F. Foakes Jackson: A History of Church History

I. History is a Science.

But the historian must be both Scientist + artist; important as one, enthusiastic as other

Scientist – too often hinders own work. – p 3 ff.

① Too anxious to avoid mistakes – never produces

② Modest – makes valuable discovery, never gives it to world

③ Researches – too busy accumulating knowledge to organize it

first ch. history – Acts. p 5 f (A corporate body – but describes individuals)

Acts 1-5 describes only unreal body – the ideal church.

Acts 6 – describes a real, faulty community – p. 6

The ideal ch. historian must have –

1) Candour – "honesty in investigation, truthfulness in expression"

2) Historic sympathy – go back + live in "the past, not judge by today's standards

"Ch. hist. "a record of the pursuit of an ideal which has never been realized" But disillusion + disappt only spurred to fresh endeavors" – p. 11

II N.T. Canon – first recorded conciliar action. Laodicea, 375 A.D. – only 32 bishops present.

III. (1) Pastoral Epistles (Tim. Tit.) "hardly any of the documents of the N T are better supported by the evidence of the fathers, not one of whom, from the earliest times, doubted that they were the work of the Apostle". p. 28

The beginnings of ch. organization + administration Timothy, Titus.

(2) The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. (Greek father in Rome, vs. Callistus + the Latin fathers) – the first digest of Ch. law

Three lost histories:
① Philippus Sidetes
② Philostorgius (Arian)
③ Hesychius

F. Foakes-Jackson. A History of Church History.

ch. V. Eusebius of Caesarea – pioneer ch'ch historian.
His main argument – "unbroken continuity of the True Faith in the Churches, of which the leading bishops were the repositories" – p 58
Why is Roman bishop not mentioned in earliest documents – Clement, Hermas?
Eusebius on Roman ch'ch – p. 61 ff
It was Alexandria's bishop which was first called "Pope" – p 62
Carthage – home of Latin Bible, Latin Xty. 63
Antioch – its founder, Barnabas
Eusebius heavily relies on Asian sources.

(A) ↗

chap. VI. Greek Historians after Eusebius (on Nestorius)
'Roman Ch'ch was independent. Constantinople's subservient to state. p. 72
① Socrates Scholasticus (ca. 378 – ca. 439) – the Constantinopolitan church, and its ecclesiastical politics – from Arian to Nestorian controversy.
A sequel to Eusebius. A lawyer's view – theological disputes were "a fight in the dark" (p 77) ~~He paints Nest~~
He paints *Nestorius as an ~~eloquent~~ arrogant fool who made mischief by discoursing on subjects he did not understand' (Jackson, p. 78)
② Sozomen – a Palestinian, admirer of monastic Christianity. (on Nicaea).
- a later contemporary of Socrates – more florid style.
- records Ambrose's courage vs. the Emperor.
*- lively account of the Council of Nicaea – but omits Nestorian
③ Theodoret – opinionated theologian. His History covers same ground as Socrates & Sozomen
Record alleged last words of Julian – "Thou hast conquered, Galilean".

Not inspiring reading – too much controversy. Little wonder historians find relief in extolling the monastic saints "as proofs of the presence of God's spirit in a worldly ch'ch" p. 86

Fowler-Jackson, Hist. of Ch. Hist

Chap VII. Augustine - not history but of a history.
He inspired others to write history e.g. —
Paulus Orosius - a Spanish Priest - Seven Books of Histories
against the Pagans — as pupil of Augustine - became
a convenient manual for mediaeval students, emphasizing
the divine govt. of the world.

Chap VIII. Gregory Bishop of Tours
His History of the Franks - the conversion of Clovis & Franks.

Chap. IX. Adamnan's Life of Columba - Conversion of Ireland.

First lecture

Sidney Mead, "Church History Explained"
in March, 1963 Church History
(New Theology No. 1 – ed. Marty & Peerman

History is an assertion, answering questions about the past. The totality of such assertions constitutes the body of historical knowledge. These assertions are made about three things:

1) activities of people in the past
2) assertions about "ideology" i.e. the way of thinking of a person, group or era based on what they said, or artifacts they left
This is a study of motives – "a chief goal of historical studies"
3) assertions about unquestioned presuppositions. Hard to get at, "because, being assumed, they are seldom ever consciously defined and articulated." "The statement of the obvious is one of the most difficult of intellectual achievements" – p. 79.

The historians method has, two aspects

1) The establishment of facts. These are seen on a continuum – "At one end are those assertions upon which there is no conscious whatsoever. At the other end are those assertions upon which there is complete consensus." – p. 80
Facts = those assertions that lie toward the latter end.
2) Interpretation. (1) Assertions about past must be made meaningful to present
e.g. use of BC about date.
(2) "The historian's value system directly conditions his historiography." p. 81
(3) Interpretation by selectivity.

Quote p 83 "Every written history is at least implicitly an explanation of and defense of the allegiance – the faith – of the historian..."

The peculiarity of Church History – Content, not method or approach. p 84

CHURCH HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE RENAISSANCE

It is not surprising that the Renaissance, with its humanist interest in the classical past produced important developments in the writing of history. Nor should it be surprising to find that it produced few church historians. Its interest in history was not religious but secular. The Italian Renaissance, therefore, saw the emergence of the lay historian, quite different from in his local, political interests and his realistic, more critical methods from the priestly mediaeval historians who had preceded him. One of the most important contributions of the Renaissance historians was their search for the texts and documents of the past which, for the first ime, they began to examine critically and without credulity.

The most familiar name in the transition from mediaeval to renaissance historical writing is that of Francesco PETRARCH (1304-74), who was not a church historian but rather "the true father of both Italian Humanism and of Humanist historical writing". (H. E. Barnes, Hist. of Historical Writing, p. 102). Petrarch's Lives (Liber de viris illustribus) was a history of Rome written as a series of short biographies of its great heroes. It dramatized the golden age of Rome as a sharp contrast to the unheroic Christian "Dark Ages" which followed, and thereby gave sharp impetus to the Renaissance's secularizing idealization of the pagan past. But it also inspired church writers to glorify their own past with lives of Christian heroes more believable than some of the miracle-filled, medaeval Lives of the Saints.

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (1405-1464). One who wrote such a Lives of Famous Men was the most famous, but not the best church historian of his times. He was famous not because he was a historian but because he was a Pope (Pius II), and Popes who write creditable histories are rare. He was not a very religious Pope, but a good one, "perhaps the best man of letters and the best speaker who ever wore the tiara". (Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 8, p. 181) He was a brilliant and immensely likeable man with a great diversity of talents--poet, novelist, essayist, diplomat, geographer, diarist and historian. Perhaps the most valuable part of his histories he wrote is his description of his own part in that history and how he viewed the events of his own time.

His historical works include:

Commentaries on the Council of Basel. Aeneas Sylvius himself was secretary of the Council which was the high point in the controversy between the conciliarists and the papacy, reaffirming the declaration of the Council of Constance (1414) that the authority of church councils was superior to that of the Pope. This work describes the deposition of Pope Eugenius IV.

History of Bohemia. The unity of Christendom in the time of Aeneas Sylvius was threatened not only by the controversy between conciliarists and papal supremacists, but also by the rise of pre-reformation reform movements like those of Wyclif and John Huss. His History of Bohemia is an important contemporary Catholic account of the Hussite Wars following the martyrdom of Huss at the Council of Constance.

Commentaries. Perhaps most valuable of all, historically, are

Commentaries. These diaries of the humanist-diplomat-pope cover his whole life, 1405-1463, and in their racy, anecdotal style contain an ;immense amount of unique information on the behind-the-scenes ecclesiastical politics not only of the Catholic church but of all Europe just before the Reformation. It includes a chapter on "How I Became Pope".

As secretary of the Council of Basel, Aeneas Sylvius had been a conciliarist, limiting the power of the pope. Perhaps his intimate view of the inner workings of the politics of that Council led him to distrust toò much democracy. At any rate, when the Council deposed Pope Eugenius IV, and elected as his successor a layman, Duke of Savoy, as Pope Felix V, Aeneas Sylvius became the new pope's secretary, and inevitably began to turn more papal and less conciliar. The process was completed when he himself was elected pope in 1485 and opposed all the conciliar views he had once defended. His papal bull, Execrabilis, of 1460 condemned as treason and heresy any appeal from a papal decree to the authority of a Council.

Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457). Whereas the importance of Aeneas Sylvius in church history is more due to his work and influence than to his writing, Valla made history by his writing of it. But like his contemporary, he was not principally a church historian. He was a linguist and literary critic, who wrote only one work of standard history, The History of Ferdinand I of Aragon.

That was not the book that gives him his place of fame as a church historian. His chief claim to special mention is rather a shorter monograph, Tract on the Donation of Constantine (De Constantini donatione declamatio) published in 1440, in which he exposed as outright forgery a famous edict attributed to the Emperor Constantine turning over temporal power to the Pope.

This, together with other critical essays such as one in which he convincingly casts doubt upon the apostolic origin of the Apostles' Creed, has earned him the title of "founder of critical scholarship and historical criticism" (Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 7, p. 768 f.). The so-called "Donation" claimed to be a charter of the Emperor Constantine granting to Pope Sylvester and his successors the overlordship of "the city of Rome and all the provinces, districts and cities of Italy or of the Western regions", in effect, the whole Western Roman Empire. It was effectively used by medieval popes as a major support of the temporal claims of the papacy over against kings and emperors. The full text of the "Donation" can be found in English in E. F. Henderson, Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages, 1892, pp. 319-329.

Valla's monograph exposing the fraud "had the effect of an intellectual earthquake", writes Thompson (Hist. of Historical Writing, vol. 1, p. 493). It was based on the investigations of others, notably Nicholas of Cusa, but it was his own simple, clear analysis of the Latin of the text that devastatingly exposed for all to see that it could never have been the 4th century document it claimed to be, but was undoubtedly written no earlier than about the time of Charlemagne in the 8th century. This was the beginning of scholarly textual and historical analysis of the documents of history.

HISTORIANS OF THE REFORMATION AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

The Protestant Reformation opens a whole new period in the writing of church history. In one sense the church histories of that period build upon the humanist historiography of the Renaissance and even far outstrip it both in the volume of historical books produced and in zealous search for and recovery of original historical sources. But in another, more negative sense, the Reformation historians and their Counter-Reformation antagonists turn away from the promising beginnings of historical impartiality and critical analysis that is found in the humanist Renaissance, and revert instead to the polemic manipulation of history and the self-serving credulity of the Middle Ages. James W. Thompson, in his History of Historical Writing is sharp in his criticism: (I, p. 526)

> "There are some periods of history which have to be not re-written but unwritten, and perhaps of no period is this so true as of the Reformation. From its inception ignorance, traditional interpretation and prejudice conspired to obscure and to mutilate the facts. There is an enormous volume of contemporary historical writing which must be discounted or discarded."

In times of controversy, like the Reformation, contemporary sources are not always the best sources, therefore, unless very critically examined and used.

Nevertheless, controversy also sharpens and stimulates the writing of church history. In their search for weapons of defense or attack, historians on both sides of the conflict dug deep for historical ammunition and in so doing made their most important contribution to historical scholarship: the recovery and publication of early documents on church history". (Barnes, p. 122). They also began to analyze church developments from a deeper perspective. As Thompson admits, despite his sharp criticism quoted above:

> "The firm establishment of Protestantism brought into prominence a branch of historiography...: church history, but of a nature radically different from the medieval historia ecclesiastica. Modern ecclesiastical history, treating of the inner life of the Church, its doctrine and administration, is the child of the Lutheran Reformation, created by the demands of the controversy raging between the Roman Church and the Protestants, the central question of which was the exclusive possession of 'the pure faith' by one church or the other.." (p. 613 f.)

We will look first at some of the less commendable polemic histories of the times, and then single out the best church historians on either side.

Polemic Church History in the Reformation

Reformation church history began rather poorly not so much as an effort to discover and report the true history of the church but rather as an attempt to prove from history that Protestantism was the true church and Catholicism a false counterfeit, or vice versa, depending on whether the historian belonged to the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. Its basic philosophy of history was a return to the view of Orosius that history is an epic struggle between God and the Devil, with this difference, that whereas Orosius, following and over-simplifying Augustine, pictured the City of God in terms of the Christian church, and the City of the Devil in terms of paganism, now with Protestants battling Catholics the struggle was between Christians. "Two new 'Cities of Satan'..replaced the pagan 'City' of.. Orosius--'the Devil's Nest at Rome' and the followers of 'the crazy Monk of Wittenberg', respectively," writes H. E. Barnes (p. 121).

Robert Barnes (1495-1540). The first guns of the battle of the church historians were fired by the Protestants. One of Luther's earliest supporters, the knight Ulrich von Hutten, in 1517 discovered Valla's expose of the fraudulent Donation of Constantine and happily sent it to Luther to use against the Pope. This may have stimulated Luther to consider the mounting of an historical attack against Rome. He found an English Lutheran refugee in Germany, Robert BARNES, and directed him to write The Lives of the Popes of Rome. It was not good history, but it was an effective attack, purporting to trace all the disasters of the Middle Ages to the wickedness of the popes and their greedy seizure of temporal power from natural national rulers.

The Magedeburg Centuries. By far the best and most influential Protestant historical polemic was a work called the Magdeburg Centuries, so-called because each of its 13 volumes was devoted to the history of a complete century from the time of Christ up to the 13th century. Compiled between 1553 and 1575, it was begun by MATTHIAS FLACIUS (or Vlacich) ILLYRICUS (1520-1575), a convert of Luther and often a theological opponent of Melanchthon but always a strong Lutheran partisan. He was assisted in the monumental undertaking by a whole corps of prominent scholars, six in all, who scoured all Europe for historical documents and evidence to strengthen their attack.

As with all the partisan histories of the Reformation, it is easy to criticize the Centuries. Its bias is obvious and extreme. Everything discreditable to Rome is included, and in a few cases even manufactured such as the report of a female pope, Pope Joan. The popes are all Anti-Christs. Miracles favorable to Catholicism are discounted as false, while those supporting the Protestant argument are uncritically accepted.

But even the most contemptuous of modern critics of the Centuries must grudgingly admit their immense contribution to the

work to the study of church history. J. W. Thompson calls it a "landmark in European historiography and culture" "For, despite all its weaknesses," he writes, "the Centuries constituted a tremendous challenge to the historic basis of the Roman Church and made both Protestants and Catholics history-minded. The very method of attack--the use of history to destroy an ancient historical institution--was a stimulus to the study and development of historical research, for the Catholics could not permit the onslaught to go unchallenged and were compelled to turn to history and find ammunition for a counter-offensive." (Thompson, p. 530 f.)

Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538-1605). The man who took up the counter-attack for Rome against the Lutherans was a 21-year-old lecturer in church history at the evangelistic conference center of (St.) Philip Neri in Rome which was called the Oratory, and later the Congregation of Philip Neri. His name was Caesar Baronius, from a noble Neapolitan family. For forty-eight years he lectured at Neri's Congregation on church history, and in 1588 he used these lectures as the basis for publication of the first volume of the work which made him famous, the Ecclesiastical Annals. Like the Centuries, which he tried to answer point by point, each volume covered one century, and when he died at age 69 he was still working on volume 13. (Later writers, Raynaldus, Bozovius, Laderchi, and eventually Theiner, added volumes which carried the Annals down to the year 1590.

The Annals of Baronius proved immensely popular. The author had the unparalleled riches of the Vatican library at his disposal, and smothered the Protestants under a mass of documents, as Thompson vividly notes (p. 537). But he lacked the integrity of the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries, and though it looked for a short while that the Catholics had won the battle of the historians, Baronius' victory was short-lived. Later historians, acknowledging their indebtedness to him for uncovering so many valuable historical documents, are not so forgiving of his methods. Preserved Smith, the historian of the Reformation, writes:

> "However poor was the work of the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries, they were at least honest in arraying their sources. This is more than can be said of Caesar Baronius, whose Annales Ecclesiastici was the official counterblast to the Protestant work. Whereas his criticism is no whit better than theirs, he adopted the cunning policy, unfortunately widely obtaining since his day, of simply ignoring or suppressing unpleasant facts, rather than of refuting the inferences drawn from them. His talent for switching the attention to a side-issue, and for tangling instead of clearing problems, made the Protestants justly regard him as 'a great deceiver'". (The Age of the Reformation, p. 585)

Bibliography: Caesar Baronius: Counter-Reformation Historian by Cyprian Pallapilly (South Bend in., Notre Dame U Press, 1974)

Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614). It was inevitable that the Protestants would rally to answer Baronius as Baronius had tried to answer the attacks of the Magdeburg Centuries. The answer, which came from a Swiss Calvinist, Isaac Casaubon, in his work Exercitationes in Baronium (Exercises against Baronius) was a triumph of critical scholarship but a popular failure.

Casaubon, a Christian humanist and philologist (not a historian) wrote his work at the request of James I of England who wished to defend Anglicanism against the claims of the Catholics. Casaubon had originally been greatly impressed with the scope of Baronius's scholarship in the Annals, but on closer reading he was shocked to find that Baronius did not even know Greek and that his history was full of errors and mistranslations. At first he suspected the Catholic of deliberate deception but concluded on further investigation that the Cardinal was a basically good man with a poorly informed mind whose lack of scholarship made him unable to digest the huge amounts of historical material he had collected. He knew everything but understood nothing. Even Catholic historians began to find errors in Baronius. One German (Lucas Holstein) counted 8000 such mistakes. Casaubon therefore felt it imperative to set the historical record straight on behalf of the Protestant cause. The result, his Exercitationes, was a disappointment. It is more a collection of pedantic footnotes than a text. It simply lists the errors of Baronius, one by one, without unified argument, and aroused little popular interest, failing thereby to halt the spread of Baronius' poorer but more successful history.

Louis Maimbourg (1610-1686). The battle continued with another very popular history, a History of Lutheranism written by a French Jesuis, Maimbourg, in 1680. It was a popular, not very scholarly, collection of the Catholic arguments. He followed it up with an even less scholarly attack on the Calvinists, a History of Calvinism.

Ludwig von Seckendorf (1626-1692). Maimbourg's clever but unsound attack on the Lutherans was crushingly answered by the sound scholarship and careful documentary research of Ludwig von Seckendorf in his Historical and Apologetic Commentary on Lutheranism and the Reformation, in 1688-1692. Both by his birth and integrity this distinguished historian commended himself to the Saxon princes of Protestant Germany who made available to him documents hitherto hidden from historians in their archives. These he used to demolish the slanders of Maimbourg. Church historians are also indebted to him for one of the first textbook surveys of church history, his Compendium of Ecclesiastical History.

Bishop Jacques Benigne Bossuet (1627-1704). With Seckendorf and Bossuet the battle of the church historians, Reformation against Counter-Reformation, begins to end and rises to a more dignified and sounder historical level. Bossuet's central argument against the Reformation is in his History of the Differences Among Protestant Churches. There he argues that Protestant rejections of papal authority break the unity of Christendom and can lead only to endless schism and ecclesiastical chaos. Unlike the more polemic writer, he admits to much that is good in Luther, and much that is bad in the popes, but insists that the choice between liberty and authority must be made on the side of authority. Another of his books, Discourse on Universal History is Augustinian in its philosophy that all history illustrates the controlling hand of God in human events. He has been called the "Orosius of the Counter-Reformation".

More Objective Church History in the Reformation

There is no such thing as completely non-polemic church history written in the period of the Reformation. What Christian could be altogether neutral in so intense a struggle for what each side considered to be the essentials of the Christian faith. Nevertheless there is a ;difference between the writers we have listed above as "polemic" and those we will now consider as "more objective". The former intentionally and purposefull attacked their opponents, sometimes deliberately distorting history in the process. The latter at least tried to give a straightforward account of events as they saw them. The distinction is only relative. Some of the "polemic" writers, like Seckendorf and Bossuet, are careful and trustworthy. And some of the "objective" historians become inevitably controversial by the very nature of their direct involvement in the theological warfare of the times. Such, for example, are Bullinger, Beza and Knox.

In general, it has been observed, the best histories of the period were written by Protestants, but the best journals and memoirs by Catholics. (Thompson, op. cit. p. 561, 574)

Let me first simply list the names and principal writings of the more ;important, less polemic historians:

John Sleidan (1506-1556). German Lutheran. Commentaries on Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, 1517-1555.

Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575). Swiss Reformed. History of the Reformation, 1519-1532.

John Knox (1505-1572). Scottish Calvinist. History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland, (to 1564).

Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Swiss Calvinist. Ecclesiastical History of Church Reforms in the Kingdom of France. (1580)

Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigne (1550-1630). French Huguenot. Universal History (from 1553-1602).

Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623). Italian Catholic. History of the Council of Trent (1619)

Niccolo Orlandini (d. 1606). Italian Jesuit. History of the Society of Jesus.

Jean Bolland (1596-1665). Dutch Jesuit. Acta Sanctorum (Lives of the Saints).

Pietro Giannone (1676-1748). Italian Catholic. Civil History of the Kingdom of Naples. (Critical of temporal power of papacy)

Gilbert Burnet (d. 1715). Anglican. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. (to 1567)

Johann Lorenz von Mosheim. (1694-1755). German Lutheran. Institutes of Church History: Ancient and Modern. (1755)

-6-

John Sleidan
(1503-56)

John Sleidan (his name is usually Latinized as Sleidanus) has been called the "greatest of all Protestant historians" in the Reformation period (J.W. Thompson, Hist. of Hist. Writing, I, p. 528). He was the first to note and analyze the significance of political factors underlying the religious developments of the Reformation.

Sleidan was a humanist scholar and disciple of Erasmus who came to be employed by the French as a diplomat in France's relationships with the Schmalkaldic League. This League was the political confederation which the Lutheran princes of Germany formed to protect themselves against the Emperor Charles V and his attempt to crush Protestantism by force of arms and restore all Germany to the Catholic faith. In the course of his diplomatic negotiations, Sleidan came to mistrust the Catholic politics of the Spanish Emperor and was gradually won to the cause of the Reformation.

Though primarily a diplomat and jurist, Sleidan's humanist interests had led him to the study of history. He translated and was influenced by the works of the mediaeval French historian, Jean Froissart (1337-1410), who was a chronicler of the heroic age of chivalry and of the Hundred Years' War between France and England. His historical method was even more influenced by another French historian whom he also translated, Philippe de Commines (1445-1509). Commines' Memoirs are more analytical and less dramatic than Froissart, and are often considered to be the transition between mediaeval and early modern historical writing.

The historical work for which Sleidan is famous is his Commentaries on Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, 1517-1555. H.E. Barnes calls it "the ablest history of the Reformation written by either a Catholic or a Protestant before Bishop Gilbert Burnet" (Hist. of Hist. Writing, p. 124). It is a legal and constitutional defense of the Protestant princes' difiance of the edict of the Emperor against Lutheranism, and of the ir right to leave the Catholic Church. But though pro-Protestant, Sleidan was so objective and balanced a historian that neither the Lutherans or the Catholics were happy with his book. Melanchthon condemned it, and the Catholics outlawed it.

The great importance of Sleidan's work is that it was the first primarily political analysis of the Reformation movement and the Protestant revolt, says Barnes (op. cit. p. 125). As Sleidans himself wrote, "In describing religious affairs I was not able to omit politics, for as I said before, they almost always interact, and in our age, least of all, can they be separated." This attention to political influences was partly due, of course, to Sleidan's own involvement in the diplomatic negotiations of the times, but it can also be traced to the influence of Calvin. Though a Lutheran in his sympathies, Sleidan had great admiration for Calvin's trained legal mind and was an earnest student of his writings.

BULLINGER and KNOX

There are two historians of the Reformation who are significant not only because they wrote Reformation history but even more because they played important roles in that history themselves as Reformers. The are Heinrich Bullinger, the disciple of Zwingli, and John Knox, the disciple of Calvin.

Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575).

Bullinger, the Swiss Reformer, is remembered in the field of church historiography for his intimate, inside account of the early years of the Swiss Reformation in his Reformationsgeschichte (History of the Reformation, 1519-32).

Bullinger, the son of a parish priest, was educated at Cologne where he came under the influence of the works of Erasmus and Luther. Returning to Switzerland in 1523 he joined Zwingli's reform movement, becoming not only the Zurich reformer's disciple and son-in-law, but also, after Zwingli's death in 1531, his successor as the Reformed "bishop" of the Zurich area.

Both as a reformer and as a historian Bullinger was moderate and conciliatory. His History is of course pro-Protestant, but it has none of the fire and anger of Knox's more famous history of the Scottish Reformation. As leader of the German-Swiss reform he tried hard to mediate the growing schism between the Lutheran and Reformed wings of the Protestant movement. He sought to avoid confrontation between church and state. Perhaps as a result of the military disaster at Kappel in 1531, where Zwingli was killed, Bullinger was less enthusiastic than Calvin (or Sleidan) for church involvement in politics. He supported Thomas Erastus whose Zwinglian "Erastianism" acknowledged the state's right to intervene and overrule in church affairs but warned the church against trying to control the state. This view led Bullinger to support the development of English Anglicanism, with its acceptance of state protection and support, against the aggressively independent and more Calvinistic position of the English Puritans.

