form before us; an ideal which may never be fully realized in any one individual, but which should at all events float before the mind of those who are content otherwise to sit at the feet of great masters.

Whether finally Germany, after being frightened out of its one-sided literary existence, and excessive scientific productivity, by the revolutionary storms of the world-year 1848, shall go on at once to carry into life her theoretic creations, and thus make them to become first really fruitful; or whether, like Greece of old, after it had produced an Aristotle and an Alexander, or the African church after it had produced an Augustine, it may be destined to die spiritually, and leave the prosecution of its work, and the practical application of its ideas, to other times and other nations—this is a question which the future itself must be left to decide.

§ 16. *Church Historians out of Germany.*

Casting a brief glance in conclusion on the latest performances in church history *out of* Germany, we are met (not to speak of some works which are only known to us by their titles²⁵), in the French Reformed church, by the name of MERLE D' AUBIGNÉ, of Geneva, whom we are the more bound to notice, as his History of the Reformation, still incomplete, has obtained in England and America an unexampled celebrity and circulation, reaching to circles also where such reading would not otherwise have come.²⁶ As regards the contents of the work itself, he has depended almost entirely thus far on German industry, by which this whole period especially has been thoroughly explored, in countless publications, on all sides. This use of foreign inquiry was here also wholly in place, and even a duty. He has had skill however to work up the matter handsomely, and to clothe it with a high degree of interest, by his uncommon power of lively and graphic dramatic representation. This, taken in connection with his decided evangelical tone and his polemic zeal against the Papacy, explains

²⁵ Namely, P. HOFSTEEDE DE GROOT, *Institutiones hist. eccles. Gronov.* 1835; and M. J. MATTER, *Histoire du Christianisme et de la société chrétienne*, ed. 2. Paris, 1838. 4 Vols. 8vo.

²⁶ He himself informs us in the preface to the fourth volume, that from 150,000 to 200,000 copies of his work had been sold, in the English language alone.

also his popularity just noticed particularly in the Puritanic section of Protestantism. His perfection here however runs by excess, on the other side, into a fault. Merle d' Aubigné presents, like Macaulay in his celebrated History of England, a series of brilliant pictures, without being able at the same time to rise to philosophical, universal views. Aiming, moreover, to make all the fortunes and deeds of his hero as interesting as possible, and to secure in this way a constant gratification to the reader, he often wrongs the history itself, and forgets the task of the historian in that of the romance writer. Marheinecke's History of the Reformation is of much less pretension, but far more correct and true. A sound simple sense for truth never seeks to make more out of history than it actually is, and takes little or no thought for effect. In the end, however, the quiet passionless objectivity and artless simplicity of the evangelists make a more enduring impression, than all rhetorical ornament and all dramatic parade. Then again that hot polemic zeal, that finds vent with Merle d' Aubigné, almost on every page, in exclamations and apostrophes against the hated Papists, is not such as becomes the dignity of a historian, who should argue *indirectly* only, though in this way precisely with most effect, by the representation of *facts*. As it is, the authority of this spirited and gifted writer in the sphere of history, is likely to wane, in proportion as with the farther progress of his work, his other peculiar sympathies and antipathies, may come probably to mix themselves with the narration, along with the anti-Roman tendency, so as to touch many of his past admirers on their own sensitive side. We cannot say, at least, that he has increased his reputation by his late work on *Cromwell*; where, carried away by the fresh impression of Carlyle's book, swallowed without digestion, he makes himself the unqualified panegyrist of a military and political genius, who sought to advance the cause of religion by war and bloodshed, the decapitation of a king, the dissolution of parliament, the exercise of dictatorial power, etc.; the direct opposite thus, in this respect, of Martin Luther, in whom notwithstanding, the same historian, inconsistently enough, praises as truly Christian and apostolic an aversion to all tumult and violence, while on the other hand most undue censure, in the fourth volume, is heaped on the good Zuingli, for becoming in the end a sort of general and appearing on the battle field at Cappel. We cannot therefore forbear remarking, that the immoderate praise bestowed upon the Genevan Doctor (whom we also hold in high honor, only within proper bounds), by the English and American religious press, reflects a very doubtful credit to say the least on its own character.