Bullinger's Reformationsgeschichte is extremely important for the care with which he preserved and copied whole documents concering the first years of the Swiss Reformation in the German-speaking cantons. His Erastianism, however, led him to neglect the political side of the Reformation and to limit his account rather narrowly to purely religious and theological matters. Moreover, his patriotic Swiss nationalism made him belittle the indebtedness of the Swiss Reformation to the Lutheran German Reformation.

The best edition of the Reformationsgeschichte was published in three volumes in 1839, edited by J. J. Hottinger and H.H. Vogeli.

JOHN KNOX
(c. 1514-1572)

Even greater than Bullinger both as a reformer and as a historian was "the thundering Scot", John Knox. He is the father of Scottish (and by derivation, American) Presbyterianism, and the author of one of the best of the partisan histories, History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland, first published in a complete edition in 1644, and more recently, in 1949 edited by C.J. Dickinson in 2 volumes.

His life history is familiar. Born probably in 1514 and educated at St. Andrews he was ordained a priest in 1536. He was converted to Protestantism probably under the influence of a Thomas Gwillian, but the circumstances and date are obscure. A friend of the earliest reformers, he was captured by a Catholic French force sent to avenge the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and served two years as a galley slave. Freed in 1549 he spent the next four years in England vigorously siding with the more Protestant and Calvinist party in the infant Anglican church. When the Catholic Mary became queen in 1553 he fled to the continent and at Calvin's urging became for a short time pastor of the English congregation at Frankfurt, but also spending considerable time as a disciple of Calvin at Geneva where, in 1556 he became pastor of the Geneva English congregation. His writings in Geneva principally developed the theme of the right of Christians to rebel against idolatrous rulers. When, in 1559, he returned to Scotland at the invitation of the Protestant nobles who hoped for his help against the threat of Catholic French rule over Scotland, it was this Christian right of revolt against ungodly rule that became the theological foundation of his personal challenge to Mary, Queen of Scots, and the cornerstone of the Scottish reformation. The defeat of the French by the Scottish lords, with English help, in 1560 had given an initial victory to the cause of reform, but the death of Mary's husband, King Francis II of France, left her free to return to Scotland as not its queen without the onus of the French connection and threatened to undo the reformation victory. From 1561 to 1567 Knox and Mary dueled for the soul of Scotland, a bitter battle which was not decided until scandal and indiscretion forced Mary from the throne in disgrace. She was succeeded by her infant son James VI (who was later to become also James I of England). Knox preached the sermon at the coronation. Five years later, in 1572, Knox died "having influenced not merely the religion but the character of the nation more than any other man in Scottish history" (Walker, Hist. of the Christian Church, rev. ed. 1959, p. 303).

Knox is better known for his fiery oratory and his thundering involvement in politics and reform than for his writings but he was also a powerful pen. His earliest work in Geneva was the well-known: The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, a tract directed against Mary Tudor arguing that no woman should rule. Two years later, in 1560, he was the principal drafter of the Scottish Book of Discipline, which moulded the constitutional church order of Scottish and American Presbyterianism.

The work which had earned John Knox an honored place in the ranks of church historians is his History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland. Perhaps it was his early training at St. Andrews, probably under the Scottish scholar John Major, that enabled Knox to at least partly subdue his bent for fiery partisanship and lift his History above the level of special pleading for his own cause to a surprising measure of balance and fairness and honest reporting of the facts. H. E. Barnes, who is not always gentle in his criticism of church historians, has this to say of Knox in his History of Historical Writing:

> 'From the standpoint of literary quality his history was a work of genius, 'displaying a marvelous precision and sureness in the selection and presentation of the striking and significant details.' For a polemic writer of the time he showed an unusual master of and reliance upon humor, sarcasm and irony. Nor did Knox fail to condemn in the most vigorous terms those who adopted Calvinism as the means of gaining selfish material ends or resorted to violence in the name of religion in order to revenge political or personal grievances. While Knox saw his facts though decidedly partisan eyes he did not consciously falsify or suppress facts." (p. 124)

The partisanship in the History is obvious, particularly in Book II, which was the first section he wrote. The Roman Catholic Church is "antichrist", and the Protestants are "the Congregation of Christ Jesus the Evangel of God". Catholic priests are "that vermin of shavelings utterly corrupted", while Protestant martyrs are the "poor saints of God". This is the propaganda side of his writing, for it must not be forgotten that the book was written amidst some of the fiercest political and religious conflicts of the whole Reformation period. But Knox was far more than a propagandist and as a historian he searched carefully for documentation and confirmation of his narrative, and invited criticism of what he had written from expert witnesses. And even from the propaganda side of the History we learn from the inside something of the fears and hopes and motivations of those sturdy Scottish covenanters who gave Scotland its freedom and Presbyterianism its firmest base.

The History is divided into four Books written by Knox plus a fifth Book added after his death. Book I was not the first part of the History as originally written. Knox first wrote Book II as an account of contemporary events in which he was caught up in the crucial years 1558-1559 beginning with the formation of the Protestant league of nobles, "The Lords of the Congregations" and the ominous marriage of Mary, Queen of Scots to the French crown prince. Knox completed this section in 1559. Book III was begun a few years later, probably in 1562, as a continuation of the story up to 1561; and Book IV (written from 1566 to 1571) carries the record from 1561 to 1564. Book V was added by a later hand, perhaps from Knox's note, but not in his vivid style. It completes the history of the Scottish Reformation to the year 1567.

The best current edition is John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. by Wm. Croft Dickinson, 2 vols., N.Y. 1950.

Theodore de Beze (Beza)
1519-1605

Another Reformer who wrote church history was Calvin's successor at Geneva as leader of the Reformed (Presbyterian) branch of the Protestant Reformation, Theodore de Beze, whose name is Latinized as Beza. In addition to a Life of John Calvin he wrote An Ecclesiastical History of Church Reforms in the Kingdom of France which has earned him a place in the ranks of church historians though his major contributions were as a New Testament Greek scholar, theologian, educator and church leader.

Theodore Beza was born in Burgundy (France), son of a lesser nobleman. He studied law at the University in Orleans (like Calvin) and was attracted to the humanist study of the classics (also like Calvin). A secret marriage made him reluctant to be ordained a priest as his family wished. After a severe illness when he was 29 years old he was converted to Protestantism, went to Geneva and publicly married his secret wife. He was made Professor of Greek in nearby Lausanne and in 1556 published a critically annotated Latin translation of the Greek New Testament which became the basis of the English translation, the Geneva Bible.

In 1558 Calvin invited Beza to Geneva and in 1559 made him Rector of the Genevan Academy which he was then founding. All through these years he was one of the chief advisers of the troubled French Huguenots in their stormy conflict with the French Catholics during the Wars of Religion. When Calvin died in 1564 he succeeded him not only as Moderator of the Company of Pastors but the leading spokesman of Reformed Protestantism in Europe.

His Life of John Calvin was a labor of love and full of valuable contemporary observations and materials but it is marred by modern standards as too eulogistic.

More important as history is his work Histoire ecclesiastique des eglises reformees au royaume de France, 1521-1563 (Ecclesiastical History of Church Reforms in the Kingdom of France). The work does not bear his name, and some think he wrote only the introduction and vol. 1, directing the writing of the rest by his pupils Nicolas des Gallars and Simon Goulart. It is not, in fact, a great history but it does contain invaluable documents and information of the critical period in French Protestantism written by a leader of the church who played a significant role in the developments he was describing.

Beza is better known as the first of the Calvinist scholastics, hardening Calvin's more flexible theology with his strong defence of double predestination and Biblical literalism. But it must also be noted that he was a champion of church unity, for his Harmony of the Confessions (1581) has been called a "landmark in ecumenical history" (McNeill, Hist. & Character of Calvinism, p. 275). It was an attempt to draw the divided wings of the Reformation together by showing to the warring theologians the basic harmony of 15 different Protestant creeds of the times.

For more information on Beza, read Henry M. Baird, Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation 1519-1605 (N.Y., LOnd. 1899)

FRENCH HUGUENOT HISTORIANS

It has been said that the year 1559 marked "a new stage in French history and historical writing".(1) In that year the persecuted French Reformed Church organized its first General Assembly, and from then on the Huguenots began to win such a significant proportion of the French nobility and intellectuals to their cause that for a while it seemed likely that France, like Holland and Scotland, would become a Presbyterian (Reformed) nation. The rise of the Huguenots was accelerated by the decline of the Catholic dynasty under a succession of weak kings. It was not surprising that a movement of such intellectual and political as well as religious strength should have produced a notable line of historians recording the progress of their church. I will mention only four. (Beza could well be included but is usually associated with the Swiss Reformation).

(1) Thompson, op. cit. p. 553)

1. Francois de la Noue (1531-1591). The best histories of the period, as has been observed, were written by Protestants; the best memoirs and journals by Catholics. An exception is the work of the Protestant memoirist Francois de la Noue, called Bras-de-fer after he lost his dar arm in gallant fighting for the Huguenots during the French wars of religion (1562-1593) and replaced it with an iron one. His Discours politiques et militaires is a collection of 26 discourses on the political and military course of the civil war between French Catholics and Protestants, especially between 1562 and 1570. Firmly Calvinist, he is nevertheless fair to his opponents, longs for French national unity, and proposed a union of moderate Catholics and Huguenots.

2. Pierre Victor La Palma, or Palma-Cayet (1525-1610). One of the best chronicles of the period was written by a historian who was first a Catholic, then a Protestant, and then a Catholic again, Palma-Cayet. Converted to Calvinism by conviction, he re-converted to Catholicism in loyalty to his King when Henry of Navarre, the Protestant leader accepted Calvinism Catholicism as the price for the kingship and the restoration of the unity of France, ending the disastrous wars of religion. Palma-Capet was appointed official recorder by Henry when he became King. He wrote two chronicles: the Chronologie novenaire covers the years 1589-1598, and is more accurate than the Chronologie septenaire which record the events of the years 1598-1601.

3. Jean de Serres (1540-1598). The best Protestant historian of these stormy times was Juan de Serres, who was equally at home as a scholar in theology or philosophy as in history. He was a graduate of Calvin's Academy at Geneva, studied there under Beza, and became principal of the college of Lausanne and the Academy at Nimes. In 1596 he was appointed royal historiographer by Henry of Navarre after his enthronement as Henry IV of France, but unlike his contemporary, Palma-Capet, De Serres remained a firm Huguenot even after his King turned Catholic. His most valuable work is Commentarium de statu

religionis et reipublicae (Commentary on the state of religion and the republic), a history of the French religious wars under Henry II, Francis II (husband of Mary Queen of Scots) and Charles IX (d. 1574). In later editions he brought the record down to 1576. de Serres is, of course, pro-Huguenot, blaming the civil strife on the political intrigues of the Catholic family of the Guises and the Queen-Mother, Catherine de' Medici. But historians rate his history as "reliable and exact" (Thompson, p. 562). Von Ranke calls the latter part of the Commentaries "perhaps the best source for the period".

4. Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigne (1550-1630). "The last of the great Huguenot historians of this period" is how J.W. Thompson describes d'Aubigne the elder in his History of Historical Writing (p. 563). A student of Beza at Geneva, and a fighter in the wars of religion since the age of 18, d'Aubigne wrote vivid, dramatic history from the viewpoint of an eye-witness. He served under Henry of Navarre (Henry IV of France) first as a soldier, then as counsellor and finally, at the urging of Henry himself, as historian. His history has the title Histoire universelle (Universal History) because it purposed to trace the history of his times not only in France and Europe but also in Turkey, Persia and Africa, but the central figure throughout is Henry whom d'Aubigne considered the major history-maker of his day. The King remained his hero even after his political conversion to Catholicism for the sake of the throne of the France, but d'Aubigne, unlike Palma-Cayet, remained a firm Huguenot all his life.

His History covers the years 1553 to 1602 and focuses on the Catholic-Huguenot struggles in France, but includes the larger picture of the Reformation controversies in Europe of the times. "No author," says Thompson, "has given fuller information than he upon the Reformation period from the beginning of the Civil Wars to the Edict of Nantes which finally brought religious peace." d'Aubigne treats of history in rather artificial segments--short periods of religious wars each ending in a treaty of peace, and his approach is heavily biographical, but few wrote better character sketches of the leaders of the age, and his is remembered as one of the first to sense the importance of public opinion on the making of history.

5. Jacques Auguste de Thou, or Thuanus (1553 1617).

Catholic Historians of the Counter-Reformation

History was a prickly subject for Catholics in the years of the Reformation. One thousand years of increasingly successful centralization of power in Rome had not been achieved without dark stains on the fabric of the papacy. Power corrupts, as a Catholic historian has observed, and it was much easier for righteously indignant Protestant historians to uncover and condemn the corruptions of what they came to call the "Dark Ages" than for the Catholic historians of the counter-reformation to attempt to explain and defend them.

1. Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623)

As a matter of fact, the best of the Catholic historians in this controversial age was as critical of the papacy as any Reformer. He is Paolo Sarpi, the Venetian diplomat and humanist scholar, whose many-sided genius has led some to compare him with Leonardo da Vinci. He was so brilliant even as a young novitiate in the Order of the Servites (the mendicant Servants of Mary) that the Duke of Mantua appointed the 14-year-old boy as court theologian. At 22 in Milan he entered the service of Cardinal Borromeo who had been a leading figure in the Council of Trent. Then for a while he represented his Order in Rome and finally, in 1588, returned to Venice. By then, at age 36, he was "already one of the best-educated men of his age..prepared and equipped to defend his native Republic with the sharpest pen ever wielded by an Italian writer." (J.W. Thompson, Hist. of Historical Writing, p. 542)

The defense of the independence of the Venetian Republic involved Sarpi in a head-on collision withe the spreading temporal power of the papacy which now claimed the rule of all Italy. Venice, as the strongest secular state in Italy was the major obstacle to that claim. Sarpi's anti-papalism, thus, was not religious like that of the Reformers but political. His chief targets were the Pope, Spain and the Jesuits, the three great power-centers of the counter-reformation. He was often accused of being Protestant and Calvinist, but Sarpi and his supporters in Venice refused to let his Catholic opponents define Catholicism. "Who talks of Calvinists?, the Venetian Doge is said to have replied to a papal attack. "We are as good Christians as the pope". (Thompson, p. 543) The point of difference with Rome was legal and constitutions, not theological.

Wide-ranging though Sarpi's learning was--he mastered everything from Hebrew to mathematics, and from medicine to psychology--his life style was severely simple. He lived in a bare cell with a picture of Christ and a crucifix over a human skull. Utterly fearless, he shrugged off a bloody attack by papal assassins with the remark, "He who thinks too much of living knows not how to live well. One is bound to die once. To be curious about the day or place or manner of dying is unprofitable." (Quoted, ibid, p. 542)

Sarpi's great historical work is his Storia del Concilio Tridentino (History of the Council of Trent), published in 1619. That

Council which met intermittently for about 20 years, from 1545 to 1563, was one of the high watermarks of the Catholic counter-reformation. In it, the victory of the papal supremacists over the forces in Catholic reform which sought a reconciliation with the Protestants sealed the permanent division of European Christendom. Sarpi's sympathies were with the Catholic reformers, and to a lesser extent even with the Protestants. Thompson quotes him as saying in 1611, "I should be delighted to witness the adva advance of the Reformation, for it would tend to advance the interests of mankind" (Ibid, p. 543). His motive in writing the History was two-fold: first, to plead for the undoing of the damage which the Council had done to Christian unity; and second, to discredit forever the doctrine of papal supremacy over the State. In his argument for the separation of church and state, and in his denial of Rome's claims to temporal power, Sarpi stood in the line of William of Ockham and Marsiglio of Padua.

The introductory part of his History which traces the course of the Reformation before the meeting of the Council of Trent, Sarpi relies heavily upon John Sleidan's great Commentaries. But for the main body of the work he gathered together an immense amount of original materials, documents and secret archives on the Council. It is to his credit that though he was obviously writing with a bias, he never falsified his material. His exposures of papal intrigue and Jesuit cunning were devastating, and even his negative bias, says von Ranke, insofar as it did not distort, created a new critical unity of approach in historical method. It "is the first example of a history in which the whole development of the subject is accompanied by unceasing censures." (L. von Ranke, tr. by E. Fowler, The Hist. of the Popes, N.Y. 1901, vol. , p. 231)

von Ranke goes on to point out some of Sarpi's weaknesses. He misunderstands the constitution of Charles V's Holy Roman Empire, for example. Instead of its three-fold division into (1) the electoral college, (2) the college of princes, including the bishops, and (3) the cities, Sarpi keeps treating of it in terms of the more common pattern in Europe, that is, the three estates, (1) clergy, (2) temporal sovereign, and (3) the cities. Sarpi also follows the common mediaeval practice of transcribing whole passages from other earlier writers. This is particularly noticeable in his free use of Sleidan's work. But even so, it is to Sarpi's credit that he makes more original use of his sources than was customary at that time. His literary style is outstanding, and his historical approach is cohesive and unified.

In the light of Sarpi's unfailing criticisms of the papacy, it is not surprising that he was widely praised by Protestant historians. More secular historians, like Gibbon and Macauley, also speak highly of him, as does one of the more recent historians of the Reformation, Preserved Smith. Macaulay calls him "the best of early modern historians. But he also has his critics, particularly among Catholic historians, notably Lord Acton. (See H. E. Barnes, op. cit. p. 129).

Of the many biographical sketches of Paolo Sarpi, one of the most readable is by A.D. White in Seven Great Statesmen (N.Y., 1919, pp. 3-53). See also Alexander Robertson, Fra Paolo Sarpi, The Greatest of the Venetians (London, 1894).

2. Sforza Pallavicino (1607-1667)

Rome could not allow so formidable an attack on its very foundation's as Sarpi's to go unanswered. The man picked for the defense was an Italian noble, Sforza Pallavicino, who had given up his title and wealth to enter the Jesuit order. As a matter of fact he was only the second choice for the task, however. Another Jesuit, Terentino Alcati, had begun to collect material on the Council of Trent but died before he could organize and write it up, so Pallavicino was able to use his material and collected even more, for he was given access to all the most secret documents of the Vatican.

Pallavicino's answer to Sarpi is titled Istoria del Concilio de Trento (History of the Council of Trent), and a few years after the publication of its final volume, in 1567, the author was rewarded with the red hat of a cardinal. But Pallavicino's defense of the Council in no way measures up to the higher standards of Sarpi's devastating but generally accurate critique. What Pallavicino does is simply to try to refute Sarpi step by step. He lists 361 so-called errors which, however, on close examination, prove to be either so trivial as to be irrelevant, or to be alleged as errors without proof other than Pallavicino's own unsupported insistence. An example: Sarpi states there was a treaty between the pope and the King of France. Pallavicino denies this, quoting a contemporary statement that there was no treaty. He fails to note that the statement merely said there was no treaty in writing and Sarpi is nearer to the actual truth that there was an oral agreement on an alliance.

The historian von Ranke concludes a comparison of the two antagonists with this devastating criticism of Pallavicino: "In matters altogether unessential he (Pallavicino) is strictly correct, but he totally misrepresents and distorts things of vital importance." (Hist. of the Popes, vol. 2, p. 237). He concludes the comparison, "They possessed minds of totally opposite character. Sarpi is acute, penetrating and sarcastic; his arrangement is exceedingly skillful, his style pure and unaffected.. Neither is Pallavicino devoid of talent. He frequently makes ingenious parallels and defends his party with considerable address. But his intellect has something weighty and cumbrous in its character.. his style is overloaded with words. Sarpi is clear and transparent to the very bottom. Pallavicino is not without a certain flow of manner, but he is obscure, diffuse and shallow." (ibid., p. 238)

The Index

Roman Catholic historians suffered a crippling blow when, in the year 1595, the church instituted an edict of suppression of free thought called the Index of Prohibited Books (Index librorum prohibitorum). Enforced by the Inquisition, the Index made it impossible for Catholic authors, or any authors in Catholic countries, to write books critical of the church. They could only defend the church. This, of course, made it impossible for faithful Catholics any longer to write impartial, balanced history, and from this date on all Catholic historical writing became lost much of its credibility.

The irrepressible Sarpi, who was always in trouble with his church, commented in the second edition of his History of the Council of Trent (which, incidentally, had to be published in Geneva, for no Catholic city would allow it printed by that date, 1629) that the Index was "the finest secret which has ever been discovered for applying religion to the purpose of making men idiotic" (Geneva, 1629, II, 91, quoted in Thompson, p. 540). From this time on, until the weakening of the Index under the influence of the Enlightenment, general Catholic church histories are too one-sided to consult without considerable caution. In certain, limited aspects of church history, notably the internal development of the Catholic church, and the rise of the new orders, and the missionary expansion of the church, Catholics still, however, produced important historical materials.

Niccolo Orlandini (d. 1609) and Franciscus Sacchinus (d. 1625)

One of the most important of such histories was the first major History of the Society of Jesus (Historia Societatis Jesu) begun by Niccolo Orlandini (Nicholas Orlandinus) and finished by Franciscus Sacchinus. Orlandini was able to compile the record only up to the death of Loyola in 1556 before he himself died in 1606. But as a humanist and mild skeptic Orlandini gave the work a solid historical tone, down-playing alleged miracles and including candid disclosures of the political maneuverings of the Jesuits.

Upon Orlandini's death, Franciscus Sacchinus, a professor at the College of Rhetoric at Rome, took up the story and gave the next eighteen years of his life to completing the history of the Society down to the year 1580. The indispensable primary source for the beginnings of the Jesuits is, of course, the remarkable autobiography of the Society's founder, Ignatius Loyola, who dictated in great, self-analytical detail the story of his life in the last years of his life, from 1553 to 1556. H. E. Barnes (Hist. of Hist. Writing, p. 132) calls it "the ablest autobiography of the whole age".

This History of the Society of Jesus, begun by Orlandini and continued by Sacchinus, was later taken up again, 88 years after the death of Sacchinus, in 1710 by Jouvency who added a rather fragmentary account of the next 15 years (1580 to 1595). And in 1750 Julius Cordara completed it from 1616 to 1625. Unfortunately these later additions were of lesser quality than the work of Orlandini and Sacchinus.

ACTA SANCTORUM, by Heribert Rosweyde (1569), and Jean Bolland (1596-1665)

"The foremost contribution of the Jesuits to historical scholarship in this period," writes H.E. Barnes (ibid, p. 132), "was the systematic assembling of a vast collection of the lives of the saints". It was started by a Father Heribert Rosweyde, but the guiding figure in this massive undertaking which is still in progress with some 68 volumes published as of 1942, was a Belgian Jesuit named Jean Bolland. The arrangement is artificial. The lives of the saints are treated in sequence based on the order of the saints' days in the church calendar, beginning with January 1. A "saints' day" in that calendar is the day of his death. The first volume appeared in 1643, and Bolland covered all

the saints who are thought to have died in the first two months, January and February. His pupils, Heaschen and Papebroch, continued the work and others are still at work toward completing one of the most important and extensive projects of church biography ever undertaken. In addition to the main volumes, a supplementary journal, named after the major founder, Bolland, has been published since 1882, called Analecta Bollandiana.

The work of Bolland and his successors helped to rescue the writing of ecclesiastical biography from the depths of credulity with which it had been afflicted from earliest times clear up to the present. Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, the friend of Galileo, once remarked that many of the saints' lives as written up to his time were "more conducive to humor than to edification" (Barnes, p. 133). But Bolland and his fellow Jesuits were aware of the damage done to the church's credibility by Protestant exposure of too many pious frauds and bogus miracles in traditional church writing, and set out to build more believable standards of authenticity into their new Acta Sanctorum. They carefully examined the old traditions and legends and arranged their sources by comparative date and reliability, pruning away much of the accumulated baggage of the uncritical past.

Anglican Church History

Bishop Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715)

Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England marks a turning point in the writing of church history, a transition between the Reformation period and the early modern. H.E. Barnes calls it "probably the ablest historical work on any phase of the Reformation down to the time of Mosheim" (p. 134).

Gilbert Burnet was a Scottish Episcopalian, born in Edinburgh and educated at Aberdeen where he studied arts, law and divinity "seldom working less than fourteen hours a day", according to J.D. Douglas (Intl. Dict. of the Xn Ch.). Ordained an episcopalian in Presbyterian Scotland, but highly critical of bishops and clergy, and remarkably tolerant toward the Presbyterians, he found his moderate position under attack from both sides. Presbyterians criticized him for being episcopal, and Anglicans because he was fair to Non-Conformists. In 1669 he was made Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, and refused two offers of bishoprics because he considered them political bribe offers. He left Scotland for London where he was made royal chaplain until he rebuked Charles II for his way of life and was discharged. Outlawed by James II he found refuge in Holland where he became adviser to William of Orange. When the House of Stuart was deposed in 1688 for its Catholicism and corruption, Burnet helped prepare the way for the Protestant prince, William of Orange to become King of England and preached the sermon at his coronation. He was made Bishop of Salisbury.

He is the author of two important historical works, one in church historiography, and one a general history. The first, his History of the Reformation of the Church of England has been highly praised for its fair and balanced treatment of both Anglicanism and Non-Conformity, and its attention to the inter-relation of cause and effect in church history, the influence of intellectual and social movements on the church, as well as the theological developments and ecclesiastical politics of the time. His second work, The History of His Own Time, is prized by historians for its intimate account of party politics and palace gossip, written from the Whig point of view but with the advantage of Burnet's direct access to court circles as chaplain to Charles II.

The History of the Reformation was published in London, in three volumes, 1679-1715. The best edition now is by that edited by Nicholas Pocock (Oxford, 1865, in 7 vols.). The History was sharply was sharply criticized by an Anglican priest, Henry Wharton, who had a personal grudge against Burnet, in a book written under the assumed name of Anthony Harmer, Specimen of Some Errors and Defects in the Histry of the Reformation of the Church of England (1692), but Wharton is forgotten, and Burnet's work still stands, though he did profit by some of the criticisms and make corrections. Criticisms by John Strype (1642-1737) were more helpful and positive. Strype published later a history of the period following that covered by Burnet, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion (1700-1731), which is more pedantic and heavy than Burnet's lively records but which does incorporate a vast amount of valuable material gathered from charters, letters and state papers.

HISTORIANS OF THE REFORMATION AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

The Protestant Reformation opens a whole new period in the writing of church history. In one sense the church histories of that period build upon the humanist historiography of the Renaissance and even far outstrip it both in the volume of historical books produced and in zealous search for and recovery of original historical sources. But in another, more negative sense, the Reformation historians and their Counter-Reformation antagonists turn away from the promising beginnings of historical impartiality and critical analysis that is found in the humanist Renaissance, and revert instead to the polemic manipulation of history and the self-serving credulity of the Middle Ages. James W. Thompson, in his History of Historical Writing is sharp in his criticism: (1, p. 526)

> "There are some period of history which have to be not re-written but unwritten, and perhaps of no period is this so true as of the Reformation. From its inception ignorance, traditional interpretation and prejudice conspired to obscure and to mutilate the facts. There is an enormous volume of contemporary historical writing which must be discounted or discarded."

In times of controversy, like the Reformation, contemporary sources are not always the best sources, therefore, unless very critically examined and used.

Nevertheless, controversy also sharpens and stimulates the writing of church history. In their search for weapons of defense or attack, historians on both sides of the conflict dug deep for historical ammunition and in so doing made their "most important contribution to historical scholarship: the recovery and publication of early documents on church history". (Barnes, p. 122). They also began to analyze church developments from a deeper perspective. As Thompson admits, despite his sharp criticism quoted above:

> "The firm establishment of Protestantism brought into prominence a branch of historiography...: church history, but of a nature radically different from the medieval historia ecclesiastica. Modern ecclesiastical history, treating of the inner life of the Church, its doctrine and administration, is the child of the Lutheran Reformation, created by the demands of the controversy raging between the Roman Church and the Protestants, the central question of which was the exclusive possession of 'the pure faith' by one church or the other.." (p. 513 f.)

We will look first at some of the less commendable [illegible] histories of the times, and then single out the best church historians on either side.

Polemic Church History in the Reformation

Reformation church history began rather poorly not so much as an effort to discover and report the true history of the church but rather as an attempt to prove from history that Protestantism was the true church and Catholicism a false counterfeit, or vice versa, depending on whether the historian belonged to the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. Its basic philosophy of history was a return to the view of Orosius that history is an epic struggle between God and the Devil, with this difference, that whereas Orosius, following and over-simplifying Augustine, pictured the City of God in terms of the Christian church, and the City of the Devil in terms of paganism, now with Protestants battling Catholics the struggle was between Christians. "Two new 'Cities of Satan'..replaced the pagan 'City' of.. Orosius--'the Devil's Nest at Rome' and the followers of 'the crazy Monk of Wittenberg', respectively," writes H. E. Barnes (p. 121).

Robert Barnes (1495-1540). The first guns of the battle of the church historians were fired by the Protestants. One of Luther's earliest supporters, the knight Ulrich von Hutten, in 1517 discovered Valla's expose of the fraudulent Donation of Constantine and happily sent it to Luther to use against the Pope. This may have stimulated Luther to consider the mounting of an historical attack against Rome. He found an English Lutheran refugee in Germany, Robert BARNES, and directed him to write The Lives of the Popes of Rome. It was not good history, but it was an effective attack, purporting to trace all the disasters of the Middle Ages to the wickedness of the popes and their greedy seizure of temporal power from natural national rulers.

The Magedeburg Centuries. By far the best and most influential Protestant historical polemic was a work called the Magdeburg Centuries, so-called because each of its 13 volumes was devoted to the history of a complete century from the time of Christ up to the 13th century. Compiled between 1553 and 1575, it was begun by MATTHIAS FLACIUS (or Vlacich) ILLYRICUS (1520-1575), a convert of Luther and often a theological opponent of Melanchthon but always a strong Lutheran partisan. He was assisted in the monumental undertaking by a whole corps of prominent scholars, six in all, who scoured all Europe for historical documents and evidence to strengthen their attack.

As with all the partisan histories of the Reformation, it is easy to criticize the Centuries. Its bias is obvious and extreme. Everything discreditable to Rome is included, and in a few cases even manufactured such as the report of a female pope, Pope Joan. The popes are all Anti-Christs. Miracles favorable to Catholicism are discounted as false, while those supporting the Protestant argument are uncritically accepted.

But even the most contemptuous of modern critics of the Centuries must grudgingly admit their immense contribution to the

Polemic Church History in the Reformation

Reformation church history began rather poorly not so much as an effort to discover and report the true history of the church but rather as an attempt to prove from history that Protestantism was the true church and Catholicism a false counterfeit, or vice versa, depending on whether the historian belonged to the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. Its basic philosophy of history was a return to the view of Orosius that history is an epic struggle between God and the Devil, with this difference, that whereas Orosius, following and over-simplifying Augustine, pictured the City of God in terms of the Christian church, and the City of the Devil in terms of paganism, now with Protestants battling Catholics the struggle was between Christians. "Two new 'Cities of Satan'..replaced the pagan 'City' of.. Orosius--'the Devil's Nest at Rome' and the followers of 'the crazy Monk of Wittenberg', respectively," writes H. E. Barnes (p. 121).

Robert Barnes (1495-1540). The first guns of the battle of the church historians were fired by the Protestants. One of Luther's earliest supporters, the knight Ulrich von Hutten, in 1517 discovered Valla's expose of the fraudulent Donation of Jonstantine and happily sent it to Luther to use against the Pope. This may have stimulated Luther to consider the mounting of an historical attack against Rome. He found an English Lutheran refugee in Germany, Robert BARNES, and directed him to write The Lives of the Popes of Rome. It was not good history, but it was an effective attack, purporting to trace all the disasters of the Middle Ages to the wickedness of the popes and their greedy seizure of temporal power from natural national rulers.

The Magedeburg Centuries. By far the best and most influential Protestant historical polemic was a work called the Magdeburg Centuries, so-called because each of its 13 volumes was devoted to the history of a complete century from the time of Christ up to the 13th century. Compiled between 1553 and 1575, it was begun by MATTHIAS FLACIUS (or Vlacich) ILLYRICUS (1520-1575), a convert of Luther and often a theological opponent of Melanchthon but always a strong Lutheran partisan. He was assisted in the monumental undertaking by a whole corps of prominent scholars, six in all, who scoured all Europe for historical documents and evidence to strengthen their attack.

As with all the partisan histories of the Reformation, it is easy to criticize the Centuries. Its bias is obvious and extreme. Everything discreditable to Rome is included, and in a few cases even manufactured such as the report of a female pope, Pope Joan. The popes are all Anti-Christs. Miracles favorable to Catholicism are discounted as false, while those supporting the Protestant argument are uncritically accepted.

But even the most contemptuous of modern critics of the Centuries must grudgingly admit their immense contribution to the

work to the study of church history. J. W. Thompson calls it a "landmark in in European historiography and culture" "For, despite all its weaknesses," he writes, "the Centuries constituted a tremendous challenge to the historic basis of the Roman Church and made both Protestants and Catholics history-minded. The very method of attack--the use of history to destroy an ancient historical institution--was a stimulus to the study and development of historical research, for the Catholics could not permit the onslaught to go unchallenged and were compelled to turn to history and find ammunition for a counter-offensive." (Thompson, p. 530 f.)

Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538-1605). The man who took up the counter-attack for Rome against the Lutherans was a 21-year-old lecturer in church history at the evangelistic conference center of (St.) Philip Neri in Rome which was called the Oratory, and later the Congregation of Philip Neri. His name was Caesar Baronius, from a noble Neapolitan family. For forty-eight years he lectured at Neri's Congregation on church history, and in 1588 he used these lectures as the basis for publication of the first volume of the work which made him famous, the Ecclesiastical Annals. Like the Centuries, which he tried to answer point by point, each volume covered one century, and when he died at age 69 he was still working on volume 13. (Later writers, Raynaldus, Bozovius, Laderchi, and eventually Theiner, added volumes which carried the Annals down to the year 1590.

The Annals of Baronius proved immensely popular. The author had the unparalleled riches of the Vatican library at his disposal, and smothered the Protestants under a mass of documents, as Thompson vividly notes (p. 537). But he lacked the integrity of the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries, and though it looked for a short while that the Catholics had won the battle of the historians, Baronius' victory was short-lived. Later historians, acknowledging their indebtedness to him for uncovering so many valuable historical documents, are not so forgiving of his methods. Preserved Smith, the historian of the Reformation, writes:

> "However poor was the work of the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries, they were at least honest in arraying their sources. This is more than can be said of Caesar Baronius, whose Annales Ecclesiastici was the official counterblast to the Protestant work. Whereas his criticism is no whit better than theirs, he adopted the cunning policy, unfortunately widely obtaining since his day, of simply ignoring or suppressing unpleasant facts, rather than of refuting the inferences drawn from them. His talent for switching the attention to a side-issue, and for tangling instead of clearing problems, made the Protestants justly regard him as 'a great deceiver'". (The Age of the Reformation, p. 585)

Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614). It was inevitable that the Protestants would rally to answer Baronius as Baronius had tried to answer the attacks of the Magdeburg Centuries. The answer, which came from a Swiss Calvinist, Isaac Casaubon, in his work Exercitationes in Baronium (Exercises against Baronius) was a triumph of critical scholarship but a popular failure.

Casaubon, a Christian humanist and philologist (not a historian) wrote his work at the request of James I of England who wished to defend Anglicanism against the claims of the Catholics. Casaubon had originally been greatly impressed with the scope of Baronius's scholarship in the Annals, but on closer reading he was shocked to find that Baronius did not even know Greek and that his history was full of errors and mistranslations. At first he suspected the Catholic of deliberate deception but concluded on further investigation that the Cardinal was a basically good man with a poorly informed mind whose lack of scholarship made him unable to digest the huge amounts of historical material he had collected. He knew everything but understood nothing. Even Catholic historians began to find errors in Baronius. One German (Lucas Holstein) counted 8000 such mistakes. Casaubon therefore felt it imperative to set the historical record straight on behalf of the Protestant cause. The result, his Exercitationes, was a disappointment. It is more a collection of pedantic footnotes than a text. It simply lists the errors of Baronius, one by one, without unified argument, and aroused little popular interest, failing thereby to halt the spread of Baronius' poorer but more successful history.

Louis Maimbourg (1610-1686). The battle continued with another very popular history, a History of Lutheranism written by a French Jesuit, Maimbourg, in 1680. It was a popular, not very scholarly, collection of the Catholic arguments. He followed it up with an even less scholarly attack on the Calvinists, a History of Calvinism.

Ludwig von Seckendorf (1626-1692). Maimbourg's clever but unsound attack on the Lutherans was crushingly answered by the sound scholarship and careful documentary research of Ludwig von Seckendorf in his Historical and Apologetic Commentary on Lutheranism and the Reformation, in 1688-1692. Both by his birth and integrity this distinguished historian commended himself to the Saxon princes of Protestant Germany who made available to him documents hitherto hidden from historians in their archives. These he used to demolish the slanders of Maimbourg. Church historians are also indebted to him for one of the first textbook surveys of church history, his Compendium of Ecclesiastical History.

Bishop Jacques Benigne Bossuet (1627-1704). With Seckendorf and Bossuet the battle of the church historians, (Reformation against Counter-Reformation), begins to end and rises to a more dignified and sounder historical level. Bossuet's central argument against the Reformation is in his History of the Differences Among Protestant Churches. There he argues that Protestant rejections of papal authority break the unity of Christendom and can lead only to endless schism and ecclesiastical chaos. Unlike the more polemic writers, he admits to much that is good in Luther, and much that is bad in the popes, but insists that the choice between liberty and authority must be made on the side of authority. Another of his books, Discourse on Universal History, is Augustinian in its philosophy that all history illustrates the controlling hand of God in human events. He has been called the "Orosius of the Counter-Reformation".

More Objective Church History in the Reformation

There is no such thing as completely non-polemic church history written in the period of the Reformation. What Christian could be altogether neutral in so intense a struggle for what each side considered to be the essentials of the Christian faith. Nevertheless there is a ;difference between the writers we have listed above as "polemic" and those we will now consider as "more objective". The former intentionally and purposefull attacked their opponents, sometimes deliberately distorting history in the process. The latter at least tried to give a straightforward account of events as they saw them. The distinction is only relative. Some of the "polemic" writers, like Seckendorf and Bossuet, are careful and trustworthy. And some of the "objective" historians become inevitably controversial by the very nature of their direct involvement in the theological warfare of the times. Such, for example, are Bullinger, Beza and Knox.

In general, it has been observed, the best histories of the period were written by Protestants, but the best journals and memoirs by Catholics. (Thompson, op. cit. p. 561, 574)

Let me first simply list the names and principal writings of the more ;important, less polemic historians:

John Sleidan (1506-1556). German Lutheran. Commentaries on Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, 1517-1555.

Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575). Swiss Reformed. History of the Reformation, 1519-1532.

John Knox (1505-1572). Scottish Calvinist. History of the Reformation of Religion Within the Realm of Scotland, (to 1564).

Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Swiss Calvinist. Ecclesiastical History of Church Reforms in the Kingdom of France. (1580)

Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigne (1550-1[illegible]). [illegible] Huguenot. Universal History (from 1553-1602).

Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623). Italian Catholic. History of the Council of Trent (1619)

Nicolo Orlandini (d. 1606). Italian Jesuit. History of the Society of Jesus.

Jean Bolland (1596-1665). Dutch Jesuit. Acta Sanctorum (Lives of the Saints).

Pietro Giannone (1676-1748). Italian Catholic. Civil History of the Kingdom of Naples. (Critical of temporal power of papacy)

Gilbert Burnet (d. 1715). Anglican. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. (to 1567)

Johann Lorenz von Mosheim.(1694-1755). Protestant. Institutes of Church History: Ancient and Modern. (1755)

BULLINGER and KNOX

There are two historians of the Reformation who are significant not only because they wrote Reformation history but even more because they played important roles in that history themselves as Reformers. The are Heinrich Bullinger, the disciple of Zwingli, and John Knox, the disciple of Calvin.

Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575).

Bullinger, the Swiss Reformer, is remembered in the field of church historiography for his intimate, inside account of the early years of the Swiss Reformation in his Reformationsgeschichte (History of the Reformation, 1519-32).

Bullinger, the son of a parish priest, was educated at Cologne where he came under the influence of the works of Erasmus and Luther. Returning to Switzerland in 1523 he joined Zwingli's reform movement, becoming not only the Zurich reformer's disciple and son-in-law, but also, after Zwingli's death in 1531, his successor as the Reformed "bishop" of the Zurich area.

Both as a reformer and as a historian Bullinger was moderate and conciliatory. His History is of course pro-Protestant, but it has none of the fire and anger of Knox's more famous history of the Scottish Reformation. As leader of the German-Swiss reform he tried hard to mediate the growing schism between the Lutheran and Reformed wings of the Protestant movement. He sought to avoid confrontation between church and state. Perhaps as a result of the military disaster at Kappel in 1531, where Zwingli was killed, Bullinger was less enthusiastic than Calvin (or [illegible]) for church involvement in politics. He supported Thomas Erastus' post-Zwinglian "Erastianism" acknowledged the state's right to intervene and oversee in church affairs but [illegible] the church against trying to control the state. This view led Bullinger to support the development of English Anglicanism, xxxxxx with its acceptance of state protection and support, against the aggressively independent and more Calvinistic position of the English Puritans.

Bullinger's Reformationsgeschichte is extremely important for the care with which he preserved and copied whole documents concerning the first years of the Swiss Reformation in the German-speaking cantons. His Erastianism, however, led him to neglect the political side of the Reformation and to limit his account rather narrowly to purely religious and theological matters. Moreover, his patriotic Swiss nationalism made him belittle the indebtedness of the Swiss Reformation to the Lutheran German Reformation.

The best edition of the Reformationsgeschichte was published in three volumes in [illegible], edited by J. J. Hottinger and H. H. [illegible].

<u>John Sleidan.</u>
(1506-56)

<u>John Sleidan</u> (his name is usually Latinized as Sleidanus) has been called the "greatest of all Protestant historians" in the Reformation period (J. W. Thompson, <u>Hist.</u> <u>of</u> <u>Hist.</u> <u>Writing</u>, I, p. [illegible]). He was the first to note and analyze the significance of political factors underlying the religious developments of the Reformation.

Sleidan was a humanist scholar and disciple of Erasmus who came to be employed by the French as a diplomat in France's relationships with the Schmalkaldic League. This League was the political confederation which the Lutheran princes of Germany formed to protect themselves against the Emperor Charles V and his attempt to crush Protestantism by force of arms and restore all Germany to the Catholic faith. In the course of his diplomatic negotiations, Sleidan came to mistrust the Catholic politics of the Spanish Emperor and was gradually won to the cause of the Reformation.

Though primarily a diplomat and jurist, Sleidan's humanist interests had led him to the study of history. He translated and was influenced by the works of the mediaeval French historian, Jean Froissart (1337-1410), who was a chronicler of the heroic age of chivalry and of the Hundred Years' War between France and England. His historical method was even more influenced by another French historian whom he also translated, Philippe de Commines (1445-1509). Commines' <u>Memoirs</u> are more analytical and less dramatic than Froissart, and are often considered to be the transition between mediaeval and early modern historical writing.

The historical work for which Sleidan is famous is his <u>Commentaries on Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, 1517-1555.</u> H.E. Barnes calls it "the ablest history of the Reformation written by either a Catholic or a Protestant before Bishop Gilbert Burnet" (<u>Hist.</u> <u>of</u> <u>Hist.</u> <u>Writing</u>, p. 124). It is a legal and constitutional defense of the Protestant princes' defiance of the edict of the Emperor against Lutheranism, and of their right to leave the Catholic Church. But though pro-Protestant, Sleidan was so objective and balanced a historian that neither the Lutherans or the Catholics were happy with his book. Melanchthon condemned it, and the Catholics outlawed it.

The great importance of Sleidan's work is that it was the first essentially political analysis of the Reformation movement and the Protestant revolt, says Barnes (Op. cit., p. 125). As Sleidan himself wrote, "In describing religious affairs I was not able to omit politics, for as I said before, they almost always intersect, and in our age, least of all, can they be separated." This attention to political influences [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Calvin, [illegible] great admiration for Calvin's [illegible] earliest [illegible] of his writings.

John Sleidan
(1506-56)

John Sleidan (his name is usually Latinized as Sleidanus) has been called the "greatest of all Protestant historians" in the Reformation period (J. W. Thompson, Hist. of Hist. Writing, I, p. 528). He was the first to note and analyze the significance of political factors underlying the religious developments of the Reformation.

Sleidan was a humanist scholar and disciple of Erasmus who came to be employed by the French as a diplomat in France's relationships with the Schmalkaldic League. This League was the political confederation which the Lutheran princes of Germany formed to protect themselves against the Emperor Charles V and his attempt to crush Protestantism by force of arms and restore all Germany to the Catholic faith. In the course of his diplomatic negotiations, Sleidan came to distrust the Catholic politics of the Spanish Emperor and was gradually won to the cause of the Reformation.

Though primarily a diplomat and jurist, Sleidan's humanist interests had led him to the study of history. He translated and was influenced by the works of the mediaeval French historian, Jean Froissart (1337-1410), who was a chronicler of the heroic age of chivalry and of the Hundred Years' War between France and England. His historical method was even more influenced by another French historian whom he also translated, Philippe de Commines (1445-1509). Commines' Memoirs are more analytical and less dramatic than Froissart, and are often considered ~~tmk~~ to be the transition between mediaeval and early modern historical writing.

The historical work for which Sleidan is famous is his Commentaries on Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, 1517-1555. H.E. Barnes calls it "the ablest history of the Reformation written by either a Catholic or a Protestant before Bishop Gilbert Burnet" (Hist. of Hist. Writing, p. 124). It is a legal and constitutional defense of the Protestant princes' defiance of the edict of the Emperor against Lutheranism, and of their right to leave the Catholic Church. But though pro-Protestant, Sleidan was so objective and balanced a historian that neither the Lutherans or the Catholics were happy with his book. Melanchthon condemned it, and the Catholics outlawed it.

The great importance of Sleidan's work is that it was the first primarily political analysis of the Reformation movement and the Protestant revolt, says Barnes (op. cit. p. 125). As Sleidanus himself wrote, "in describing religious affairs I have not been able to omit politics, for as I said before, they almost always intersect, and in our age, [illegible] all, can they be separated." This attention to political [illegible] Sleidan's [illegible] [illegible] Calvin, [illegible] politics, Sleidan [illegible] great admiration for Calvin's trained legal mind [illegible] student of his writings.

[illegible]

[illegible] 1559 [illegible] intellectual and political [illegible] produced a notable line of historians [illegible] church. I will mention only four. ([illegible] is usually associated with the Swiss Reformation).

(J. Thompson, op. cit. . 550)

1. Francois de la Noue (1531-1591). [illegible] period, as has been observed, [illegible] memoirs and journals [illegible] Catholics. [illegible] Protestant memoirist Francois de la Noue, [illegible] lost his arm [illegible] French wars of religion (1562-15[illegible]) [illegible] his Discours [illegible] on the political and military [illegible] Catholics and Protestants, especially [illegible] Calvinist, he is [illegible] French national unity, [illegible] and [illegible].

2. [illegible] (15[illegible]) [illegible] the best [illegible] of the period [illegible] was first a Catholic, then a Protestant, [illegible] Calvinist [illegible] to Catholicism [illegible] Protestant [illegible] later accepted [illegible] kingship and the restoration [illegible] Wars of Religion. [illegible] the Chronologie novenaire [illegible] more accurate than the Chronologie septenaire [illegible] events of the years 15[illegible]-1601.

3. Jean de Serres (15[illegible]-159[illegible]). The best Protestant historian of [illegible] was Jean de Serres, who was equally at home as a [illegible] in theology [illegible] as in history. He was a graduate [illegible] studied there under Beza, and became [illegible] of the college of Lausanne and the Academy at Nîmes. [illegible] of France, [illegible] is Jean [illegible] de S[illegible]

TSF BULLETIN

60

SUMMER 1971

Price 10p (12p with RE Bulletin)

TSF Bulletin

A journal for theological students, expounding and defending the historic Christian faith. On the assumption that contributors are in sympathy with the doctrinal basis of the Theological Students' Fellowship, they have full liberty of expression.

Editor :
I. Howard Marshall MA BD Ph D,
Lecturer in New Testament Exegesis, University of Aberdeen

TSF Chairman :
Ian S. Palmer, King's College, London

CONTENTS

Published three times yearly by the Theological Students' Fellowship
39 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3EY.
Price: 10p (12p with RE Bulletin). Postal subscription: 40p per annum (45p with RE Bulletin).

Personal View: Leaving the Gag On

I H Marshall

It would be unfortunate if the effect of Eric Alexander's article in the previous issue of the *TSF Bulletin* was to suggest to some readers that the only proper method of communicating the gospel today is by preaching in the traditional manner, and that consequently we can quietly forget all the disquieting things said in Gavin Reid's book, *The Gagging of God*. Mr Alexander's article had a limited aim, namely that of showing that preaching the Word of God is the permanent task of the church, and that we are not called to drop forthwith the traditional art of preaching in view of what Mr Reid has said. That this is a correct view of the situation is shown, in my opinion, by Mr Reid's own activity as a preacher. But to stop short at this point is to miss an essential part of Mr Reid's thesis. *If the Christian church thinks that it has exhaustively fulfilled its responsibility to bear witness to Christ by holding preaching services of the traditional variety, then it has gone seriously astray*. The gag is still in position.