In England and America thus far it has been held sufficient gen-

erally to follow Mosheim, taking along with him perhaps as a complement to his learning the more pious work of Milner. The thoroughly learned and highly valuable monographies of the Scotch theologian, THOMAS M'CRIE, on the Life of John Knox and the Reformation in Spain and Italy, have called forth unfortunately no imitation; and even the Puseyitic controversy has led to nothing more than party illustrations of particular doctrines and usages in Patristic and English-Episcopal church history.²⁷ On the other hand, however, we meet at times in English and American *Reviews*, with very thorough and interesting essays in the sphere of church history; and the excellent translations of Gieseler by DAVIDSON, and Neander by TORREY, show plainly enough that the later literature of Germany in this department is beginning to be prized, and that it may be expected in due time to lead also to independent productions. England has her MACAULAY, America has her PRESCOTT, and why then should they not be capable of producing also a great church historian? True, our system of sects and denominations, with the narrow spirit of party which it seems to nourish, stands greatly in the way of any impartial study and representation of *universal* church history, for this supposes a wide and Catholic mind; but it is to be hoped, that an increasing interest in historical theology will counteract the force of this bigotry, and be itself still farther advanced by its decline. Which result may God hasten, in his own time.

§ 17. THE USES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

We conclude this sketch with a few remarks on the value and use of church history, as it results from a proper treatment of it.

1. The knowledge of church history is the self-consciousness the church has of her own development, which as such carries its unconditional value and use first *in itself*. This we must lay stress upon over against the one-sided utilitarian view, by which it is cultivated for certain party and private interests only, and so degraded into a mere tool for transient ends. The present is the result of the past, and cannot possibly be comprehended in full without the knowledge of this in

²⁷ The work of WILLIAM PALMER: *A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest to the present time*, can make no pretension to scientific worth. The well known convert, Newman, before his transition, passed a most unfavorable, no doubt too unfavorable, judgment on his countrymen, in regard to their acquaintance with church history, where he wrote among other things, "It is melancholy to say it; but the chief, perhaps the only English writer, who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the infidel Gibbon." *Essay on the Dev. of Chr. Doct.* Appleton's edition, p. 14.

a thorough way. The church consequently also, to understand herself, must know her origin and her genesis. Her past deeds, sufferings and fortunes, belong to the substance of her life, are integral elements of her being, that require the succession of time for their evolution. We need no outward impulse first to engage our interest in the history of the kingdom of God; the nature of the Christian faith itself is sufficient for this with every one, according to inward vocation and outward opportunity. Faith seeks always a clearer apprehension of its object, and thus takes the deepest interest in the ways of God, the words and deeds of his servants, the cloud of witnesses looking forth without and from the past. In the same way that man, as man, according to the old saying: *homo sum, nihil humani a me alienum puto*, is prompted and bound to take an interest in all that is strictly human, it becomes the Christian also, as a Christian, to have the most active sympathy with the doings and fortunes of all his brethren in the faith, with whom he is joined in one body. Theology altogether, apprehended and pursued in the right spirit, is not simply a theoretic process, but divine worship. Church history then deserves to be studied for its own sake; it is an essential part of the knowledge of the being and work of the Triune God, in which consists eternal life.²⁶

Out of this higher internal worth of church history, flows its practical use and necessity for certain ends and callings, especially for the teachers and leaders of the Christian congregation. Our science, like all human knowledge and activity, should be employed to the honor of God, to glorify his name and build up his kingdom.

2. Thus the knowledge of church history is farther one of the most *powerful helps for successful action in the service of the kingdom of God*. The present is not only the product of the past, but the motherly soil also of the future, which he that cultivates must understand, and which no one can understand thoroughly except by intimate acquaintance with the past. No one, for example, is prepared to govern a State *well* and to advance its prosperity, who has not made himself familiar with its wants and its history. Ignorance can produce only a bungling work, that must soon go again to wreck. History is next to the word of God the richest source of wisdom and experience. Her treasures are inexhaustible. Why is it that so much is wrought in church and State, that after a few years is again forgotten? Because the authors had no knowledge of history and no respect for it. *That tree only defies the storm, whose roots strike far into the earth. So that work only can stand, whose foundation rests in the solid ground of history.*

²⁶ Comp. John 17: 3.