The practical argument from Scripture is that the early church certainly did not confine itself to the traditional type of preaching using the opportunities provided in the synagogue or in its own 'in-group' meetings. It made use of a variety of evangelistic methods, well chronicled for us in Michael Green's book, *Evangelism in the Early Church*. It took over the methods of the Jews as well as of secular philosophers and pagan religious leaders. There was no traditional Christian method of making the gospel known, and the methods had to be worked out from scratch, making use of the analogies provided by other faiths and philosophies, and adopting whatever means was best adapted to the first-century environment. Thus the early church held open-air meetings wherever a crowd might be gathered. It encouraged the use of the home and of personal evangelism. It made use of literary means to reach those who could read and of non-literary means to reach the illiterate.

The theological argument from Scripture is that the Bible in no way equates the Word of God exclusively with the spoken words of men. A study of the concept of 'witness' in the Gospel of John will quickly show that a variety of means, including the words of men and the silent evidence of mighty works, were used to proclaim Jesus as the Son of God. The Word of God might be spoken or written, and it might also be made known in symbolic action (such as the sacraments) or in mighty deeds. It can of course be argued that the actions would be meaningless if unaccompanied by some form of verbal explanation, but this objection does not alter the basic point that here we have an example of making Christ known other than by a sermon.

Why, then, has the church gagged God? Two explanations may be suggested. The first is that since the normal method of communication in the ancient world was by the spoken word, we have tacitly assumed that what was the most effective practical means of communication in the ancient world had the status of a theological principle. We have gone beyond the evidence of the New Testament in thinking that the Word of God must mean a sermon of a particular type and delivery. But once this assumption is questioned, it should become obvious that the Word of God may be clothed in other forms.

The second explanation is to be found in the fact that the world has changed both from ancient times and from the days of our grandfathers. Whereas in the past one might expect to find the unconverted in church (and there are, of course, still plenty of them there), nowadays most of them are not found there. The vast mass of the population is but rarely in church. (And if it be protested that this has been so for a very long time, then all that can be said is that the church has been gagging God for far longer than it cares to admit.) In other words, the traditional sermon fails to reach the people because the people are not there to hear it. When missionaries provide primitive tribespeople with transistor receivers on which they may hear gospel broadcasts, these sets are tuned to a pre-set frequency. It would be sheer stupidity to send out the broadcasts on an entirely different frequency, but it is no more stupid than to send out countless gospel messages into the void of empty church buildings where there is nobody to hear.

It may also be argued that there is little likelihood of the unchurched masses flocking back to church so that we may preach the gospel to them there and thus convert them. Any long-term plan of evangelism which is tied to the traditional church service can only be regarded as short-sighted. Not only so, but the traditional means of evangelism by means of one person delivering a monologue of upwards of twenty minutes' duration appears to be out. People in general will no longer sit and listen. The changes in modern society and in modern means of propagating belief have rendered the church's methods antique. And those to whom the methods seem antique may well suspect that the message is of equal vintage and irrelevance.

Are we, then, to leave the gag on? Or are we prepared to go back to the New Testament and ask how its principles are to be put into effect today? To one observer it seems that the following points might be made.

First, the traditional sermon still retains its place today ; but its place is basically that of proclaiming

the Word of God to the believing company of God's people. The sermon is perhaps to be not so much a means of evangelism as of edification. As such, it still has a great future. It would be wrong to stop preaching, simply because the audiences are small. We have no divine mandate to give up this means of accomplishing a vital part of the work of God.

Second, it is still the case that some of the unconverted come into the church (even if only into the church hall), and that we can reasonably expect this to go on happening. But we dare not confront them with a presentation of the gospel which is redolent of plush pews and musty cushions. What they encounter must be both intelligible and (blessed word) relevant. Where the gospel is presented by word of mouth, it must be up-to-date in its wording and contemporary in its imagery and thought-forms. It will mean the end of the AV (but that happened for some of us years ago), and I suspect that it may also mean a more limited use of our traditional hymnology; Charles Wesley will remain second to none, possibly to all eternity, but much of what he wrote will not do for the contemporary world. Some of our 'traditional' modern choruses and the like will have to be shed likewise. Personally I shall not be sorry if I never hear again, 'And now the choir will sing an anthem', but it is more than my personal idiosyncracy which leads me to suggest that this too needs to be bowed out, having accomplished its purpose.

In short, the whole church service needs re-casting, so that it makes sense to the modern person whom we hope to convert. Our evangelistic methods must be conditioned by the kind of person who we must reach. And the church building too; one friend of mine cheerfully threatened to turn the whole of his church into a gigantic coffee bar — the pews all removed and appropriate furniture substituted. The point is a serious one, but even more serious is this consideration: the coffee bar has been an effective means of evangelism for several years now, but who has got the prescience to see what is going to be the next most effective means of evangelism and get it going on a wide scale as soon as possible?

But more difficult than adopting any of these changes of environment for the gospel is the task of learning to speak it in a contemporary form. How do you put the eternal and unchanging gospel into a modern idiom? In one sense it is easy to put the Word into twenty minutes of traditional phraseology and imagery. The task we shirk is that of re-thinking and re-expressing it so that the language of Zion becomes intelligible in the City of Destruction. But, if the possibility of reaching our hearers depends upon our learning their language, dare we shirk it, any more than the missionary shirks learning his Tamil or Chinese?

Third, *even when we have accomplished all this, we have still not reached the decisive point.* We have only shored up the tottering structures. We have still not reached the people outside, who may never be tempted inside until after they have been converted. And a church that fails to reach them has surely failed deplorably in its mission. Therefore, the basic assertion of this brief article is that we must go out to the people.

How do other people communicate with them? The most significant means of communication are TV and radio. Very well then, the church must make use of them. There are such things as religious programmes, and there is no reason in the world why the gospel should not be made known through them. It is not a task that everybody can do; very well, let them be trained. It costs money; very well, let it be provided by the Christians who cannot themselves be specialists. But very few people watch religious TV. It would be interesting to know how many people do watch the religious slot in comparison with the number in church at the same time . . . But even so, do we not need Christian dramatists and script-writers to provide a Christian form of entertainment?

And we need quality Christian literature (because some people still read), and Christian art, and Christian music. A few brave souls are venturing in these directions, but how much more could be done.

It may sound as if it is all work for specialists. But surely too it is time for a resurrection of personal evangelism, for if people will not come to church then we must talk to them wherever they are, on the doorstep, in the workshop or canteen, anywhere and everywhere. The scope is immense; what are we waiting for before we begin?

Make no mistake; it will mean an almighty upset in our set ways. I have only just begun to sketch out some of what it will mean, and I fear that I am too traditionally-minded myself to take the argument as far as it should be taken. But I can see no way of avoiding the conclusions to which I am increasingly driven. Nor need one apologize for raising this matter in the *TSF Bulletin*. For what part has preparation for a modern ministry in your college syllabus and your extra-curricular conversation? What are you doing about it now, before you find yourself in a church situation where the pressures to conform to an existing pattern are going to be the biggest barrier to progress?

Yes, I believe that much of what Gavin Reid has to say is right. We cannot expect to win the world simply by preaching a set sermon at 11.0 and 6.0, no, not even to the accompaniment of much prayer. For God answers prayer only when the people who pray are obedient to His will, and He did tell us to *go out* and bring them in, not just to stay in and help the converted.

I make no claim to put the point as effectively as Gavin Reid; mine is the humbler task of the person who draws a red line beneath his words and adds the marginal note, 'Argument invincible; shout loud!'

The Old Testament in its Context: 2 From Egypt to the Jordan

K A Kitchen

This paper continues Mr Kitchen's appreciation of the Old Testament books and data in the context of their world of origin, i.e. the ancient Near East, with whose usages and forms the outward form of their divine message shows affinity, so speaking to men in comprehensible terms; the principles and necessary succinctness of the first article[1] operate also here.

1. Structure of Exodus

Unlike Genesis, Leviticus and (less obviously) Deuteronomy, Exodus and Numbers do not manifest a characteristic literary profile marked by an explicit framework. However, the main line structure of Exodus may be viewed in terms of its practical contents much as follows:

1. Travel from Egypt to Mt. Sinai, 1: 1 - 19: 25
   Mainly narrative, but incorporating genealogical data (6: 14-28), Passover rites (in 12; 13) and Song of the Sea (15: 1-18, 21).
2. Institution of the Covenant at Sinai, 20: 1 - 31: 18
   Covenant on historical base with many distinctive features.
3. The Covenant Broken, 32: 1 - 33: 23
   Narrative of Israel's idolatry and punishment; Moses' intercession.
4. The Covenant Renewed, 34: 1 - 36: 1
   In narrative and renewed stipulations.
5. Cultic stipulations of Covenant implemented, 36: 2 - 40: 35
   Narrative of construction and erection of the tabernacle.
6. Additional Notes (*a*) 16: 34-36; (*b*) 40: 36-38
   Manna for forty years; guidance in journeyings.

Here, sections 1 - 5 are all linked with Sinai, presupposing nothing later than the Hebrews' sojourn there. All the basic material in them could have been first written down at Sinai[2] (*cf.* § 5 below). Section 6 — two brief notes on manna for 40 years and on the journeyings — would date at earliest to the time of Israel's arrival in the Plains of Moab, and belong to the post-Sinai phase of the history of the book of Exodus (*cf.* § 5 below).

[1] See *TSFB* 59 (spring 1971), pp. 2-10.

[2] One may note the references to Moses writing in Exodus (17:14; 24:4; 34:27), with R. K. Harrison, *IOT*, p. 569, and E. J. Young, *IOT*, pp. 42-45, who adds other biblical references to the role of Moses.

2. Structure of Leviticus

Leviticus completes Exodus and its covenant (*cf.* just below), while itself remaining a distinctive entity, as follows:

1. Prescribed Offering-rites from People and by Priests, 1: 1 - 7: 38
   Burnt-, meal-, peace-, sin-, guilt-offerings — what the people give (1: 1 - 6: 7) and how the priests offer them (6: 8 - 7: 38).
2. Inauguration of Priesthood and Ritual; Rules, 8: 1 - 10: 20
   Of priests (8), of tabernacle-offerings (9); rules for priests (10).
3. Rules and Rites for Clean and Unclean, 11: 1-15: 33
   In five sections (one per present-day chapter).
4. Ritual for Day of Atonement, 16: 1-34
5. Injunctions upon people and priests; feasts and jubilee, 17: 1 - 25: 55
   Social and religious rulings, national feasts, jubilee.
6. *a.* Blessing and Curses, 26: 1-46
   b. Appendix on Vows, 27: 1-34.

The tabernacle and priesthood provided for in Exodus are brought into function in Leviticus, after the basic kinds of offerings are prescribed (1 - 7). The provisions of Exodus 28-29 are fulfilled in Leviticus 8-9 with induction of the priests and inauguration of the tabernacle offerings. In the second half of the book, priests and people are integrated in the rules for clean and unclean (11-15) and the injunctions defining holiness for both (17-22), all centred round the rite of the Day of Atonement (16). Festivals, other rulings and the jubilee occupy the last prescriptive section of the book (23-25). The real tailpiece of the book is the blessings and curses (26); the vows of chapter 27 thereafter are thus kept apart (as 'voluntary'?) from the mandatory provisions of the rest of Leviticus.

The content of Leviticus supplements and completes that of Exodus in the religious and social spheres — and particularly the religious and ritual aspects of the covenant as made, broken and renewed actually at Sinai; this would be reflected by the terminal blessings and curses of Leviticus 26. Nothing in Leviticus attaches to any phase of Hebrew history later than Sinai; it could have been written up at any time from then on.

3. Structure of Numbers

Numbers has little formal structure; by content, it falls into three recognized sections:

1. Preparations for leaving Sinai, 1: 1 - 10: 10
2. Journeyings to the Plains of Moab, 10: 11 - 21: 35
3. In the Plains of Moab, 22: 1 - 36: 13

Narrative, laws and sundry documents (*e.g.* census-lists, itinerary, *etc.*) are all combined to carry the story and laws of Israel through the 40 years' discipline to Moab.

4. Deuteronomy

1. Chapters 1-33 give the renewal of the Sinai covenant in the Plains of Moab, and reflect in full the features of such a covenant: preamble, historical prologue, stipulations (basic and detailed), deposition and reading of text, witnesses, solemn ceremony, and blessings and curses.
2. Chapter 34, the sole indubitable post-Mosaicum, is a twelve-verse account of the death and burial of Moses.

The first thirty-three chapters form a basically unitary whole (*cf.* § 7 *c* below); chapter 34 could be added at any time from soon after Moses' death onwards.

5. Content, composition and role of Exodus to Deuteronomy

a. Content. Genesis enshrines the historical heritage of, and promises of a land to, the Hebrews up to the time of their exodus from Egypt.[3] Exodus and Leviticus together stand at the mid-point — Sinai — of their journey from Egypt to Palestine, to enter on fulfilment of the promises. As from Sinai, Israel are no longer an overgrown family, but a tribal nation. By the Sinai covenant, they came under a divine Sovereign. That covenant shows the essential features of a late-second-millennium covenant (*cf.* § 7 *c* below) — but unlike a mere political treaty extracting troops and tribute, it enjoined the norms to which Israel must hold in social and religious life to conform to their Sovereign's will and show forth His character in theirs.

The narrative of Exodus 1-19 links the distant patriarchs to their oppressed descendants, and records the escape from Egypt experienced by all present at Sinai. The covenant in Exodus plus Leviticus provided the foundation of norms for everyday life plus the service of the Sovereign — His worship. Numbers covers the period from Sinai to Moab, and as already noted, Deuteronomy was the renewal of the covenant with some appropriate supplementary data.

b. Composition. That Moses was already writing both at Sinai and before it has been noted above (§ 1 end and note 2); his activity in the Plains of Moab is reflected in Deuteronomy 31: 9, 24 and Numbers 33: 1, 2. Exactly when, where and by whom were Exodus-Deuteronomy written? Strictly, there is no mechanically-proven answer. Throughout all four books, Moses is irrefutably prominent and very closely connected not only with the course of events but also with large sections of their contents. The question of his authorship, in practical terms, turns on the *nature* of his connexion with the large sections alluded to and on the significance of his appearing usually in the third person (rarely in the first person beyond Deuteronomy, except in 'historical' quotation).[4] Here, there is legitimate room for varying estimates of his possible role — extensive or quite limited — as effective author of any or all of Exodus-Deuteronomy, *i.e.* as the man who actually composed and wrote down (or dictated) the text or a proto-text of the existing books.

Thus while it is technically impossible to state dogmatically and precisely all that a Moses wrote ('this much — no more, no less'), yet one can suggest realistic upper and lower limits to his possible activity; his actual activity may then be considered to have fallen somewhere within the limits determinable.

First, we may look for the minimum required by the Old Testament evidence.[5] Here, there are two classes of data. First comes the specific references to Moses writing. Exodus 17: 14 has him record God's coming punishment of Amalek in a document;[6] Exodus 24:4, 7 has him write 'all the words of the Lord' — in this context, surely Exodus 20:1-17, 22-26 and 21: 2 - 23: 33 (*i.e.* most of the basic Sinai covenant matter); Exodus 34: 27, 28 would seem to order Moses to write the immediately-preceding covenant-renewal (34:10-26) *and* to record a re-writing out on new tablets of the original decalogue. So, in Exodus, the minimum for Moses seems to be at least part of one extra-biblical document (on Amalek), and the basic body of the Sinai covenant (20-23) and its renewal after breach. Leviticus has nothing in this category. Numbers 33:1, 2 indicate that Moses wrote out an itinerary of Israel's journeyings from Egypt to Moab, a document that underlies the itinerary of Numbers 33:3-40. Then, Deuteronomy 31:9, 24 ('this instruction/law') indi-

[3] *Cf. TSFB* 59 (1971), p. 9.

[4] I make no apology whatever for treating Moses (like the patriarchs) as a historical character — just as most people would accept the real existence of a David or a Solomon, a Hesiod or a Herodotus, even though none of these is any more directly attested by contemporary inscriptions, *etc.*, than Moses or the patriarchs.

[5] For a convenient summary of what is actually attributed to Moses, *cf.* Young, *IOT*, pp. 42 ff., or *NBD*, p. 849b.

[6] The word *spr* both in biblical Hebrew and in West Semitic generally can mean not only 'book' but also a letter, or list, or almost any kind of document, long or short; for Hebrew, *cf.* Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1907 and reprs.), pp. 706-707, and for Ugaritic and other West Semitic, C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Pont. Bib. Institute, Rome, 1965), p. 451, no. 1793, and C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest* (Brill, Leiden, 1965), pp. 196-197, respectively.

cate that Moses wrote a body of 'law' or 'instruction' for Israel — most likely to be the directly-spoken material of Deuteronomy 1: 1 - 4: 40 (with colophon, 4: 44-49); 5: 1 - 26: 19; of 27 (excluding narrative headings, verses 1a, 9a, 11a); of 28: 1 - 31: 8 (including colophon, 29: 1, but excluding narrative headings). And Deuteronomy 31: 19, 22 indicate that Moses also wrote Deuteronomy 32: 1-43, the 'Song of Moses'. Thus, the whole of Deuteronomy 1-32 would in the first instance be attributable not only to the mouth but also to the pen of Moses, except for a small handful of third-person narrative-scraps (*e.g.* 4: 41-43; 31: 9-30 *passim*; 32: 44-52) and similar introductory headings (especially in 27).

Then, for our minimum estimate of Moses, there is a second class of data. This consists of material explicitly said to have been spoken or given by Moses to Israel and/or the priests, usually God's commands. Its status is similar to the first class of data, but not provenly identical. That is, it *could* also have been written as well as spoken by Moses — but it is not so described; it may, therefore, have been written down directly by someone else (as spoken), or was remembered orally and could later (soon after Moses' death?) have been written down. This second group of Mosaic-originating data includes the following. In Exodus, much of 1-11 would have to come from the memory and lips of Moses, his parents (1; 2: 1-10) and associates; instructions for the people, 12-14 *passim;* the Song of the Sea, 15: 1-18; the instructions for the cult, 25-31; God's dealing with Moses, *etc.,* in 32-34; and Moses' words in 35: 1-19, and 35: 30 - 36: 1. In Leviticus, all of 1-7; elements of 8-10; all of 11-23; much of 24; and all of 25-27 (including colophons at 26: 46 and 27: 34). In Numbers, one may see similar data (the Lord to Moses, Moses to Israel or Aaron, *etc.*) in 5: 5 - 6: 27; 8-9; 15; 19; 28-30; 34: 1-15 and 35: 9-33; here, the actual wording to Israel is reproduced in our extant record. God's word to Moses without a direct record of words, but simply the subject-matter and related events is also material originating with Moses but whose form goes back less transparently from the present book to the occasions themselves; such is to be seen in Numbers 1: 1 - 5: 4; 10: 1-10; 13; 14; 16; 17; 20-21; 25: 10ff.; 26; 27; 31; 32; 34: 16 - 35: 8; and 36. In Deuteronomy Moses' further words (without specification of writing) occur in 32: 46-47, and his 'Blessing' in 33; God's last word to him is 34: 4.

A minimal view of Moses' scope of production as an author may, therefore, be summarized as follows. In Exodus, he wrote the basic convenant and its renewal; he was source of his own early life-history, probably composed the Song of the Sea, and gave instructions for the Passover and first-born rites before the exodus as well for the details of the tabernacle, its cult and priesthood in the wake of the Sinai covenant. Absolutely minimally, this material (not said to have been written by him) could have been written at the time by an associate, or transmitted orally and later written out and combined with Moses' own personal writings (soon after his death?). Less minimally, one may suggest that much of the data in the second class was *also* written down first by Moses (especially all directly-quoted instructions to Israel, priests, *etc.*), and the rest by others or later. The whole of the book of Leviticus is given through Moses (barring undesignated bits of narrative in 8-10; 24; and plus or minus third-person headings); minimally, written down by (an)other(s) or transmitted orally, then written; less minimally, written as well as issued by Moses, plus or minus the headings, and minus the narratives (post-mortem?). In the book of Numbers, a document underlying 33: 3-49 was written by him; about ten or eleven chapters' worth of instruction stems directly from him (whether orally or in writing); and about another 16/17 chapters' worth had its origin with him and in specific occasions during his leadership of Israel, whether written up by Moses or someone else. Finally, virtually all of Deuteronomy is directly his: the main body of 1 - 31: 8 and the Song of 32: 1-43 all in writing, and the Blessing of 33 (plus minor bits) is his, whether then written by him or by others. Only minor narrative bits in 4: 41-43 and parts of 31; 32; 34 are undesignated, while alone 34: 5-12 is indubitably post-Mosaic (either immediately or later). Over-all, and especially if the undesignated book of Genesis were also his, Moses would in fact, on this minimal showing, be the effective author (written and oral in proportions that can be variously estimated) of a very considerable amount of the present contents of the Pentateuch. The proportion obviously could be still higher, if one theoretically credited him with all, some or any of the 'unauthored' narrative sections in these books. Outside the Pentateuch, his writings include a divine curse-to-come on Amalek (Exodus 17: 14), and he is credited with Psalm 90 (whether orally or written).

Secondly, is it possible to delimit a realistic maximum view?[7] This really turns about the question of Moses appearing in the third person in the narratives of Exodus-Deuteronomy. At one extreme, some may argue that such narratives are most naturally understood as coming from another's pen (regardless of whether that pen wrote in the Plains of Moab or at any later epoch). At the other extreme, some may incline to suggest that Moses wrote all the narratives, *etc.,* in the third person — Young referred in this matter to the example of Caesar's *Commentaries.*[8] In that case, non-Mosaic elements in these books[9] would virtually be limited to any indubitable post-

[7] By 'realistic', I mean a view that does not include such assumptions as that Moses wrote beforehand the account of his death and others' estimate of his greatness in past narrative as now found in Dt. 34: 5-12.

[8] Young, *IOT,* p. 86.

[9] *I.e.,* other than pre-Mosaic data, used by Moses and hence his secondarily.

Mosaica, and to any subsequent minor textual revision (*e.g.* of orthography).[9a]

Is it possible to lift this point from mere discussion in a vacuum into the realm of objective evidence? In some measure, yes. But two aspects are best considered separately, each with its relevant evidence. First, headings and colophons. Headings in the third person are common in the biblical Near East and are standard usage in wisdom literature, for example. In Egypt autobiographical texts commonly begin with the titles and name of the man concerned followed by *djed* or *djed-ef*, '(he) says/said', and then a narration in the first person.[10] Praise of the gods by individuals begin with headings like 'Praising (this or that deity) by so-and-so (titles, name); he says, "Hail to thee . . .!" ' (or the like, praise or prayer to deity in second person).[11] Wisdom books began with 'Beginning of the Instruction made by . . . (titles, name); he says ". . ." ' in the third, second and first millennia alike.[12] Nor is this confined to Egypt; similar phenomena recur in varying classes of writing in Mesopotamia, with the Hittites and in Syria-Palestine itself. Suffice it to mention, *e.g.*, the headings that commonly open cuneiform letters (as in the second millennium BC, our period) from all three regions, using such phrases as 'thus speaks X' (name and/or title[13]). Likewise from the same range of regions, the headings of treaties and covenants of this period.[14] Identical in nature are very formal headings like (*e.g.*) Deuteronomy 1:1 or 33:1, which the present writer would attribute to Moses exactly like the Near Eastern formal headings to their respective authors. One could possibly also clarify here the innumerable pentateuchal headings of the form 'And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying ". . ." ', although this is not mandatory.

A considerable role in documents of the biblical Near East is played by colophons — statements appended to texts (or instalments of texts, on tablets) which give the subject or title of the work, or the name of the scribe responsible, or often both; sometimes further details are included (date, collation, original, dictation, *etc.*).[15] These are throughout given in the third person, when a scribe or author is named; a typical colophon runs, 'First tablet of the ritual of uncleanness and the ritual of the river; it is (the rites) by Tunnawia, the old woman. Complete; (the scribe) Pikku wrote (it).'[16] Precisely this kind of usage was noted in the first article of this series for sectional or subsectional endings in Genesis.[17] And it recurs in Exodus to Deuteronomy. Thus, such a colophonic tailpiece is Exodus 6:26-27, ending the genealogical document Exodus 6:14-27, and in terms of Near Eastern scribal usage its third-person reference to Moses and Aaron does not imply their being long dead and gone as *Alttestamentler* have at times naïvely assumed, but rather it is simply an identifying tag.[18] Such colophons are seen to best advantage in Leviticus, where they end individual rites, whole sections, or even the whole book. All of 1-7 is summed up by subject-matter and authorship in a colophon at 7:37, 38, covering the types of offering prescribed through Moses; each of the five ritual topics on (un)cleanness in the five chapters 11-15 ends with an appropriate descriptive colophon (11:46, 47; 12:7b followed by a rider; 13:59; 14:54-57; and 15:32, 33). The entire book and its vows-supplement ends with colophons at 26:46 and 27:34. Most of these are just like those attested throughout the Near East. For a collection of several rituals in one document provided with a common colophon — as with Leviticus 7:37, 38 (or the whole book, as cited) — one may compare (*e.g.*) a collection of five different rituals grouped in one document with a common colophon at the end, known from the Hittite archives of the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC.[19] In Numbers, an internal colophon at 30:16 qualifies the laws of 30:1-16, and the whole book ends with a colophon in 36:13. Deuteronomy 29:1 is probably the colophon to the main bulk of the renewed covenant in Deuteronomy[20]. Thus, third-person headings and colophons present no authorship problem when viewed in context.

The second aspect is that of third-person narratives. Here, both the Old Testament and the Near East may offer a sufficient indication, together, of a

[9a] Indubitable post-Mosaica (other than Dt. 34: 5-12) are very few and hard to prove; in Genesis, conceivably Dan in 14:14 and the kings in Israel clause in 36:31b, and in Ex.-Dt. little else that will bear much scrutiny (*cf. PCI*, pp. 41-47 *passim*, with reference to Young and others).

[10] *E.g.* Khnumhotep II, *c.* 1900 BC in Middle Egypt (text, A. de Buck, *Egyptian Readingbook*, I (Brill, Leiden, 1948), pp. 67 ff.; ET, J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I (Chicago, U.P., 1906), §§ 622-624, ff.), and innumerable others at all periods of history.

[11] *Cf.* A. Barucq, *L'expression de la louange divine et de la prière dans la Bible et en Egypte* (*IFAO*, Cairo/Paris, 1962) especially pp. 47 ff.

[12] Several examples, *cf. ANET*, pp. 412 ff., and under the United Monarchy later in this series.

[13] Examples are legion; a selection, *cf. ANET*, pp. 480, 482 ff.

[14] *E.g. ANET*, pp. 202a, 203b, to cite only the most accessible.

[15] Akkadian examples, H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (Kevelaer, Neukirchen, 1968); Hittite, see E. Laroche, *Archiv Orientalni* 17 (1949), pp. 7-9; at Ugarit, *cf.* C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* (Pont. Bibl. Inst., Rome, 1949), pp. 49, 83.

[16] Hittite; published by A. Goetze and E. H. Sturtevant, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (Amer. Or. Soc., New Haven, 1938), pp. 24-25.

[17] *Cf. TSFB* 59 (1971), p. 10.

[18] *Cf.* Young, *IOT*, p. 72, with further remarks on verses 26, 27.

[19] Tablet in two bits (*KUB*, VII, 1 plus *KBo*, III, 8), edited by H. Kronasser, *Die Sprache* 7 (1961), pp. 140-167, 169, and *ibid.* 8 (1962), pp. 108-113.

[20] As it refers back to what precedes; it should therefore probably be omitted from sub-section 1 C of *AO/OT*, p. 96 (*c*).

feasible view. In Jeremiah 36:1-3, that prophet receives the divine command to write in a scroll all the words that God had spoken to him up to that time. However, Jeremiah himself does not pick up the pen; instead, he dictates to Baruch who acts as his scribe — and that, twice, for the scroll that Jehoiakim burned and for the scroll that replaced it (Je. 36:4, 6, 18, 27, 32). Thus, when Moses wrote, he doubtless wrote; he also could have dictated, not least the matter that Exodus-Deuteronomy say he spoke — and possibly also narrative-matter.

However, Jeremiah 36 is but one passage and over 600 years after Moses. Here, our Near Eastern data bridge the gap. From Syria-Palestine itself, from Ugarit in the fourteenth century BC, a tablet of the Baal Epic bears the following colophon:[21]

'El-melek the Shebnite wrote (it); Attani-puruleni, high-priest and chief of (temple) herdsmen, dictated[22] (it); Niqmad (II), king of Ugarit (plus two other titles) donated (it).'

Here, as with Jeremiah, and as early as Moses, the chief man dictates and another writes. There is, therefore, no reason why an Eleazar or a Joshua should not have similarly served a Moses.[23] If, for example, he was recounting the narrative of the exodus, Moses can be conceived of as speaking in the first person and being written down in the third person. He could have said, 'Now I was keeping the flock of my father-in-law . . . and I led my flock . . . to Horeb . . .' (*etc.*), while his scribe would correspondingly write 'Now Moses was keeping the flock of his father-in-law . . . and he led his flock . . . to Horeb . . .' (*etc.*; *cf.* Ex. 3:1); and so, *passim*, in much of Exodus-Deuteronomy. Such a scribe could have inserted rare explanatory comments such as Numbers 12:3 that commentators do not always wish to attribute to Moses himself. Other third-person narratives and comments may more easily represent the work of others other than by first/third person dictation, *e.g.* Deuteronomy 32:44f. For the first/third person shift in dictation suggested here, one or two supporting hints may be noted. Thus, while various Hittite rituals, for example, report their authors' (or authoresses') words in the first person,[24] others as transmitted to us describe their author(esse)s' ritual activities in the third person[25] — surely, a transference effected by the original scribe as suggested above for Moses. Evidence in favour of this suggestion is perhaps directly provided by yet other rituals. Here, after the third-person title which identifies the author, he/she will say 'If such-and-such trouble occurs, then I act/make offering as follows.' After this first-person initial statement, the text then proceeds to recount the appropriate activities with the author *in the third person*.[26] In other words, after the initial pronouncement, the scribe has turned the whole into a third-person narrative, just as is here suggested to be a possibility for Moses. Hence, one may suggest that, on a maximal view, there is nothing in the Old Testament text and its Near Eastern cultural content to prevent attribution to a Moses of much third-person narrative, via the use of a scribe, and some evidence — both biblical and extra-biblical — that indicates the currency of such a procedure over a long span of time.

To finish with the 'who' of the Pentateuch, one may thus suggest that the actual literary work of Moses lies somewhere in between the 'minimal' and 'maximal' general limits offered above. As for 'when' and 'where', one may suggest that Genesis (with or without Dan for Laish in 14:14 and mention of kings/Israel in 36:31b) was composed on the eve of the exodus, with much use of existing records and traditions. En route to Sinai, Moses obediently jotted down the doom of Amalek (Ex. 17:14). At Sinai, he wrote the basic covenant-document and its renewal, and possibly other items underlying the later book of Exodus. What he did write at Sinai (Ex 24: 4, 7; Ex. 34: 27, 28) plus some of these, one might call 'proto-Exodus', and (as Exodus even now has no final colophon) consider it merely the first half of a whole. Also at Sinai, one may suggest that Moses had recorded (dictated?) all of what is now Leviticus 1-7; 11-23; 25-27, at first partly in separate documents or sections (*cf.* colophons), and later (still at Sinai) as one whole, with

[21] Best translation, H. L. Ginsberg, *ANET*, p. 141; *cf.* also Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, p. 49 top.

[22] Lit., 'taught'.

[23] In Egyptian literature of much earlier date (*c.* 1990 BC—patriarchal age!), one recalls also the introductory narrative in the Prophecy of Neferty, where the king himself reaches for pen and papyrus to take down the words of the sage Neferty as he speaks them (*e.g. ANET*, p. 444b; there called 'Neferrohu'). And the Hittite rituals with named authors must in most cases have ultimately been written down by scribes at the dictation of the authors and authoresses of the rituals concerned. *Cf.* also the Mesopotamian colophon cited but misapplied by E. Nielsen, *Oral Tradition* (SCM, London, 1954), pp. 28-29 (with corrective, *AO/OT*, p. 136).

[24] *E.g.* those of Hatiya (published by O. Carruba, *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wishurijanza* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1966), pp. 2ff.), and Pissuwattis, Goetze in *ANET*, pp. 349-350.

[25] *E.g.* those of the god Tarpattassi (*ANET*, pp. 348-349), and by the 'old woman' Tunnawi (Goetze and Sturtevant, *Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*) where the 'old woman' appears in third person throughout; likewise that of the *hattili*-priest Papanikri, in which the *hattili*-priest also appears in the third person throughout (publ., F. Sommer and H. Ehelolf, *Das hethitische Ritual des Papanikri von Komana* (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1924), pp. 2* ff.).

[26] Clearest is the ritual by Mastigga (*ANET*, pp. 350-351), plus that of Anniwiyanis (E. H. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (Linguistic Soc. of America, Philadelphia, 1935), pp. 100 ff., 106 ff.). Likewise that of Uhhamuwa (*ANET*, p. 347b).

final colophons — this would be 'proto-Leviticus'.[27] Some record of what is now in Leviticus 8-10; 24 was doubtless also retained. Other recording-work had been done at Sinai or soon after, of which we know nothing except for the allusion in Numbers 11:26 ('those written', RSV 'registered'). So much, at least, was done at Sinai.

During the journeyings, other records accumulated prior to arrival in Shittim by Moab (within Nu. 1-21), perhaps at Moses' dictation or by his hand, as in 5:5 - 6:27; 8-9; 15; 19, and finally the itinerary written by him (*cf.* Nu. 33:2). This material plus other of the contents of Numbers may have formed a 'proto-Numbers', including the matter of 28-30; 34:1-15 and 35:9-33, with final colophon (Nu. 36:13). Following renewal of the covenant with the new generation of Israel, Moses wrote most of Deuteronomy 1-30, plus the Song of 32, and perhaps other small bits, forming 'proto-Deuteronomy'.[28] At some time he also produced Psalm 90; and at Shittim, finally the Blessing now Deuteronomy 33.

After Moses' death, it is perhaps possible to suggest that the four books 'proto-Exodus' to 'proto-Deuteronomy' were defined and completed by an Eleazer or a Joshua adding in the final connecting pieces of explanatory narrative, *etc.*, to produce virtually the present books. Minor additions may have been made later (Dt. 34:5-9 by Joshua; verses 10-12 then or later?), with perhaps orthological or other minor revision (? Gn. 14:14; 36:31b) by, or in, the time of the United Monarchy.

c. Role. The total heritage of the pentateuchal (or, if one will, 'proto-pentateuchal') books possessed by the Hebrews on the eve of crossing the Jordan was at once a statement of their origins and destiny (Genesis, with history and promises), and a normative foundation defining the main limits of right and wrong as subjects of their divine Sovereign whose covenant was not a mere political instrument but governed the purpose and conduct of their life as a nation of people who were to show forth God's ways on earth in practical obedience and a didactically-orientated worship. Sinai and Moab had seen the revelation, crystallization and confirmation of a given foundation and way of life for the emergent tribal nation to live by, and in God's time to build on.

6. Other data

Outside the Pentateuch and Psalm 90, other records doubtless had begun to accumulate, whether as written documents or traditions of the people. These would include additional non-pentateuchal genealogical matter which later found its way into 1 Chronicles 1-8. Of a 'Book of the Wars of the Lord', nothing now survives beyond an allusion and quotation such as Numbers 21:14-16. And none can currently know whatever may have passed into oblivion with not even so fleeting a notice as that work enjoys.

7. Near-Eastern contextual background to Exodus-Deuteronomy

a. Introductory. That so much consideration has so far been given to the biblical record as such, with practically no reference to various 'modern' views of Moses as a shadowy entity (if ever extant at all) and of those records as constructed much later from quite different 'documents' allegedly 'detected' by various criteria (not to mention much later dates for the whole) — this may puzzle some and exasperate others. For this, there are two basic reasons. First, the only *extant* documents are those we *now* have in the present Old Testament (all else is just guesswork, no matter how eruditely dressed up), while the reasons normally offered (and the presuppositions assumed) in advocating other versions of Israel's history and different 'histories' of her literature are at best inadequate and at worst plain wrong. The usual shibboleths about rival 'codes' of laws and on their supposed order in time have been refuted repeatedly over the years.[29] The conventional forms of literary criticism ('J,E,P,D', *etc.*, oral tradition, *Gattungsforschung*) were evolved in a vacuum and their criteria can be proven to be non-significant and just plain wrong when compared with the ways in which people *really* wrote in the biblical world.[30] The evolutionary scheme of concepts (retained in practice as often as it is denied in principle) by which guilt and 'elaborate' priestly usages are 'late' is wholly illusory when measured against the entire biblical world of the Near East. And so on. The second reason is that when the Old Testament writing and the theoretical re-evaluations of them are finally measured against the visible, tangible yardstick of the Near East — the Old Testament world — then it is the extant documents that match with their Near Eastern context, and not the reconstructions based on false premises and false criteria. In what follows, some of that background is briefly presented, and mere cross-reference given for more of it when covered elsewhere, under space-limits here.

b. Oppression and exodus (Ex. 1-19). The final theatre of the Hebrew oppression in the Egyptian east Delta was bounded by Pithom and Raamses (Ex. 1:11). Pithom is not yet finally fixed on the map; it may be the site now called Tell er-Retaba

[27] The second half of the early whole made up of Exodus—Leviticus.
[28] Ex. 16: 34-36 and 40: 36-38 were perhaps added in now.

[29] At random, *cf.* (*e.g.*) A. H. Finn, *Unity of the Pentateuch* (Marshall Bros., London, *c.* 1928), pp. 149-254, 294-328, *etc.*; G. T. Manley, *The Book of the Law* (Tyndale Press, London, 1957); *cf. PCI*, pp. 17 ff.
[30] For basic facts and principles involved, *cf. AO/OT*, pp. 112-138, *PCI*.

(or Rotab), otherwise it would be simply the religious name ('Domain of (the god) Atum') for Tell el-Maskhuta, ancient Succoth, Egyptian Tjeku. However, in the case of Raamses, there seems little doubt that we here have Pi-Ramesse, the famous Delta residence of the Ramesses-kings, the 'Estate of Ramesses'. After much discussion, it now seems practically certain that Pi-Ramesse/Raamses is to be located not at Tanis but further south in the geographically far more suitable area of Khata'na-Qantir.[31] It should be remembered that from *c.* 1100/1080 BC, with the fall of the Ramessides, Tanis replaced Pi-Ramesse as royal Delta residence. Thus the mention of Raamses in Exodus 1:11 accurately reflects the facts of the thirteenth and at latest twelfth century BC. As late as the Hebrew Monarchy (whether united or divided), the correct equivalent is the 'field of Zoan' as in Psalm 78:12, 43, same as Egyptian *Sekhet-Dja'net*, 'fields of Tanis'.

The names of the midwives (Ex. 1:15), far from being 'purely artificial',[32] are both genuine early West-Semitic names from the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC and earlier. 'Shipra' is found as early as *c.*1750 BC in an Egyptian list of Asiatic slaves long before the Exodus,[33] while Pu'ah (as *P'gt*) is well attested in the texts from Ugarit both as a word for 'girl' and as a proper name.[34] References to people making their stint of bricks and to lack of straw and men for brickmaking are well known in thirteenth century Egyptian papyri;[35] likewise, the relevance of putting chaff and grit into Nile mud for bricks.[36] And the wealth of background on foreigners and education in New Kingdom Egypt for Moses' upbringing is sufficiently sketched elsewhere.[37] Similarly, the lively background to Exodus 5 provided by records of surveillance of royal workmen, and holidays for cultic and other reasons (Deir el Medineh ostraca).[38] The plagues of Exodus 7-12 reflect closely a realistic sequence of phenomena linked with a too-high inundation of the Nile and the account forms a unitary whole.[39] The Song of the Sea (Ex. 15) is a triumph-hymn of victory over the Egyptians, using precisely that literary category so proudly flaunted by the pharaohs of the fifteenth to twelfth centuries BC over their foes.[40] The first day's travel from Raamses to Succoth (Ex. 12:37) corresponds to the same stint for a day's travel from 'the Palace' (of Pi-Ramesse) to the 'keep' at Succoth (Tjeku) in Papyrus Anastasi V, 19:3-8 of the late XIXth Dynasty, *c.* 1220 BC.[41] The route followed by the Hebrews went roughly south-east, east-south-east to Succoth, then east to Etham, back north (Ex. 14:1 ff.) and finally due east through the 'Sea of Reeds' (*Yam Suph*) — to the discomfiture of the pharaoh's troops[42] — before turning again south-east into Sinai, along its west coast and then inland to Mt. Sinai. Such a route is entirely consistent with our still-limited knowledge of east Delta historical geography and topography.[43]

c. The covenant and its renewal in Sinai and Moab. The form and content of the Sinai/Moab covenant has been intensively studied in the light of Near Eastern data ever since Mendenhall's pioneer study of 1955 drew attention to affinities between the Sinai covenant and treaty-forms of the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC.[44] This objective dating criterion applies not only to Exodus (or, here, Exodus-Leviticus) and data in Joshua 24 (renewal at Shechem) but even more strikingly to Deuteronomy. In the light of such a tangible yardstick (especially first-millennium forms are entirely different), dating Deuteronomy to *c.* 621 BC or the Exodus-Leviticus material) to the Monarchy (J,E) and Exile (P,H) is simply a grotesque error with no basis in reality. Details can be found elsewhere.[45]

[31] Earlier bibliography and main views, *cf. AO/OT*, p. 58 with notes 5-9. From the area of Khata'na-Qantir come the remains of a palace, of houses of high officials of Ramesses II and later reigns, of a royal colossus, small objects *in situ, etc.*—enough *in situ* evidence of a very major Ramesside centre. On the other hand, the large quantity of broken-up Ramesside stonework found at Tanis (of stelae, statues, obelisks, walls and pillars) is all of it *re-used* material, carted off and re-employed by the XXIst-XXIInd Dynasty kings; no original remains of Ramesside foundation-structures have ever yet been found at Tanis. *Cf.*, conveniently, J. Van Seters, *The Hyksos* (Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1966), pp. 128-137, also pp. 137 ff. *Cf.* Uphill, *JNES* 27 (1968), p. 314f.

[32] So M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personnamen* (1928), p. 10.

[33] Papyrus Brooklyn 35. 1446; *cf.* W. F. Albright, *JAOS* 74 (1954), pp. 229, 233.

[34] Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 229 n. 50; term, Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, p. 469, no. 2081.

[35] *Cf. AO/OT*, p. 156; also 'the 'Apiru who drag stone for the pylon' of a building of Ramesses II (R. A. Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies* (Oxford, 1956), p. 493).

[36] See *NBD*, p. 168a.

[37] See *NBD*, pp. 343-344, 844-846; Semites in Egypt, W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1962), pp. 369 ff.

[38] *Cf. AO/OT*, pp. 156-157.

[39] *Cf. NBD*, pp. 1001-1003 (following Hort).

[40] References, see *PCI*, p. 48 (ii), (a), 9, i-iii.

[41] Translated, Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, p.255; the report concerns two runaway slaves, heading south-east then back north, much as Moses may have done (Ex. 2:15) and the Hebrews certainly did (Ex. 12: 37; 13: 20 – 14:2, *etc.*).

[42] With the 600 charioteers of Ex. 14: 7, *cf.* figures for other Near Eastern forces (*TSFB* 41 (spring 1965), p. 18 *f*), to which add the 2500 Hittite chariots at the Battle of Qadesh, *c.* 1300 BC (Sir A. H. Gardiner, *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 9, 10, 39), and 924 Canaanite chariots taken by Tuthmosis III (*ANET*, p. 237b), plus 730 and over 1032 chariots captured by Amenophis II (*ibid.*, pp. 246b, 247b).

[43] See Kitchen, *sub verbo* 'Exodus, The', in *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (in press); the 'literary-critical' solution of H. Cazelles, *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955), pp. 321-364, is superfluous.

[44] G. E. Mendenhall, *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1955), pp. 26-46, 50-76.

[45] See *AO/OT*, pp. 90-102, 128, and full references there; also, *NPOT*, pp 3-5.

However, the Sinai covenant is uniquely an overarching form to contain no ordinary treaty of politics, but also the basic norms for a people (customary law, *etc.*) and the acceptance rites of their worship (the tabernacle and its rituals). Ever since the discovery of Hammurabi's Babylonian law-collection almost seventy years ago, various affinities have been often noted between the laws of the Pentateuch and those of the Near-Eastern collections (Ur-Nammu, Lipit Ishtar, laws from Eshnunna, Hammurabi, Hittite laws, and Middle Assyrian laws).[46] The remarkable fact is that four of these collections are of *patriarchal* age and even earlier, with the Hittite laws originating *c.* 1700/1600 BC, and only the Assyrian laws being as late as the period of a Moses. Thus, with such comparisons,[47] such parts of the pentateuchal books are *already* of archaic origin in Moses' time.[48]

d. Religion and ritual. The tabernacle should in no way be dismissed as a mere figment of later priestly imagination; its constructional techniques were familiar in Egypt for over fifteen centuries prior to Moses and Bezalel.[49] The careful enumeration of materials and furnishings (Ex. 25-30; 36-40) is in no respect too 'advanced' for the thirteenth century BC. Long before, in the third millennium BC, we find extensive inventories (detailed and summarizing) of temple-possessions in Vth-Dynasty Egypt, elaborately tabulated in red and black ink.[50] In the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC (especially King Tudkhalia IV in thirteenth century), the Hittites produced numerous such inventories.[51] For such lists within a larger document (as in Exodus), one may note (*e.g.*) the Ritual by Ulippi to resettle the Black Goddess in a new temple.[52] It lists at length (§§ 2-5, 6-8) some forty items of ritual furnishings for the new temple of the goddess and a series of things to be presented on the first day of the rites. As for elaborateness of ceremonial for a new shrine, Leviticus 8-9 records that consecration of Aaron's priesthood was seven days (rites are given for the first only, but for all seven *cf.* Ex. 29: 35-37), with an inauguration of the altar on the eighth day. The ritual of Ulippi for a new temple was for either six or seven days, with a far greater elaboration of cultic activity throughout. 'Priestly' much of Leviticus may be by subject-matter; but it is no more needfully 'late' than the innumerable Hittite rituals of the fifteenth-thirteenth centuries BC, not to mention Ugaritic rituals of the same epoch, or Egyptian and Mesopotamian material of far greater elaboration going back far earlier. The same ritual of Ulippi also exemplifies the antiquity in practice of other concepts and usages seen operative in Leviticus. It includes a total burnt-offering of a sheep whose blood was used to smear the new image, temple and furnishings of the Black Goddess as final rite,[53] several other animals having been sacrificed in preceding rites.[54] Compare the sacrifices with use of blood from sin- and burnt-offerings. Leviticus 8-9 *passim*. Generally speaking, the Hebrew offerings and rites of sacrifice are altogether simpler and *not* elaborate when compared with most of the rites known from the entire Near East in the last three millennia BC, and this is particularly true of the calendar of festivals. One may, for example, contrast barely a dozen annual feasts (individually, never longer than seven or eight days) in Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers with over sixty annual festivals in the calendar of the Medinet Habu temple of Ramesses III in Thebes, a document almost 1,500 lines long, where a given festival may be of one, or more, day's length up to thirteen (Sokar) or even twenty-seven (Opet-festival of Amun), with suitable provisions, sometimes running to thousands of loaves, hundreds of cakes and jugs of beer, and a variety of animals.[55] The rest of Egypt and the Near East would show the same general contrast.[56] Among individual concepts, that of sin and guilt is sufficiently attested not only in Moses' time (Egypt, Ugarit, Hatti, *etc.*),[57] but far earlier. The principle of symbolical substitution shown by laying hands on and

[46] Introduction to these collections, R. Haase, *Einführung in das Studium Keilschriftlicher Rechtsquellen* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1965).

[47] *Cf.* (*e.g.*) the relevant footnote refs. to Exodus, Deuteronomy, *etc.*, *ANET*, pp. 166 ff., and tables in Manley, *Book of the Law*, *passim*.

[48] Suggested in *Christianity Today* 12/19 (1968), p. 921; *cf.* W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Athlone Press, London, 1968), pp. 88-92. On differing attitudes of Old Testament and Near Eastern laws, *cf.* Greenberg as cited in *AO/OT*, p. 148, and Manley, *Book of the Law*, p. 81 *etc.*, on Kornfeld.

[49] Kitchen, *THB* 5/6 (April 1960), pp. 7-13.

[50] Hieratic texts transcribed in P. Posener-Krieger and J. L. de Cenival, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, 5th Series* (Br. Museum, London, 1968), plates 20-32, *cf.* pp. xiv, B, 8-13.

[51] Listed by E. Laroche, 'Catalogue des textes hittites, III', RHA 15/60 (1957), pp. 30-33, nos. 292-307.

[52] H. Kronasser, *Die Umsiedlung der schwartzen Gottheit* (Böhlaus, Vienna, 1963), for edition. Following Riedel, he already has noted possible comparisons with items in Exodus (pp. 57-58), including use of a tent alongside the new shrine as in Ex. 33:7-11 (*cf.* Finn, *Unity of the Pentateuch*, pp. 275-276).

[53] Kronasser, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-33.

[54] *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 17, 19.

[55] For the Hebrew calendar, *cf.*, conveniently, *NBD*, p. 177, table with references. The Madinet Habu calendar was published in the Epigraphic Survey, *Medinet Habu III* (Chicago, Univ. Press, 1934), hieroglyphic texts only. For details, *cf.* H. H. Nelson, U. Hölscher and S. Schott, *Work in Western Thebes*, 1931-33 (Chicago, U.P., 1934), especially pp. 2, 18-23, and 52-90 *passim*. On Sokar, also G. A. Gaballa and K. A. Kitchen, *Orientalia* 38 (1969), pp. 1-76.