3. Again, church history is the best and most complete *defence of Christianity*, and so is eminently fitted to establish our faith, and minister comfort and edification largely to our souls. It is a perpetual commentary on that word of the Lord: "Lo, I am with you alway, to the end of the world." He moves with the fulness of his grace through all Christian centuries, he reveals himself in the most different personalities, employing them as organs of his spirit, his will, his truth, his peace. The apostles and martyrs, the apologists and church fathers, the schoolmen and mystics, the reformers and all those countless witnesses, whose names are indelibly traced on the pages of church history, form themselves into one choir, which sings an everlasting doxology to the Redeemer, and proclaims with loud voice that the Gospel is no fable, no fancy, but power and life, peace and joy, all in one word that man can desire in the way of good or glory. Such examples, in which the life of the God-man comes to actual and as it were corporeal expression, speak far more forcibly than all intellectual proofs and abstract theories. In the same way church history furnishes the strongest argument for the indestructibility of Christianity. To the word of the Lord: "On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," every century responds, *Yea and Amen!* There is no hostile power on the earth, or under it, which has not already conspired against the congregation of the redeemed, and bent its whole force for its annihilation. But it has overcome them all. Stiff-necked and blinded Judaism laid its hand on the Anointed of the Lord and his servants; but the Lord has risen from the dead, his followers have adored his wonderful judgments over the desolate ruins of Jerusalem, the chosen people wanders dispersed, without shepherd and without sanctuary, through all nations and times, a perpetual living proof of the truth of the threatenings of the divine word, and "this generation shall not pass away" till the Lord come again in his glory. Greece applied all its art and philosophy, to confute the doctrine of the cross and make it ridiculous in the eyes of the cultivated world; but her wisdom was turned into folly, or made to serve as a bridge to Christianity. Rome, proud mistress of the world, devised the most unnatural torments, to torture Christians to death and root out their name from the earth; but tender virgins showed more courage in face of eternity than tried soldiers and Stoic philosophers; and, lo, after a couple of centuries of the most bloody persecution, the Roman emperor himself cast his crown at the feet of the despised Nazarene, and was baptized into his name. The crescent of Islam sought to overshadow the sun of Christianity, and moved blood-red along the horizon of the Oriental and the African Church, nay passed over even into

Spain and France; but the messengers of the Lord have driven back the false prophet, and his kingdom resembles now a decaying corpse. All sorts of heresies and schisms rose in the bosom of the Church itself, even with its earliest history, and seemed for a time to have forced aside the pure doctrine of the gospel; but this has still always recovered its ground again, and brought the army of errorists to shame. The popes surrounded the simple doctrine of salvation with so many human additions, that it was hard any longer to get at it, and they exercised despotic rule over the whole Western Christian world; but the inmost life-force of the Church worked itself powerfully through the rubbish, placed the light of the pure word again in its place, and set conscience free from the oppressive chains of the hierarchy. Deists, materialists and atheists, in the 17th and 18th centuries, set themselves to undermine the Bible; nay, the heroes of the French Revolution went so far, in their mad fanaticism, as to set aside the God of Christians, and place the goddess of reason on the throne of the world, and the most frightful scenes of cruelty accompanied the act; but in a short time they had to revoke their own folly; the Lord in heaven laughed at them and had them in derision. Napoleon, the greatest potentate and captain of modern times, proposed to substitute for the universal dominion of Christianity, the universal dominion of his own sword, and to degrade the church into an instrument for his own political ends; but the Lord of the Church hurled him from his throne, and the giant spirit, that had thrown all Europe out of joint, must die, a prisoner on a lonely rock of the ocean, of a broken heart. In the bosom of Protestantism has risen, since the close of the last century, a Rationalism, which armed with learning and philosophy, has proceeded gradually to the denial even of a personal God and of immortality, turning the history of the Saviour into a mythological book of fables; but over against it has appeared also already a believing theology, which has triumphantly driven its objections from the field, while in the camp of the foe itself division has taken place, and one system of unbelief is found actively refuting another. Spiritual death and indifference, in the train of Rationalism, spread itself over whole sections of the Church; but the Christian life already celebrates again its own resurrection, banished out of one country it flourishes with fresh vigor in another, and extends its activity out to the farthest limits of the heathen world. The most important kingdoms, the best constructed systems of human wisdom, have perished; while the simple faith of the Galilean fishermen shows itself at this day as powerful as ever, regenerating the most hardened sinners, imparting strength for good, joy in affliction, and triumph in death. The Lord of hosts has ever been a wall round about his Zion.