[56] Egyptian feasts, *cf.* S. Schott, *Altägyptische Festdaten* (Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1950); Ugarit, *cf.*, briefly, Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, pp. 107-115 *passim;* Hittite festivals, *cf.* lists of texts, Laroche, *RHA* 15/60 (1957), pp. 65-77, nos. 473-532 (also, p. 63f., nos. 463-7).

[57] Note, *e.g.*, *ANET*, p. 381b (Egypt), Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, pp. 109-111 (offerings for sin); for Mursil II (Hittite) and others, *cf. TSFB* 41(1965), p. 11. Earlier, *NPOT*, p. 18 and refs.

confessing sins over a goat then sent into the wilderness (*cf.* Lv. 16:20-23) is firmly attested for the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC in the Hittite rituals of Uhhamuwa and Ashkhella[58] by which (respectively) plague or death are warded off by presenting to a deity and then driving forth a sheep or a sheep and a woman captive to carry off plague/death into enemy lands. Again, the humanitarian provision sometimes found in Leviticus (*e.g.* 5:7, 11; 12:8) allowing a smaller sacrifice from a poor person is reflected at this same epoch in Hittite data, where a poor person may offer one sheep rather than nine.[59] And what is blemished is no more popular there[60] than in (*e.g.*) Leviticus 22:17 ff. To banish all such usages and concepts for another 700 years or more until the Exile or after is both futile and erroneous.

e. The wilderness journeyings. Various features in the account of this period correspond directly to known features and phenomena of the regions concerned, *e.g.* water-supplies, mud-flats, season incidence of quails, *etc.*[61] Israelite numbers may seem high,[62] but are internally consistent;[63] whatever their origin, they are hardly just arbitrary. Such details as the use of long silver trumpets (Nu. 10: 1-10), a rectangular encampment around the tabernacle (Nu. 2), and ox-wagons (Nu. 7: 3, 6, 7) again make sense in a fourteenth-twelfth century BC context.[64] Itineraries like that of Numbers 33 are no more 'late' than the Syro-Palestinian route-lists of Papyrus Anastasi I (thirteenth cent. BC), or Old Assyrian merchants' itineraries to Asia Minor as early as Abraham.[65]

f. Literary and linguistic aspects. The combination of several literary *genres* in one work, as with Exodus and Numbers (narrative, covenant/laws, poems, lists, geneaologies, *etc.*) is characteristic of the ancient Near East and cannot determine authorship.[66] In linguistic matters, it is not good enough to dub a word or construction 'late' merely because it occurs (even solely) in passages termed 'late' on *a priori* grounds; and much so termed is now attested early, or for long timespans — examples and essential principles are accessible elsewhere.[67] The entire text and contents of the pentateuchal books are ripe for restudy in the full context of the world in which they were written.

Abbreviations used

ANET J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton Univ. Press, New Jersey, 1950-69).
AO/OT K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Tyndale Press, London, 1966).
IOT Introduction to the Old Testament, (a) by E. J. Young, 3rd ed., 1964, (b) by R. K. Harrison, 1970 (both Tyndale Press, London).
JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies.
NBD J. D. Douglas *et alii* (eds.), *The New Bible Dictionary* (Inter-Varsity Press, 1962 and reprs.).
NPOT J. B. Payne (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Word Books, Waco, 1970).
PCI K. A. Kitchen, *Pentateuchal Criticism and Interpretation*, Notes of Lectures, Dec. 1965 (TSF, London, 1966 and repr.).
RHA Revue Hittite et Asianique.
T(H)B Tyndale (House) Bulletin.
TSFB Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin.

[58] *ANET*, p. 347b, or Friedrich, *Der Alte Orient* 25/2 (1925), pp. 10, 11-13.
[59] Goetze, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 6(1952) p. 101, and Kronasser, *Die Sprache* 7(1961), p. 152.
[60] *E.g. ANET*, pp. 207-210 (especially §§7, 19); on excluding foreigners as in Lv. 22:25, *cf. ANET*, p. 208, § 6.
[61] *Cf. NBD*, pp. 1328-1330, and *cf.* remarks of Manley, *Book of the Law*, pp. 92-93.
[62] On possible interpretations, *cf.* (*e.g.*) J. W. Wenham, *TB* 18 (1967), pp. 27-40.
[63] *Cf.* Finn, *Unity of the Pentateuch*, pp. 264-274.
[64] *Cf. NBD*, p. 847; also in Harrison, *IOT*, pp. 622-623.
[65] *Cf.* respectively *ANET*, pp. 476-8, and refs. in *AO/OT*, p. 50 n. 75.
[66] *Cf.* (*e.g.*) *AO/OT*, pp. 125 f. for but two examples of many.
[67] See *AO/OT*, pp. 139-146, for relevant principles.

Evangelicalism: a Historical Perspective

A Skevington Wood

The word 'evangelicalism' is certainly one of the most misunderstood in the theological vocabulary; even evangelicals, who ought to know better, are capable of confusing it with 'evangelism'. It has, however, a noble pedigree, the description of which may help to avoid contemporary confusion about the meaning of the word. In the present article Dr Wood examines the history of the usage of the word and of a number of its congeners which throw further light upon its meaning. Dr Wood is a Methodist minister, until recently on the staff of the Movement for Worldwide Evangelization and now a tutor at Cliff College. He is the author of a number of important works in church history, including the life of Thomas Haweis and studies of the Methodist Revival and of John Wesley.

'When we don't know where we are,' a Cambridge don once remarked, 'it is sometimes a good idea to take a backward look and discover where we once

were.' Then he added sardonically: 'I have the feeling that in Cambridge we haven't known where we were for the last 200 years.'

Whether or not this is a correct assessment of Cambridge, it is certainly a correct assessment of the importance of the backward look, claims Professor Robert McAfee Brown, who recounts the story in his book on *The Spirit of Protestantism* (1961). We cannot understand twentieth-century evangelicalism purely in terms of the twentieth century. We need to look back and remind ourselves of what we once were, and why. Only then shall we be in a position to consider our role today. Much current misunderstanding of evangelical attitudes on the part of those who belong to other schools of thought arises from a failure to appreciate what might be described as our evangelical pedigree. Even some who themselves espouse the cause are nevertheless unfamiliar with its historical antecedents. It is useful to inspect once again the rock from which we were hewn and the quarry from which we were extracted.

Evangelical

It is too easily assumed that evangelicalism is a comparatively recent innovation. It is equated with American fundamentalism at the outset of the present century or American revivalism in the last. At the earliest it is traced to the eighteenth-century awakening under the Wesleys and Whitefield. Even when its essential connection with the Reformation has been established, any claim to further antiquity is immediately dismissed on the score that Protestantism itself represents a total departure from the past. Dr J. V. Langmead Casserley, for example, endeavours to explain how, in his view, the Catholic tradition was regrettably fractured by the Reformers. He argues that they took an unprecedented step in founding entirely new churches 'called after the name of Christ indeed and dedicated to His glory but certainly not founded or contemplated by Him in the days of His flesh', with 'new ministries differing both in origin and principle from that of the ancient Church'.[1]

On this theory, the Reformation amounted simply to a revolt against the church universal. And insofar as the papacy claimed that allegiance to the see of Rome was a necessary condition of inclusion in the church of Jesus Christ, the Reformation may indeed be regarded in a revolutionary light. Such assumptions prompted Jacques Maritain to deplore 'that immense disaster for humanity, the Protestant Reformation'.[2] The evangelical, however, prefers to agree with Philip Schaff that the Reformation took 'a deeper plunge into the meaning of the Gospel than even St Augustine had made', and demanded that final loyalty must be accorded to this gospel and the One who is both its subject and object, namely Jesus Christ our Lord.[3] The church is the fellowship of those who belong to Christ, irrespective of other affiliations. As a consequence, the Protestant believes that fidelity to the organizational expression of the church in any particular communion is measured by its degree of fidelity to the gospel. These were the presuppositions which determined the classic breach with Rome at the time of the Reformation. In no sense did the pioneers of reform regard themselves as innovators setting up a new church. It was Rome that had left the old paths and thus disqualified itself.

Because of major misunderstandings, a reappraisal of the historical significance of evangelicalism is overdue. 'Evangelical' and 'Protestant' are emotive words today, capable of arousing profound feelings either of sympathy or of antagonism. But the image behind the language may be a complete distortion. There is an evangelical Protestantism falsely so called from which moderate conservatives today would wish to dissociate themselves. Yet all too often in the eyes of others the degenerate deterioration is confused with the original and authentic stock.

In his *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1938) Sigmund Freud supplied numerous instances of words being forgotten, twisted, or misplaced because of emotional undertones.[4] He quoted a piece of dialogue from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar,* Act III, Scene 3 between the poet Cinna and a citizen of Rome. *'Cinna* Truly my name is Cinna. *Burgher* Tear him to pieces! He is a conspirator. *Cinna* I am Cinna the poet! not Cinna the conspirator. *Burgher* No matter; his name is Cinna; tear the name out of his heart and let him go.'

The name 'evangelical' by derivation refers to the distinctive doctrines of the gospel. In this sense it was applied to John Wyclif, the morning star of the Reformation, who was dubbed 'the evangelical doctor'.[5] The Reformation proper was touched off by Martin Luther's rediscovery of the gospel and he himself is rightly regarded as the father of Protestant evangelicalism. The first three chapter headings in Canon James Atkinson's survey of Luther and the Reformation in the Paternoster Church History series refer successively to 'Luther's Discovery of Evangelical Theology', 'Luther Teaches Evangelical Theology', and 'The Papacy Repudiates Evangelical Theology'.[6] 'Luther sensed that the Church had grown further and further away from the Gospel,' Atkinson comments, 'and had lost it in favour of a powerful secular institution and a humanized philosophy-cum-theology. He made nothing new yet

[1] J. V. Langmead Casserley, *No Faith of My Own* (1950), p. 85; *cf.* Kenneth Hamilton, *The Protestant Way* (1956), p. 31.
[2] Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers: Luther, Descartes, Rousseau* (rev. 1929), p. 13.
[3] Philip Schaff, *History of the Creeds of Christendom* (1877), vol. I, p. 204.
[4] Sigmund Freud, *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (Penguin ed., 1938), p. 82.
[5] John Stacey, *John Wyclif and Reform* (1964), p. 73.
[6] James Atkinson, *The Great Light: Luther and Reformation* (1968), pp. 11, 30, 38.

made everything new. He simply restored the Gospel. He innovated nothing but renovated everything.'[7] Luther complained that under the papacy the gospel lay 'idle in the dust beneath the bench'.[8] It was his mission to restore and reinstate it.

Hence the Reformers styled themselves *evangelici* (gospel men) within the church, as distinct from the *pontifici* who still retained their allegiance to the pope and Scholastic theology.[9] The title 'evangelical' was assumed by Luther and his followers before his excommunication and enforced secession from the Roman communion. Originally it stood for the supremacy of the gospel within the existing church, despite the apostasy and corruption of Rome. 'Luther's Reformation sought to establish the Church once more upon the foundation of the gospel,' explains Professor Jaroslav Pelikan, 'and so to root the unity of the Church in the redemptive action of God rather than human merit and human organization.'[10] Luther's aim was to unite the church in the gospel. But Rome was patently unready for reorientation, and when Luther was anathematized by the pope, he was compelled to assume the role of a somewhat reluctant dissident.

Since the Reformation the term 'evangelical' has been used to describe the Protestant churches in general, as basing their doctrine on the gospel, and the Lutheran churches in particular. Erasmus employed the designation as early as 1529—the precise year when the parallel title 'Protestant' originated.[11] In 1531 William Tyndale alluded to 'the evangelical truth' when expounding the Gospel of John.[12] In the following year Sir Thomas More in his confutation of Tyndale identified both Tyndale and Barnes as evangelical.[13] By 1619 the *Arraignment of Barnevelt* could speak of 'the reformed evangelical religion'.[14]

In the eighteenth century the word was applied to those who preached the doctrines of the revival. How soon after Wesley's conversion this occurred is not clear. H. M. Larner thought it was roughly 'in the middle of the century'.[15] In his *Life of Colonel Gardner,* published in 1747, Philip Doddridge deplored the antinomian tendencies of some 'who have been ignorantly extolled as the most zealous evangelical preachers'.[16] In 1759 Thomas Haweis wrote to Samuel Walker of Truro and mentioned William Talbot, Vicar of Kineton. 'Talbot took his living with a view to doing good before he could be at all said to be evangelical,' he declared.[17] In these instances the name appears to have been used in its broadest sense of conformity to the gospel, as it had been since the Reformation.[18] All who were involved in the eighteenth-century awakening were called evangelical, as they were also called Methodists. Thus in the early stages Methodists were known as Evangelicals and Evangelicals were known as Methodists; the terms were virtually interchangeable.

Later, however, the label 'Evangelical' was attached to a group within the Church of England distinct from the Methodists—whether Wesleyan, Whitefieldite or whatever—who eventually left the establishment. By 1770, as the theological controversy over predestination reached its unfortunate zenith, A. M. Toplady could write to John Wesley: 'You complain that the Evangelical clergy are leaving no stone unturned to raise John Calvin's ghost.'[19]

The crucial issue, however, was not in fact theological. It is an over-simplification to define Anglican Evangelicalism as merely the Calvinist wing of the revival. Rather, as Canon Charles Smyth so effectively demonstrated, 'the fundamental divergence between Evangelicals and Methodists came over the problem of Church order'.[20] To quote William Jones of Nayland: 'We have the character of Methodism complete: it is Christian godliness without Christian order.'[21] The curious paradox is, of course, that Methodism, having broken free from the restraints of traditional church order, proceeded, under the genius of John Wesley, to evolve a highly developed and vigorous system of its own.[22] Although the actual divergence did not become generally apparent until the last two decades of the century, it is clear that quite early

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[8] *Works of Martin Luther,* ed. Henry Jacobs (1915-1932), vol. II, p. 150 ('An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate' (1520)).
[9] *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge,* ed. C. M. Jackson *et al* (1908-1912), vol. IV, p. 291.
[10] Jaroslav Pelikan, *Obedient Rebels* (1964), p. 14.
[11] He wrote 'Against those who vaunt for themselves the Title Evangelical'. There is a further reference in a letter to Andomar on 10 April 1531 (James Anthony Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus* (1894), p. 406, Ep. mclxxxv).
[12] William Tyndale, *Exposition of St. John* (1531), p. 92. 'He exhorteth them to proceed constantly in the evangelical truth.'
[13] Thomas More, *Confutation of Tindall* (1532) in *Works,* ed. William Rastell (1557), p. 353.
[14] *The Arraignment of John van Olden Barnevelt* (1619) p. 11.
[15] *A Dictionary of English Church History,* ed. S. L. Ollard and G. Crosse (1912), pp. 211-212.
[16] Philip Doddridge, *The Life of Colonel Gardner* (1747), p. 162.
[17] Edwin Sidney, *The Life and Ministry of Samuel Walker* (1838), p. 479.
[18] *Cf.* L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Early Evangelicals: A Religious and Social Study* (1953), p. 132.
[19] Augustus Montague Toplady, *A Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley: relative to his pretended Abridgment of Zanchius on Predestination* (1770), in *Works* (1825), vol. V, p. 348.
[20] *Charles Smyth, Simeon and Church Order: A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century* (1940), p. 255.
[21] William Jones, *The Life of George Horne,* prefixed to his *Works* (1830), p. cvii.
[22] *Cf.* A. Skevington Wood, *Thomas Haweis* (1957), p. 15.

in the revival the really vital issue was recognized. On 20 March 1761 Wesley wrote to James Rouquet: 'The grand breach is now between the regular and irregular clergy.'[23] Thus the differentiation was unmistakeably drawn between Methodists and Anglican Evangelicals. Although the term evangelical came to be more narrowly associated with a party inside the Church of England, its wider reference to all who accept the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel as revealed in the Word of God has never disappeared.

Orthodox and apostolic

Having established the historical connotation of the term evangelical, let us proceed to examine a series of collateral designations which will help to clarify its import. The first of these is *orthodox*. 'Evangelicals are orthodox in doctrine, and enthusiastically orthodox,' declared Canon Elliott-Binns.[24] He had Anglican Evangelicals in mind, but what he wrote applies to all. Yet orthodoxy is not regarded as an end in itself: the ethical consequences of right belief constitute a major concern which has a peculiar relevance to our permissive society today. Nor is orthodoxy equated with arid rectitude. We take Wesley's point that the mere holding of impeccable theological opinions is 'at best a very slender part of religion'.[25] Yet in an age when experiments in unorthodoxy appear to be carried to unwonted and unwarranted lengths, there is wisdom surely in recalling the values which are safeguarded by orthodox belief. According to Dr James I. Packer, orthodoxy 'expresses the idea that certain statements accurately embody the revealed truth-content of Christianity and are therefore in their own nature normative for the universal Church'.[26] Such a conception is rooted in the New Testament insistence that the gospel has a specific content (1 Cor. 15: 1-11; Gal. 1: 6-9; 1 Tim. 6: 3; 2 Tim. 4: 3, 4). It further implies that no truly Christian fellowship can exist between those who accept it and those who repudiate it (1 Jn. 4: 1-3; 2 Jn. 7-11). It was as a result of conflict with heresy — especially that of the Gnostics— that Irenaeus sought to define a rule of faith by which right doctrines could be tested. To this orthodox belief the church was unanimously committed. She believes these basic items, Irenaeus could declare, 'just as if she had but one soul, and one and the same heart, and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed only one mouth . . . For the faith being ever one and the same, neither does one who is able at great length to discourse regarding it, make any addition to it, nor does anyone who can say but little, diminish it.'[27]

Another word by which evangelicalism may be explicated is *apostolic*. It traces its lineage from the apostles' teaching referred to in Acts 2: 42. Here is the content of orthodoxy. The true apostolical succession is one of doctrine, not of ministry. 'In the government of the Church', declared John Calvin, 'nothing is more absurd than to disregard doctrine, and place succession in persons.'[28] And in his reply to Cardinal Sadolet's invitation to the senate and people of Geneva to return to the Roman fold, Calvin challenged the pope to make good his claim to stand in the succession of Peter by maintaining the purity of the gospel.[29] The English Reformers consciously aimed to secure 'a perfect and apostolical reformation'.[30] They might differ from their Continental brethren in matters of worship and government, but were entirely at one with them in the substance of doctrine. Hence John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester — later one of the Smithfield martyrs — could explain in his examination before Edmund Bonner: 'I allow the Church of Geneva and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica,* and doth follow the doctrines that the apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward's days was according to the same.'[31]

John Wesley maintained a similar position in his letter to the editor of the *London Chronicle* in 1761, answering a *Caveat against the Methodists* issued by the Romanist Richard Challenor. Wesley was quick to point out that it really amounted to a warning against Protestants. If the true church, as the Bishop-Coadjutor asserted, has 'a perpetual succession of pastors and teachers divinely appointed and divinely assisted, then this has never been lacking in the reformed churches, for they convert sinners to God — a work none can do unless God Himself doth appoint them thereto and assist them therein'.[32] So Wesley contended that 'their teachers are the proper

[23] *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley,* ed. John Telford (1931), vol. IV, p. 143.
[24] L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Evangelical Movement in the English Church* (1928), p. 91.
[25] *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley,* 3rd edition, ed. Thomas Jackson (1829-1831), vol. VIII, p. 249. *A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists* (1748).
[26] *Baker's Dictionary of Theology,* ed. Everett F. Harrison, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Carl F. H. Henry (1960), p. 390.
[27] *Ante-Nicene Christian Library,* ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (1866-1872), vol. V, p. 43. *Against Heresies* i. 10. 2.
[28] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* E. T. Henry Beveridge (ed. 1949), IV. ii. 3.
[29] *The Library of Christian Classics,* vol. XXII *Calvin: Theological Treatises,* ed. J. K. S. Reid (1954), p. 243, *Reply by John Calvin to the letter by Cardinal Sadolet to the Senate and People of Geneva* (1539).
[30] *The Reformation of the Church: A Collection of Reformed and Puritan Documents on Church Issues,* ed. Iain Murray (1965), p. 53. *Cf.* John Hooper's letter from the Fleet Prison in which he contrasted the 'superstitious and blind church' with 'that perfect and enlightened Church of the apostles' (*ibid.,* p. 57).
[31] John Philpot, *Works* (1842) (Parker Society), p. 153. The reference is found in an article by Gervase Duffield in *The Churchman* (vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 19-29) to which I am indebted at this and other points.
[32] Wesley, *Letters,* vol. IV, p. 137.

successors to those who have delivered down through all generations the faith once delivered to the saints'.[33]

Primitive

Another word, often employed by Wesley, may be added to our list of evangelical correlatives: it is *primitive*. Wesley never tired of appealing to the Scriptures and to the early church. Primitive Christianity — before the rot set in — was his ideal and criterion. This was altogether in the spirit of the pioneer Protestant reformers, as Gordon Rupp has been showing us afresh.[34] They were considerably influenced by Renaissance humanism, with its motto *'ad fontem et originem'*.[35] The new stress on historical sources sent them back to the Bible and the primitive church. It was from this study that they came to realize how far Rome had deviated from true doctrine. The Reformation was at heart a return to early Christianity. Its aim was to restore the church to its pristine purity.

When the Reformers spoke about 'our church', as over against the corrupt Roman system, they were not referring simply to a sect or a denomination. They meant the renewed church of Jesus Christ which stood in the direct line of descent from the apostles and the primitive period, and its local manifestation in a particular congregation. It was in this one church that reform was to be accomplished. Even the enormities of papal government did not deter the Reformers from their purpose to effect renewal from within. There was no thought of setting up a new church, as if that were at all possible in the light of New Testament principles. The Reformers were satisfied to appeal directly to the gospel and indirectly to the primitive church.

That is made clear in the title of the Second Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Heinrich Bullinger in 1566, which Walter Hildebrandt characterized as 'the quintessence of the entire development of the reformed faith'.[36] 'A confession and simple exposition of the true faith and catholic articles of the pure Christian religion . . . to witness to all the faithful that they persist in the unity of the true and ancient Christian Church, and that they are not sowers of any new or erroneous doctrine, and consequently also that they have nothing in common with any sects or heresies whatsoever.'[37]

The English Reformers were equally emphatic on this point. Thomas Cranmer looked to 'the old Church', and distinguished between this and the external organization of Rome which mistakenly 'accounted itself to be the Holy Catholic Church'.[38] John Jewel could conclude his *Apologia* (1562) — recognized as a classic statement of the evangelical position within the Church of England — with these words: 'We have searched out of the Holy Bible, which we are sure cannot deceive us, one sure form of religion, and have returned again unto the primitive Church of the ancient fathers and apostles, that is to say, to the ground and beginning of things, unto the very headsprings of Christ's Church.'[39] Another contemporary, Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln, contrasted the fidelity of the primitive church with the vagaries of succeeding centuries. 'St Paul spake with a loud voice and a strong spirit: Woe be to me, if I preach not the Gospel. The same was the voice of all the old fathers and godly men in the beginning. They were occupied in nothing but either in teaching and confirming truth, or in reproving and defacing falsehood and heresy; but after six hundred years the prelates of the Church well near clean lost their voices.'[40]

This appeal to the primitive church as preserving and proclaiming the truth of Scripture, involved the recognition that the historical creeds served to safeguard evangelical doctrine. Luther accepted the three so-called ecumenical creeds of the ancient church, not because they had been adopted by Councils but because they conformed to Scripture.[41] In 1538 he wrote a short exposition of these symbols, explaining that he did so in order that he might yet again testify to the fact that he held to 'the real Christian Church, which up until now has preserved these symbols and creeds, and not to that false, arrogant church which is indeed the worst enemy of the real Church.'[42] The Apostles' Creed is regarded as 'truly the finest of all', since 'briefly, correctly, and in a splendid way it summarizes the articles of faith'.[43] Referring to the over-all teaching of the creeds, Luther affirmed: 'This is my faith, for so all true Christians have believed and so the Holy Scriptures teach us.'[44] Luther advised a Christian who was under fire for accepting the article about the virgin birth to reply: 'I have here a little pamphlet called the creed, and it contains this article. This is my Bible: it has stood for a long

[33] *Ibid.*
[34] Gordon Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (1969), p. xxii.
[35] *Cf.* Duffield in *The Churchman*, vol. 77, no. 1, p. 20.
[36] Walter Hildebrandt and Rudolf Zimmermann, *Das Zweite helvetische Bekenntnis* (1938), quoted by Arthur C. Cochrane in his edition of *Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century* (1966), p. 222.
[37] *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche*, ed. Wilhelm Niesel (1938), p. 1.
[38] Thomas Cranmer, *Works* (1844-1846; Parker Society), vol. I, p. 476.
[39] John Jewel, *Works* (1845-1850; Parker Society), vol. IV, p. 1084; *cf.* John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (1963), p. 207.
[40] Thomas Cooper, *An Answer to an Apology for Kirche*, ed. J. T. Müller (1869), p. 300. *Private Mass* (1562) ff. 12v-13r, in Booty, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
[41] Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (ET, 1966), p. 7.
[42] *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav J. Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann (1955-), vol. 34, p. 201. *The Three Symbols or Creeds of the Christian Faith* (1538).
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Luther's Works*, vol. 37, p. 372. *Confession Concern-*

time, and still stands without being disproved. I stand by this creed: I was baptised in this faith and I shall live and die by it.'[45]

The sequence of Calvin's *Institutes* (1536) in their original form is based on the Apostles' Creed, which was regularly recited in the worship of the Reformed congregation in Geneva. Calvin valued it 'because it states the leading articles of redemption in a few words, and may thus serve as a tablet in which the points of Christian doctrine most deserving of attention are brought separately and distinctly before us'.[46] Everything contained in it is 'sanctioned by the sure testimony of Scripture'.[47] The Second Helvetic Confession even went so far as to denounce as heresy whatever was not in accord with the creeds approved by the four great Councils of the church, together with that known as Athanasian.[48]

Whilst the writings of the Fathers were constantly tested by the touchstone of Scripture and on occasion found wanting, they were not rejected by the Reformers when they remained faithful to the biblical norm. Luther claimed that his theology was derived directly from the Word of God, and was independent of patristic corroboration. Nevertheless, he constantly referred to the Fathers, particularly to Augustine, as supporting his views. Calvin was equally replete with allusions. Indeed Dr G. S. M. Walker declared that 'his admiration for the patristic period, *ante papatum* as he puts it, was as unbounded as that of any Anglican'.[49] So steeped was he in early Christian literature that when discussing the true mode of fasting he made an unacknowledged reference to the works of John Cassian.[50] He told Cardinal Sadolet that in attacking the papacy he was 'armed not only with the virtue of the divine Word, but also with the aid of the holy fathers'.[51] He refuted the insinuation that the Reformers relied exclusively on their own judgment and could find in the whole history of the church not even one individual to whom deference was due. 'Although we hold that the Word of God alone lies beyond the sphere of our judgment, and that the fathers and councils are of authority only insofar as they agree with the rule of the Word, we still give to councils and fathers such rank and honour as it is proper for them under Christ to hold.'[52]

Cranmer was convinced that a consensus of patristic thought would corroborate the theology of the Reformation and reveal that the errors of Rome were in fact simply the corruptions of the mediaeval period. When all the Fathers concurred in their exposition of any passage in Scripture, Cranmer was ready to regard such unanimity as flowing from the Spirit of God. Yet, of course, he recognized that the Fathers were always to be subjected to the tribunal of Scripture as they themselves invariably desired to be.[53] Jewel's verdict deserves quotation: 'They were learned men, and learned fathers; the instruments of the mercy of God and vessels full of grace. We despise them not, we read them, we reverence them, and give thanks to God for them. They were witnesses unto the truth, they were worthy pillars and ornaments in the Church of God. Yet they were not meant to be compared with the Word of God. We may not build upon them: we may not make them the foundation and warrant of our conscience: we may not put our trust in them. Our trust is in the name of the Lord.'[54]

Catholic

The terms apostolic and primitive pave the way for the next correlative of evangelicalism to be considered, namely, *catholic*. This is perhaps the most controversial claim of all. Yet the Reformers resolutely refused to surrender the note of catholicity to the Romans. They contended that historically the doctrines of the Reformation had been held by the universal church prior to the period of papal distortion. None was more jealous of this than Luther himself. Hence Professor Pelikan is able to assert: 'Martin Luther was the first Protestant, and yet he was more Catholic than many of his Roman Catholic opponents.'[55] This is the paradox which lies at the heart of the Protestant Reformation. Calvin was no less concerned to stake a claim for catholicity. According to a distinguished French historian, Imbart de la Tour, his aim was 'to restore, in the midst of Protestantism and to some extent in opposition to it, the catholic idea of universality and authority'.[56] He envisaged 'a new catholicity solely founded on the Word of God'.[57] So when he met Castellio's objections to the inclusion of the Song of Songs in the canon of Scripture, he took his stand on 'the universal census of the universal Church'.[58]

The Reformers intended by the description 'catholic' a reference to universal doctrine. 'The Catholic Church standeth not in the multitude of persons,' affirmed Jewel, 'but in the weight of truth.'[59] Here was the link between the early church and the Reformation. 'Surely we have ever judged the primitive Church of Christ's time and the apostles, and of

ing Christ's Supper (1528).
[45] *D. Martin Luthers Werke, kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. J. F. K. Knaake *et al.* (1883-), Bd. 37, p. 55.
[46] *Institutes* II. xvi. 18.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] *Reformed Confessions*, p. 247.
[49] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. 16, no. 4, p. 372.
[50] *Institutes*, IV. xiii. 18; *cf.* John Cassian, *De Institutis Coenoborium*, 5. 23.
[51] *Theological Treatises*, p. 240.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 255.
[53] Cranmer, *Works*, vol. II, p. 33.
[54] Jewel, *Works*, vol. IV, p. 1173.
[55] Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
[56] Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la réforme* (1905-1935), vol. IV, p. 53.
[57] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[58] B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation* (1911), p. 635.
[59] Jewel, *Works*, vol. III, p. 266.

the holy fathers, to be the Catholic Church: neither make we doubt to name it Noah's ark, Christ's spouse, the pillar and upholder of all truth: nor yet to fix therein the whole mean of our salvation.'[60] Hence Nicholas Ridley could assure his interrogator that he recognized the catholic or universal church which is the bride and body of Christ: 'this Church I believe, according to the Creed: this Church I do reverence and honour in the Lord.'[61] But, he added, 'the rule of this Church is the Word of God'.[62] Hugh Latimer could speak similarly to John White, Bishop of Lincoln: 'Your lordship often doth inculcate the Catholic Church, as though I should deny the same. No, my lord, I confess there is a Catholic Church, to the determination of which I will stand; but not the Church which you call Catholic, which sooner might be termed diabolic. And whereas you join together the Romish and Catholic Church, stay there, I pray you. For it is one thing to say Romish Church, and another thing to say Catholic Church.'[63] There were thus two types of catholicity: Roman and Reformed. It is no part of the evangelical position to reject the second.

It may be surprising to some to learn that a Puritan like John Owen could write *On the Nature of the Catholic Church* — 'peculiarly, and properly' so called, he added.[64] In its visible form it is 'comprehensive of all who throughout the world outwardly own the gospel', 'with a confession of one Lord, one faith, one baptism' which comprises 'a sufficient foundation for their love, union and communion'.[65] 'It is, then, the universal collective body of them that profess the Gospel throughout the world which we own as the Catholic Church of Christ.'[66] Owen then went on to express the view that the Church of England at that period, measured by its standards received from the Reformation, was 'as sound and healthful part of the Catholic Church as any in the world'.[67] Despite all that he himself endured at the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities after the Restoration, being deprived of his office as Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University. Owen could nevertheless still assert that 'it is a most perverse imagination that separation is the only cure for Church disorders'.[68]

This adherence to the notion of catholicity further emphasizes the fact that the evangelical position is not to be regarded as an innovation. So far from dissociating itself from the past, it would find its rightful place in the mainstream of the church universal. This continuity was not altogether interrupted by what Luther described as 'the Babylonian Captivity of the Church', during the era of papal dominance.[69] Recent research has disclosed the unexpected strength of what Professor James H. Nichols calls 'the evangelical undertow' in the Middle Ages.[70] Studies like Obermann's *Forerunners of the Reformation* (1966) indicate that the renewal of the church was brought about by the crystallization of tendencies already apparent in the preceding centuries.[71] The action of Luther, explains Dr Visser 't Hooft, was not 'an arbitrary breakaway from a sacred tradition', but rather 'the restoration of a deeper and invisible continuity of faith'.[72]

The definitive reformed statements of faith in the sixteenth century are impressively unanimous in stressing the continuity of the church. The Second Helvetic Confession, which we have already identified as one of the major documents, begins its chapter on the church in this fashion: 'Because God from the beginning would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2: 4), it is altogether necessary that there always should have been, and should be now, and to the end of the world, a Church.'[73] The Heidelberg Catechism provides the following reply to the question 'What do you believe concerning the Holy Catholic Church?' 'I believe that, from the beginning to the end of the world, and from among the whole human race, the Son of God by His Spirit and His Word, gathers, protects, and preserves for Himself, in the unity of the true faith, a congregation chosen for eternal life.'[74]

Reformed

The two correlatives of evangelical which conclude our survey are more predictable: namely *Reformed* and *Protestant*. To set them in that order is to observe the historical sequence in which they originally appeared. In the days of Luther, the church was reformed before it became known as Protestant. The Reformation, moreover, had to do primarily with the church, its doctrines and practice, and is not to be presented as if its political implications took precedence. It has been approached of late in

[60] John Jewel, *An Apology, or Answer in Defence of the Church of England* (1564), Sig. G. viii; *cf.* Booty, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
[61] John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. S. R. Cattley and G. Townsend (1837-1841), vol. VII, p. 412.
[62] *Ibid.*
[63] Hugh Latimer, *Remains* (1945; Parker Society), pp. 289-290.
[64] *The Works of John Owen*, ed. William H. Goold (1850-1855), vol. XV, p. 78. *A Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love, Church Peace, and Unity* (1672).
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 85.
[67] *Ibid.*
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[69] *Works of Martin Luther*, vol. II, p. 170. *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520). The biblical sacraments 'have been subjected to a miserable captivity by the Roman curia, and the Church has been deprived of all her liberty' (p. 177).
[70] James H. Nichols, *Primer for Protestants* p. 34.
[71] Heiko Augustinus Obermann, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (1966), pp. 32-43.
[72] W. H. Visser 't Hooft, *Anglo-Catholicism and Orthodoxy* (1933), p. 72, quoted in Daniel T. Jenkins, *The Nature of Catholicity* (1942), p. 76.
[73] *Reformed Confessions*, p. 261.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 314.

terms of the constitutional changes involved, the rise of nationalism, and its sociological and economic repercussions. In his contribution to the second volume of *The New Cambridge Modern History,* of which he is the editor, even so distinguished a historian as Dr Geoffrey Elton regards the mainspring of the Reformation as political.[75] For this misjudgment he has been suitably taken to task by Gordon Rupp.[76]

Two applications of the word *Reformed* must be noted. In its first and general connotation it indicates that which is associated with the Reformation touched off by Luther, with its rediscovery of the gospel through a recognition of the supremacy of Scripture. The heart of this biblical realization of what is essential to the Christian faith and to the Christian community lay in the 'article of a standing or falling church' — justification by faith.[77] For Luther, this was not simply the head of a doctrinal catalogue, but the criterion by which all belief was to be assessed. Dr Harold J. Grimm has effectively shown how the basic tenets of the Reformation emerged. 'This doctrine of justification by faith and not by works, which became the fundamental principle of Protestantism, he (Luther) had found in the Bible and not in the textbooks of the mediaeval Schoolmen. Therefore he turned from the works of men to the Word of God and enunciated the second evangelical principle which formed the basis of Protestantism: the recognition of the Bible as the sole authority in religious matters. When, finally, he came to the conclusion that the ecclesiastical hierarchy as it had developed in the Middle Ages hindered rather than aided the Christian in his personal, direct approach to God, he formulated the third fundamental principle of the Protestant Reformation: the universal priesthood of believers.[78] This, then, is the original and definitive meaning of the adjective Reformed: it stands for all those evangelical doctrines rehabilitated from the Scriptures in the crisis of the sixteenth century.

The second and subsidiary use of the term Reformed dates back only to the seventeenth century and is not apparently found earlier.[79] During the Thirty Years War it became customary to classify the Protestants or *Evangelici* into two groups — the Reformed and the Lutheran. In the sixth article of the Peace of Westphalia this distinction was clearly drawn. Hence the title Reformed has come to be assumed by Presbyterians in particular, and more generally by those who hold to the emphases of Calvin and Melanchthon. In this more restricted sense, not all evangelicals can be called Reformed, but in the original and determinative significance of the term, of course, they can.

The very derivation of the word Reformed suggests that in the sixteenth century the visible church was not abandoned in despair. It was the aim of the Reformers to reshape it from within. None of them regarded the church, with all its aberrations and abuses, as irremediably corrupt. They cherished the hope of renewal. The papacy might arrogate to itself prerogatives which belong to Christ alone and the Reformers might therefore identify the pope with antichrist, as in fact they did. Despite these abominations, however, the Reformers did not write off the church as beyond redemption. That would have been to deny the power of God.

In his commentary on Galatians, Luther raised the question of how Paul could still address as churches those who had been led astray from the gospel of grace into an excessive legalism.[80] Similarly the Corinthians, many of whom had been perverted by false apostles and did not believe in the resurrection of the dead, were nevertheless addressed as the church which is the body of Christ.[81] Luther went on: 'So today we still call the Church of Rome holy and all its sees holy, even though they have been undermined and their ministers are ungodly. For God "rules in the midst of His foes" (Ps. 110: 2), AntiChrist "takes his seat in the temple of God" (2 Thes. 2: 4), and Satan is present among the sons of God (Jb. 1: 6). Even if the Church is "in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation" as Paul says to the Philippians (2: 15), and even if it is surrounded by wolves and robbers, that is, spiritual tyrants, it is still the Church. Although the city of Rome is worse than Sodom and Gomorrah, nevertheless there remains in it Baptism, the Sacrament, the voice and text of the Gospel, the sacred Scriptures, the ministries, the name of Christ, and the name of God. Whoever has these, has them: whoever does not have them, has no excuse, for the treasure is still there. . . . Wherever the substance of the Word and the sacraments abides, therefore, there the holy Church is present, even though AntiChrist may reign there; for he takes his seat not in a stable of fiends or in a pigsty or in an assembly of unbelievers, but in the highest and holiest place possible, namely, in the temple of God (2 Thes. 2: 4).'[82]

The implications of this and other similar passages in Luther cannot be escaped. Neither those who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession, nor those who followed Calvin and the tradition of Geneva, nor yet indeed those who originally effected the reform of the English Church, had any other intention than to revitalize the church from within. They

[75] *The New Cambridge Modern History,* vol. II, ed. G. R. Elton (1958), p. 228.
[76] Gordon Rupp, *Protestant Catholicity* (1960), p. 20.
[77] *Articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*: Schmalkald Articles II in *Die Symbolischen Bücher der Evangelische Kirche,* ed. J. T. Müller (1869), p. 300.
[78] *Luther's Works,* vol. 31, p. x. Introduction to *Career of the Reformer.*
[79] Duffield in *The Churchman,* vol. 77, no. 1, p. 24.
[80] *Luther's Works,* vol. 26, p. 24. *Lectures on Galatians* (1535).
[81] *Ibid.*
[82] *Ibid.,* pp. 24-25.

sought to re-form its doctrine and structure in conformity with the Word of God. According to Dr Geddes MacGregor, 'the possibility, even, of a separate Church or purer sect was as repugnant to their thinking as it would be to any modern Roman Catholic. What the reformers wanted was the secure establishment of the Catholic Church Reformed'.[83] Dr MacGregor deplores the fact that Protestantism subsequently lost 'the passion for the health of the one indivisible Church without which Luther and Calvin would have lacked motivation for their holy and courageous enterprise'.[84] He quotes a seventeenth century tract which lamented this decline. 'To call us Calvinians and the Reformed churches Calvinian Reformed Churches, is to disgrace the true churches of Christ and to symbolize with the papists.'[85] It goes on to say that 'one ought not to join with the papists in giving the names of sects unto the Reformed Churches'.[86]

The watchword of the Reformers was *ecclesia reformata sed semper reformanda* — the church reformed yet always in the process of being reformed. Reformation was never regarded as ultimate. It is a continuous process. Unless it is constantly being effected, it lapses into deformation. Reformation cannot be a finished product: it is always going on. 'The Reformation was not completed in the sixteenth century; it is never completed,' writes Professor John T. McNeill. 'We may for the sake of comfort try to transform Protestantism into a closed system; but it breaks out again. It has no "infallible" voice to silence other voices in decrees that are "irreformable". Protestantism cannot be static.'[87] 'Blessed Reformation!' — that is the cry of partisanship. 'Yea, rather', added the Latitudinarian Faringdon, 'blessed are they that reform themselves.'[88]

Blaise Pascal, in a perceptive phrase, referred to the grandeur and misery of the Reformation heritage. The grandeur lies in the noble stand for scriptural truth that was made in the sixteenth century. The misery arises from the sad fact that the work of the Reformation has been arrested if not reversed in so many of those churches which own allegiance to its name. We have failed to maintain our own reform, and are thus incapable of bringing renewal to the church as a whole. Professor Arthur C. Cochrane asks a shattering question, and yet one which evangelicals dare not refuse to consider: 'Could it be that the *ecclesia semper reformanda* is better understood today in the church of Vatican Council II than in the churches which are heirs to the Reformation?'[89] Whatever answer is given to that specific enquiry, it remains a tragic fact that so many of those communions which derive from the Reformation now need to be reformed themselves.

Protestant

The term *Protestant* is anathema in many circles today. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that never before in history has Protestantism had such a bad press. It is too literally construed as being purely a matter of protest, and although demonstrations of every other sort are part of the accepted political scene today, any hint of religious militancy is immediately suspect. Of course, to place a merely negative construction on Protestantism is not only to misconceive its nature but also to ignore its historical antecedents.

The term Protestant originated in Germany at the Second Diet of Spires in 1529. A strong majority supporting the papacy had revoked a previous act of toleration towards the followers of Luther. By way of reaction, six princes, with the backing of fourteen imperial cities, entered their protestation against what they considered to be a retrograde measure. A longer statement, the *Instrumentum Appellationis,* made it clear that the evangelical minority took their stand, as Luther himself had done, on the Word of God. 'This Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christians; it shines clearly in its own light, and is found to enlighten the darkness. We are determined by God's grace and aid to abide by God's Word alone, the Holy Gospel contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments. This Word alone should be preached, and nothing that is contrary to it. It is the only truth. It is the sure rule of all Christian doctrine and conduct. It can never fail us nor deceive us. Whoso builds and abides on this foundation shall stand against all the gates of hell, while all merely human additions and vanities set up against it must fall before the presence of God.'[90]

As Professor Roland H. Bainton has rightly pointed out, 'the emphasis was less on protest than on witness'.[91] That indeed is the primary etymological significance of *protestatio* in post-Augustan Latin and, according to Dean Inge, 'it is ignorance which seeks to restrict the word to the attitude of an objector'.[92] A positive testimony to the supremacy of God's Word lies at the heart of Protestantism.

There is a sense, however, in which the necessity for a distinct Protestant voice is conditioned by the existence of that which occasioned its first declaration of evangelical rights. To that degree T. S. Eliot

[83] Geddes MacGregor, *The Coming Reformation* (1960), p. 18.
[84] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[85] *Ibid.*
[86] *Ibid.*
[87] *The Protestant Credo,* ed. Vergilius Ferm (1953), p. 116.
[88] Anthony Faringdon, *Sermons*, vol. III, p. 117.
[89] *Journal of Ecumenical Studies,* vol. 2, no. 1, p. 87, n. 15.
[90] R. N. Flew and R. E. Davies, *The Catholicity of Protestantism* (1950), pp. 13, 14.
[91] Roland H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (1952), p. 149.
[92] William Ralph Inge, *Protestantism* (1927), p. 1.

was justified in asserting that 'the life of Protestantism depends on the survival of that against which it protests.'[93] The purpose of Protestantism was to recall the church to the magisterial centrality of the Word. When once again the church is prepared to place itself under the sovereign judgment of Scripture and incessantly seeks to reform itself according to that criterion, the need for the protest of Protestantism will disappear. The one holy catholic and apostolic church will have regained its evangelical fullness and became what God intends it to be. This must always be the end we have in view. As Professor Kenneth Hamilton (himself an evangelical) has put it in the closing sentence of his fine book *The Protestant Way* (1956): 'The Protestant protest will be made perfect when it is no longer "Protestant", but merged in the wider protest of a Catholic Church no longer "Catholic".'[94] That is, as they say, a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Authentic evangelicals have no love either for party names or party stances. We do not seek to monopolize the title evangelical as a narrowly exclusive label. We prefer to regard it as descriptive of what the whole church must inevitably be if it is aligned to the biblical pattern in doctrine, worship, and spirit. The term evangelical is meant to be a universal, and not the particular designation merely of a group. When we recover the historical perspective, we shall realize the vast sweep of the name we cherish, and see our place in the wholeness of the church which is Christ's body here on earth. It is this reinvigorating breadth of outlook which we are in danger of forfeiting under the strain of contemporary pressures. It was Robert Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln — a leading participent in the Savoy Conference and the man who drafted the preface to the 1662 Prayer Book — who reminded the sectaries of his time in memorable words that the Church was not to be confined to the narrow 'pingle' of a room in Amsterdam.[95]

Much of the foregoing has hinged on the doctrine of the church. Evangelicals refuse to dogmatize about the details of its government and ministry, but they are fully united in the conviction that it is the focus both of revival and reformation. These represent the supreme requirements of our time. We find ourselves in agreement with the conclusion of Dr Geddes MacGregor concerning the church: 'If it is a purely human institution, it will decay and die. If it is — as we believe the Church to be — the very handiwork of the living God, it may indeed decay through human sin; but He who created it will revive it, and for us this is only another way of saying that the next Reformation is coming.'[96]

[93] Thomas Stearns Eliot, *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture* (1948), p. 75.
[94] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 253.
[95] Robert Sanderson, *Works*, ed. W. Jacobson (1854), vol. I, p. 80.
[96] MacGregor, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

A Bibliographical Guide to the Study of Church History

2 The Early Church to the Middle of the Fifth Century (continued)

D F Wright

This part of the Guide should be read in conjunction with Section I, which appeared in the last issue of the TSF Bulletin, *and to which frequent reference is made in this Section.*

SECTION II: FROM NICAEA TO THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

1. Source material

J. Stevenson, *Creeds, Councils and Controversies* (London, SPCK, 1966) is again quite invaluable, though necessarily more selective than its predecessor. The concentration of H. Bettenson, *The Later Christian Fathers* (OUP, 1970), on more systematically doctrinal concerns, makes it a useful supplement to Stevenson.

2. Reference works

See Section I. 2 for three dictionaries, for Altaner's *Patrology* and the *Atlas* by van der Meer and Mohrmann. Quasten's third volume (1960) covers the Greek Fathers of the post-Nicene church; he has not yet dealt with the later Latin Fathers. For these use can be made of P. de Labriolle, *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius* (1924; London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969).

3. General histories

See I. 3 above for Chadwick, Frend, Davies, Duchesne vols. 2 and 3, Kidd vols. 2 and 3, and Lietzmann vols. 3 and 4. Lietzmann's account reaches only to the end of the fourth century but marks a decided advance on earlier works. *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire*, by J. R. Palanque, G. Bardy and P. de Labriolle (2 vols., London, 1949 and 1952), like Lebreton and Zeiller on the earlier centuries (see I. 3 above), is translated from the great French history of the whole church edited by Fliche and Martin. It provides the most comprehensive reliable treatment of the fourth century at present available in English, with strengths and weaknesses similar to those noted for Lebreton and Zeiller. Von Campenhausen's two volumes (see I. 3) are relevant to this later period, with particularly valuable studies of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine.

Finally, of the general histories of late antiquity the following deserve to be mentioned for excellent chapters concerning the life of the church: *The Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 1 (CUP, 1911) — 'The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms', and vol. 4 (new edit., in 2 parts, 1966 and 1967) — 'The Byzantine Empire'; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian*, vol. 1 (1923; New York, Dover Publications, 1958, paperback); A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social Economic and Administrative Survey* (3 vols., Oxford, Blackwell, 1964); and G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (2nd edit., Oxford, Blackwell, 1968).

4. History of doctrine

See Section I. 4 for basic works by Kelly, Bethune-Baker, Wiles (two), Grillmeier, Prestige (two) and Harnack. H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (Cambridge, 1900), is still of great value, though inevitably a partially outdated account. The continuing debate about Arius may be represented by four articles: T. E. Pollard, 'The Origins of Arianism', *JTS* n.s. 9 (1958), pp. 103-111; M. F. Wiles, 'In Defence of Arius', *JTS* n.s. 13 (1962), pp. 339-347; G. C. Stead, 'The Platform of Arius', *JTS* n.s. 15 (1964) pp. 16-31; L. W. Barnard, 'The Antecedents of Arius', *VC* 24 (1970), pp. 172-188.

On Athanasius, A. Robertson's introduction to the volume of translations in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (2nd series, vol. 4, 1891; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1957) is first class. While the fundamental essays of E. Schwartz still await a translator there is a useful if brief and little-known account by H. I. Bell, 'Athanasius: A Chapter in Church History', *Congregational Quarterly* 3 (1925) pp. 158-176. J. F. Bethune-Baker, *The Meaning of Homoousios in the Constantinopolitan Creed* (*Texts and Studies* VII: 1, 1901; Nendeln/Liechtenstein, Kraus, 1967) deals expertly with the crucial question of what the 'Nicene' Creed means in its central affirmation.