The gates of hell, through eighteen centuries, have not prevailed against the Church; as little will they prevail against it in time to come. To have stood so many and such various storms, and to have come forth from all only more pure and strong, she must indeed be formed of indestructible material. This church history raises to an absolute certainty, for him who studies it with a truth loving spirit. It is therefore, next to the word of God, the best and richest book of devotion, that will not allow us even then to faint, when thick darkness covers the present, and the walls of Zion are beset with foes on every side.

4. Finally, church history, in proportion as it serves to confirm our faith in the divine origin and indestructible nature of Christianity, must exert a wholesome *moral influence* also on our own character and life, and so prove an important help to *practical religion*. It is morality in the form of facts, Christ and his gospel preached from the annals of his own kingdom.³⁹ The shining examples of godly men, which it causes to pass before our spirit, powerfully challenge us to imitation, that we like them may consecrate our thoughts and actions to the honor of the Lord and the welfare of man, and so continue to be felt with happy influence long after our death. Especially is the study of history adapted also, to free our minds from all sorts of prejudice, narrowness, party and sect feeling, and to fill us with true catholic spirit; with that love which joyfully acknowledges the most manifold forms of the Christian life in their proper right, in the blooming variety of flowers that deck the garden of God adores the wonderful wisdom of the heavenly gardener, and feels itself in living union with the pious of all ages and nations; with that love, which must be poured out in large measure upon the Church, before her present mournful divisions can be brought to an end, accomplishing thus the precious promise of the One Shepherd and one flock, and the prayer of our great High Priest: "That they all may be one, as Thou Father, art in me, and I

³⁹ Luther says admirably: "It is a rare worth that belongs to histories; for all that philosophy, wise men and general reason can teach or think out, that is profitable for good life, this history forcibly presents by examples and cases, and sets it at once before the eyes, as though we were by and saw it so happen. And when we look at it deeply, we find that from histories and annals have flowed, almost all rights, art, good counsel, warning, threatening, terror, consolation, strengthening, instruction, providence, prudence, along with all virtues, as out of a living spring. In this view, histories are nothing else than the advertisement, monument and mark, of God's work and judgment, how he upholds, governs, hinders, enlarges, punishes and honors the world, men especially, as every one may deserve, be it evil or good."

in thee ; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

Here indeed all depends on the mind and spirit with which church history is studied ; for like the Bible itself it may be, and often has been, scandalously abused in the service of bad ends, as may be sufficiently inferred from the foregoing history of this science.

ARTICLE IV.

REVIEW OF TALVJ ON THE COLONIZATION OF NEW ENGLAND.

By Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., Cincinnati.

Geschichte der Colonisation von New England, von den ersten Niederlassungen daselbst im Jahre 1607, bis zur Einführung der Provinzialverfassung von Massachusetts im Jahre 1692. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet von Talvj. Nebst einer Karte von New England im Jahre 1674. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1847.

History of the Colonization of New England, from the first Settlements there in the year 1607 to the Introduction of the Provincial Government of Massachusetts in the year 1692. Investigated from the Original Sources by Talvj. With a Map of New England in the year 1674. Leipsic: F. A. Brockhaus. 1847.

"*Perversi difficile corriguntur et stultorum infinitus est numerus,*" says the wise Preacher, according to the Vulgate, Eccl. 1: 15. Every day we have occasion to notice the justness of this remark, and in nothing more strikingly than in what is said and written respecting the Puritans.

Should some typographer of our day examine the printing apparatus of Guttenberg and Faust, notice how unwieldy and clumsy it was, how very slowly and imperfectly it executed its work, and on comparing it with the more perfect machinery of these times, should pour contempt on the inventors of the art, pronounce them entirely unworthy the gratitude of posterity, and hold them up to ridicule as mere bunglers and impudent pretenders, what should we think but *Perversi difficile corriguntur*?

If some little dapper fellow should climb upon the Kentucky giant, and placing one foot on each shoulder should stand upright, and with