On the Christological debates, R. V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies* (London, 1940) and *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1953), should be added to the works mentioned in I. 4, above. On individual aspects the student can use C. E. Raven, *Apollinarianism* (Cambridge, 1923); R. A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ: A Study in The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (OUP, 1963); and F. Loofs, *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, 1914). There is also an illuminating study by H. Chadwick of the relation between 'Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy', *JTS* n.s. 2 (1951) pp. 145-164.

The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, ed. T. H. Bindley, revd. F. W. Green (London, Methuen, 1950) is a helpful compendium, with texts, translations and full annotation, of the statements canonized from Nicaea to Chalcedon. Kelly on the Creeds (see I. 6*e*) must not be neglected here, nor Wolfson's study of patristic Trinitarian and Christological thought in the light of philosophical assumptions (see I.5). The complications created by the evolving patriarchates' rival aspirations are discussed by Chadwick, 'Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea', *HTR* 53 (1960), pp. 171-195, and N. H. Baynes, 'Alexandria and Constantinople: A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy', in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (University of London, Athlone Press, 1955).

5. Specialized studies

a. Church and state. For Parker and Frend (last chapter) see I. 6*d* above. S. L. Greenslade, *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius* (London, 1954), is an excellent sketch, and can be supplemented by N. Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London, SCM, 1961), and K. M. Setton, *The Christian Attitude towards the Emperors in the Fourth Century* (New York, 1941). Eusebius's influential political philosophy of the Christian empire is clearly expounded and its source analysed by N. H. Baynes, 'Eusebius and the Christian Empire', in *Byzantine Studies* (see 4 above), and F. E. Cranz, 'Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea', *HTR* 45 (1952), pp. 47-66, and there is also the general study by D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London, Mowbray, 1960). On Ambrose F. H. Dudden, *St. Ambrose: His Life and Times* (2 vols., Oxford, Clarendon, 1935), is comprehensive and reliable, while exhaustive documentation for the whole period is presented, somewhat idiosyncratically at times, in P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church*, vols. 1 and 2 (London, SPCK, 1966).

b. Paganism and Christianity. The works by Armstrong and Markus, Jaeger, Cochrane and Nock *Conversion*) listed in I. 5 above all have material dealing with the post-Constantinian era, and *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Mediaeval Philosophy* mentioned in the same place

contains excellent chapters on Neo-Platonism, an understanding of which is essential for this era of Christian thought. *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century,* ed. A. Momigliano (Oxford, Clarendon, 1963), is an outstanding collection of essays, with which can be read P. R. L. Brown, 'Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy', *JRS* 51 (1961), pp. 1-11, and M. L. W. Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell Univ. Press, 1967, paperback). There is useful material in S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (1898; New York, Meridian Books, 1958, paperback) which pays much attention to the issues between paganism and Christianity.

c. The papacy. The three books recommended in I. 6b pursue the story at least as far as the papacy of Leo the Great, of whom there is also a full biography by T. G. Jalland, *The Life and Times of Leo the Great* (London, 1941).

d. Monasticism. Apart from chapters in the general histories of the church, especially Lietzmann, vol. 4 (see I. 3), resort must still be made to H. B. Workman, *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal* (London, 1913), for a survey of the whole development. More recent studies deal only with particular phases of the ascetic movement, apart from O. Chadwick's introduction to his translations in *Western Asceticism* (*Library of Christian Classics,* vol. 12; London, SCM, 1958) and D. Knowles, *Christian Monasticism* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969, paperback). These brief sketches can be supplemented by D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1966), 'an introduction to the study of Egyptian and Palestinian monasticism under the Christian empire'. Though jam-packed with information and not easily digestible, it is thoroughly up to date and embodies much original research. W. K. L. Clarke, *St. Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism* (Cambridge, 1913), and M. G. Murphy, *St. Basil and Monasticism* (Washington, 1930), together do justice to one of the most attractive of monastic pioneers, and O. Chadwick's study of *John Cassian* (2nd edit., CUP, 1967) does likewise for the Latin West. L. Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (London, Burns and Oates, 1963), has much of value about monasticism.

e. Donatism: Augustine: Pelagianism. W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church* (Oxford, 1952), remains the standard treatment in English, sympathetic as the title implies and inclined to exaggerate the (important) role of 'non-theological factors'. These are examined more carefully in S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (2nd edit., London, SCM, 1964, paperback), with a wider reference than Donatism. A. H. M. Jones, 'Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?' *JTS* n.s. 10 (1959), pp. 280-288, claims they were not. (A useful older survey of this territory can be found in E. L. Woodward, *Christianity and Nationalism in the Latin Roman Empire* (London, 1916).) P. R. L. Brown, 'Religious Dissent in the Later Roman Empire: The case of North Africa', *History* 46 (1961), pp. 83-101, is an important article. Augustine's part in the Donatist conflict is treated in G. G. Willis, *Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* (London, SPCK, 1950), with most attention given to ecclesiastical issues, and of course in general studies of the African Father, such as G. Bonner, *St. Augustine of Hippo: Life and Controversies* (London, SCM, 1963) and P. R. L. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London, Faber, 1967, paperback). Of these two the former is more a text book introduction to Augustine's career and successive engagements with Manichaeism, Donatism and Pelagianism; the latter is a brilliantly perceptive interpretation, which requires previous familiarity on the reader's part to secure access to its true profundity. Brown's articles on religious coercion in Donatist North Africa and Augustine's attitude thereto, in *History* 48 (1963), pp. 283-305, and *JRS* 54 (1964), pp. 107-116, should also not be missed. J. J. O'Meara, *The Young Augustine* (London, 1954), is of great importance for understanding the *Confessions,* which pose a problem not unlike that of 'history or theology?' in the Gospels. Other first-class works on aspects of Augustine's activity are E. Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine* (London, Gollancz, 1961), J. H. S. Burleigh, *The City of God* (London, 1949), H. A. Deane, *The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine* (New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1963), and F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (London, Sheed and Ward, 1961), which is a remarkably full and vivid picture of the inner life of the North African church. The issues of the Pelagian controversy from Augustine's point of view are ably expounded by B. B. Warfield in the introduction to the translation of the anti-Pelagian writings in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (1st series, vol. 5, 1887; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1956), but it has become increasingly clear of late that there is more to be said for Pelagius than Augustine allows. P. R. L. Brown's article 'Pelagius and his Supporters: Aims and Environment', *JTS* n.s. 19 (1968), pp. 93-114, repays close study, while R. F. Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (London, A. and C. Black, 1968), presents the new look on Pelagius.

f. Worship, life, art and architecture. The books by Dugmore, Jungman, Duchesne, Srawley, Lampe, Telfer, Poschmann, McArthur, Davies (three), Gough, van der Meer, Grabar and Krautheimer listed in I6*i* relate also to the fourth and fifth centuries. H. Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper* (Leiden, Brill, 1953ff. appearing in fascicles), is much more commendable when delineating different types of developed liturgies than in tracing them back to two quite diverse originals. Bouyer's study of early Christian spirituality (see *d* above) should have found

a mention in I. 6*i* and also belongs here. *The Cambridge History of the Bible,* vols. 1 (eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, CUP, 1970) and 2 (ed. G. W. H. Lampe, 1969), contain fine studies on exegesis, especially of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome and Augustine, but nothing about preaching, which is a neglected topic in early church studies. Those interested can refer to van der Meer (see *e* above) for Augustine and Baur (see *g* below) for Chrysostom. O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford, 1911), can be added to the related works mentioned in I. 6*i*.

g. Other topics. There are lives of two other important Fathers by J. Steinmann, *St. Jerome* (London, Chapman, 1959), and C. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* (2 vols., London, Sands & Co., 1959-60). On the former there are valuable essays in *A Monument to St. Jerome*. ed. F. X. Murphy (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1952). On the Christianization of the Goths and other barbarian peoples the studies of E. A. Thompson have thrown much light, particularly his essay in Momigliano's volume (see *b* above) and *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1966). The progress of modern research on early Christianity in Britain is expertly surveyed in *Christianity in Britain, 300-700,* eds. M. W. Barley and R. P. C. Hanson (Leicester Univ. Press, 1968). Briefer, more systematic accounts are available in M. Deanesly, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England* (London, A. and C. Black, 1961) and J. Godfrey, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England* (CUP, 1962), neither of which in its early chapters restricts itself to 'England' The most recent study of Patrick is R. P. C. Hanson, *St. Patrick, His Origins and Career* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1966). Basic problems still remain for future resolution.

The New Bible Commentary Revised

J. G. S. S. Thomson

In 1970 the Inter-Varsity Press published The New Bible Commentary Revised *(1310 pp. £3.00). It represents a thorough-going revision of the original work published in 1953, over half the articles being entirely new. It therefore seems appropriate to publish this brief commendation of the volume by Dr Thomson, a Semitic scholar now engaged in the pastoral ministry.*

Three editions in seventeen years constitute a fairly impressive record for a one-volume Bible commentary. For good measure, there have been no fewer than nine impressions of the second edition in eleven years. And this second edition was called for within one year of the appearance of the first edition!

It isn't that the *NBC* has had no serious competitors. The names of long-established guides spring readily to mind: Jamieson, Fausset and Brown; Wycliffe and others. Each has for long been a standby to serious Bible students. In addition, the Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (2nd edition, 1970) and now the new Jerome Commentary (£10.50 !) are erudite contributions from Roman Catholic scholars.

The edition is announced as a 'new completely revised' one. Some of the general articles (*e.g.* the now well known expositions of the evangelical views on the authority of Scripture, and revelation and inspiration, by Professor Bromiley and Dr Packer respectively) show only slight alterations. Others have been eliminated altogether; two new articles on the history of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch, and Moses and the Pentateuch replace one on the historical literature of the Old Testament, and the teaching of the prophets is given fresh treatment in another new article on Old Testament theology. This third edition contains also an article on the period between the Testaments.

Among the new articles there is none dealing specifically with the New Testament church. This is a serious omission, if for no other reason than that there is a wide spectrum of views on the church among evangelicals, and a commentary written primarily for that part of the religious constituency would have rendered a service by providing a statement on the New Testament teaching on the nature, functions and destiny of the church.

The editors plead that 'restriction on space' has compelled the team of writers 'to curtail discussion of some speculative matters regarding dates and questions of authorship'. Those interested in these matters are directed by the Editors to the sources and authorities which deal with them.

The *NBC* is a work by a team of writers who in themselves strike a fine balance between biblical scholarship and the practical experience of the self-authenticating power of Holy Scripture gained by men in the parish ministry. Here is a group of Christian writers, scholars and parish ministers, who have recognized that biblical scholarship must be integrated with traditional Christianity if it is to bear any spiritual message or fruit in modern society.

In a day of uncertainty, when many scholars and ministers are shouting from the housetops their unsureness concerning the Bible, seriously-minded Christian laymen will find in the *NBC* a platform on which a team of evangelical scholars and ministers

stand together to declare their faith in the integrity and trustworthiness of Holy Scripture, and in what it says, claims and teaches. The *NBC* thus fills a gap in the field of biblical commenting by providing a work which takes account (albeit a restricted one) of modern biblical knowledge from the standpoint of all who accept the full doctrine of biblical inspiraton. The writers are prepared to let the Bible speak for itself, and speak its own message.

The way that this is done marks a subtle difference between this commentary and most of the other one-volume commentaries. They all divide the biblical text into pericopes; but whereas most one-volume works emphasize linguistic details and/or questions of literary criticism and historical problems to which the text gives rise, the *NBC*, while not entirely ignoring these matters, keeps consideration of them to a mimimum. The advantage of this procedure is that the users of this commentary will suffer much less from that kind of frustration and irritation whch stem from a feeling that they are not being allowed to see the wood because of the trees.

Now this means that the *NBC* is of immense benefit to Christians in general and not to any one group. It means that the commentary has an undoubted devotional value — a rare and felicitous achievement in the field of biblical commenting. On the other hand, the Christian layman who is reading the Bible in preparation for a teaching-preaching activity will be able to turn to the *NBC* with a measure of confidence that here he will receive guidance that will take him to the pericope's central themes and to the heart of its main message. He will find, at the same time, that his attention is drawn to other matters of detail which, although of secondary importance, are essential in re-creating the context in which both the main thrust and the significant themes of the passage are to be set.

In welcoming this revised edition of the *NBC* I am persuaded that I speak for many thousands of Christians who will appreciate its immense devotional value, as well as its scholarly and practical merit.

Book Review

Principles of Pastoral Counselling by R. S. Lee
144pp. 80p.
Pastoral Care in Hospitals by Norman Autton
168pp. £1.00.
SPCK (Library of Pastoral Care), 1970.

These two books are strictly handbooks, and should introduce us to larger works in their own field. The pastor who aspires to become a 'counsellor', and the parson who desires to become a hospital chaplain, will benefit from studying them carefully.

The chief concern of every minister of the gospel should be pastoral 'counselling'. Not necessarily in the strict sense in which it is defined here as a 'qualified' psychiatrist, but as one who loves people and shares their common problems of mental and physical sickness, and works toward their healing and normality. How best this goal can be achieved must be decided by the man himself. Many ministers are learning the new techniques and finding them as exciting as their first approaches to theology. The first primer will define the area of its employment, and what methods should be used. It does raise, however, a fundamental problem (see p. 77), which must be resolved. Some form of reconciliation must be established between the old traditional patterns of theology and the new Freudian techniques. Dr Lee almost poses a choice between normal 'confessional' counselling and technical psychiatric 'sharing'. Inevitably the doctrines that lie behind our attitudes will require some readjustment, but how much, and what? The reader is left with the *impression* that Freud is more important than Paul! So most of us will glean what we can without necessarily fully accepting the implications. The vital quality of the 'counsellor' will shew through his handling of 'cases'. One warning is sounded that should alert us all. The pastor himself should be 'analysed', lest he unavoidably falls into guiding others by his own defects and weaknesses! Most of us rely upon the Spirit of God to lift us above ourselves in such encounters, and to bring to the needy a deep assurance of Christ's pardoning love, as the place of recovery and the true rest centre. God can still use the loving heart and the helping hand to lift faltering men and women above their disabilities.

The second book is chiefly for hospital chaplains, whole or part-time. It contains much useful information that the ordinary parish 'visitor' could digest and employ in his approaches to staff and patients. Only certain types need apply for this team ministry with its danger of isolation and specialisation. Training is essential under the direction of an experienced supervisor in the setting of a hospital. The demanding nature of the work calls for those who are physically and mentally fit. They must be 'integrated' persons. The issues of theology are highlighted, especially the nature and destiny of man. The basic Christian doctrines must have been mastered and related to modern situations, and be expressed in simple terms and not complicated jargon. The spiritual life of the chaplain is tested to the core by his situation. He must be fit, flexible, adaptable, cooperative, emotionally mature, alert, spiritually and theologically sound, and open to new truth. The presence of Christ must be mediated through his manner. In this unique ministry a link with a parish church is vital to provide contact with the outside world. Opportunities and challenges face those who look into this field for their own future sphere of service.

R. E. Higginson Croydon

Index to issues 58-60

Printed in England by Green & Co. (Lowestoft) Ltd., Crown Street, Lowestoft.

TSF BULLETIN

63

SUMMER 1972

Price 10p (12p with RE Bulletin)

TSF Bulletin

A journal for theological students, expounding and defending the historic Christian faith. On the assumption that contributors are in sympathy with the doctrinal basis of the Theological Students' Fellowship, they have full liberty of expression.

Editor :
I. Howard Marshall MA BD PhD,
Senior Lecturer in New Testament Exegesis,
University of Aberdeen

TSF Chairman :
Christopher Sugden BA,
St Peter's College, Oxford

CONTENTS

Published three times yearly by the Theological Students' Fellowship,
39 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3EY.
Price: 10p (12p with RE Bulletin). Postal subscription: 40p per annum
(45p with RE Bulletin).

The Old Testament in its Context: 5 Judah, Exile and Return

K A Kitchen

We present a further instalment of Mr Kitchen's outline-appreciation of the Old Testament. The series will be concluded with a general survey of 'profiles and perspectives' in our next issue.

JUDAH ALONE AND BABYLONIAN EXILE, c. 640-539 BC

1. Historical outlines and background

a. Josiah, c. 640-609 BC. This king is most famed for his attempts at religious reform (2 Ki. 22-23; 2 Ch. 34-35), when a 'book of the law' was found.[1] The new XXVIth Dynasty in Egypt began as an Assyrian vassal, but became Assyria's ally (out of self-interest) against Babylon and Media. In 609 BC, Necho II thus marched to Assyria's aid. Josiah saw his chance to bring down Assyria by hindering the pharaoh, but paid for his effort with his life (2 Ki. 23: 28-29; 2 Ch. 35: 20-24). And in 609/8, the shrunken Assyrian realm vanished forever,[2] leaving Babylon master.

b. Decline and fall of Judah, 609-582 BC. In 605 BC, the Babylonians decisively defeated Necho II of Egypt, claiming Syria-Palestine (cf. 2 Ki. 24: 1, 7), taking hostages (Dn. 1: 1-7); at this time, Nebuchadnezzar II became king of Babylon.[3] Babylon was less successful against Egypt in 601, and Jehoiakim foolishly rebelled against Babylon (2 Ki. 24: 1). After siege, Jerusalem capitulated in March 597 BC; young Jehoiachin and many Judaeans were carried off to Babylon (2 Ki. 24: 10-17; 2 Ch. 36: 5-10; Je. 24: 1), as the Babylonian chronicle also records.[4] Zedekiah learned nothing from his predecessors' errors, and in turn rebelled (2 Ki. 24: 20) with the connivance of the pharaoh Hophra (Je. 44: 30; cf. 37: 5). This time the Babylonians utterly swept away city, temple and state in 587/6 BC,[5] and more people after the trouble in 582 BC.[6]

c. The Babylonian exile. At court, Jehoiachin and family were on regular allowances; ration-tablets for 595-570 BC were found at Babylon.[7] Nebuchadnezzar eventually attacked Egypt in 568/7 BC,[8] as predicted there by Jeremiah (46: 13ff.) and Ezekiel in Babylonia (29: 17ff.), among the exiles. Cyrus II took over Media (550) then Babylon (539).

2. Literary prophets, 7th-6th centuries BC

a. Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah. As the Assyrians had sacked Egyptian Thebes (*c.*663 BC),[9] so would Nineveh crash (as it did, *c.*612)[10] and his people be free of her, proclaimed Nahum (1: 12-15). Zephaniah upbraided the sins of Judah and her neighbours in Josiah's time. With the Babylonian triumph (605 BC and after), Habakkuk was concerned over the judgment of his people and the wickedness of the oppressor. Edom treacherously rose against Judah *c.*586 BC when struck down by Babylon; Obadiah's brief utterance may date from this episode (or perhaps later). There is no cause to deny authorship of any of these books to the men named.

b. Jeremiah. Active from *c.*627 BC (Je. 1: 2; 25: 3) until at least 582 when he was carried into Egypt (Je. 40-43; 52: 30); his book shows real personal qualities. Its composition may be threefold: (i) Individual prophecies could be written down as given (e.g. by Baruch), and at one stage everything from 627 BC ('the beginning . . .') down to 604 BC (cf. Je. 36, 604). (ii) Once in Egypt, Jeremiah and Baruch probably ended by putting together all that is in Je. 1-51 (1-36+37-51), ending with the colophon, 'Thus far are the words of Jeremiah' (51: 64 end). (iii) Je. 52 is substantially[11] the same as 2 Ki. 25, ending with Evil—Merodach favouring Jehoiachin in Babylon in 562 BC, some twenty years (and many hundred miles) from phase (ii). Thus, when copies reached Babylon, its account of the kingdom's end (Je. 39) was supplemented with chapter 52. This 'appendix' apart, there is no reason to deny the authenticity of the book as a whole. The book has no marked structure, but one may see[12] (a) a series of oracles, 1-25 from the time of Josiah to Zedekiah and (b) narratives, 26-52 (incorporating oracles, e.g. 30, 31, 46-51, from the time of Jehoiakim and afterwards).

1 See D. W. B. Robinson, *Josiah's Reform and the Book of the Law* (Tyndale Press, 1951).
2 *CCK*, p. 19; *ANET*, p. 305 (17th year).
3 *CCK*, pp. 23-26, 67/69.
4 *CCK*, pp. 32-35, 73; *ANET*3 (and *Supplt*), p. 564, '7th year'.
5 2 Ki. 25: 2-21; Je. 39; 52: 3-27, 29.
6 2 Ki. 25: 22-26; Je. 52: 30, cf. Je. 40-41.
7 *ANET*, p. 308; W. J. Martin in D. W. Thomas (ed.), *Documents from OT Times*, 1958, pp. 84-86. Cf. Albright, *BA* 5 (1942), pp. 49-55. Later, 2 Ki. 25: 27-30.
8 *ANET*, p. 308 end; *CCK*, pp. 94-95.
9 Assyrian accounts, cf. *ANET*, pp. 295b, 297a; background, *ThIP*.
10 *CCK*, pp. 13-17.
11 In 2 Ki. 25 and Je. 52 (cf. 39-41), the differing sections are complementary.
12 With F. Cawley and A. R. Millard, *New Bible Com-*

c. Ezekiel. Like his elder colleague Jeremiah, both prophet and priest. He too had to proclaim the downfall of Judah and Jerusalem (1-24) as well as against the sinful nations around (25-32). Thereafter, once downfall came, he was then commissioned to proclaim restoration in given conditions (33-35) of the people (36-37, despite future threats, 38-39), and of the temple as focus of restored worship in a renewed nation and land (40-48). False confidence had to be destroyed, and a thereafter dispirited people given new and true hope.

d. Daniel. A work of six chapters mainly narrative, and six of complementary visions; its datelines run from ' the third year of Jehoiakim ' (*c.*605) and Nebuchadnezzar II to the first and third year of Cyrus II (*c.*538, 536; 1: 21; 10: 1), and it is essentially a unity. It purports to be by Daniel under the Neo-Babylonian and Persian Empires, serving its rulers and having visions of empires and kingdoms to come with periods of time. Here, the point on which all turns is the reader's own attitude to biblical prophecy, and specifically whether it may include the future or not. If so, no problem need arise. If not, tension is immediate, and the work will be dated (regardless of anything else) to the second century BC.[13] Linguistically, there is no valid support for the late date,[14] nor are the historical errors securely founded;[15] an early date *is* feasible, despite strongly-held prejudices to the contrary.

3. Judah and exile: other literature

a. Poetry. (i) *Lamentations.* This touching lament breathes the atmosphere of fallen Jerusalem, while its poetic form indicates reflection on and after the event. It may well date to the 580s BC; no real evidence exists either for or against Jeremiah's supposed authorship. The literary category of lamentation over the fall of a notable city is very ancient in the biblical Near East. Some ten to fifteen centuries before, Mesopotamia produced the Curse of Agade (*c.*2000 BC)[16] and Lamentations over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur[17] (including hope of restoration) and over Ur itself.[18]

(ii) *Psalms.* To the Exile belongs at least the anguish of Psalm 137.

b. The prophetic history — Kings. This book takes the story of the Hebrews from the death of David to the fall of his dynasty and its fortunes in exile, *c.*561 BC (2 Ki. 25: 31-34). Like the book of Samuel which it follows,[19] it is an anonymous narrative. Its standpoint is that of the prophets, and it sets forth the failure of kings and people on the central matters of apostasy in terms of the law and covenant, and the dissolution of Israel and exile of Judah as the consequential punishment from God. The term ' Deuteronomic history ' is understandable, but is too narrow a label, perhaps even erroneous, as the basic concepts involved reached far beyond Deuteronomy and even beyond just the Old Testament.[20] The chronicular style, and synchronisms between the two kingdoms, find some analogy in Mesopotamian historiography;[21] the chronological data in Kings exhibit the highest standards of accuracy.[22]

RESTORATION AND DIASPORA UNDER PERSIA, c. 539-330 BC

4. Historical outlines and background

a. The return. Babylon fell quickly to Cyrus in 539 BC,[23] after a sharp battle at Opis for the province of Babylon.[24] The new ruler brought in a new policy of returning subject peoples and deities to their homelands.[25] The decrees of Cyrus sent images of Babylonian deities back to their cities — and the Jews back to Judea, as many as wished (Ezr. 1: 1ff.). There is no warrant to dispute the authenticity of the decrees of Cyrus or Darius I (Ezr. 6: 2-5).[26] Darius confirmed a similar decree of Cyrus in Asia Minor;[27] Cambyses and Darius I showed interest in temples in Egypt;[28] and in the late fifth century Darius

mentary Revised (Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), p. 628.

13 Date based on the misconception that the prophecies end with the Seleucids and Maccabees in 165 BC; in fact, however, they run on to the Roman Empire and the first century AD (cf. Young, *IOT*, p. 373), before which time the book certainly existed.

14 See Kitchen and Martin in D. J. Wiseman *et al.*, *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (Tyndale Press, 1965), pp. 28-79.

15 Cf. (e.g.) Wiseman, in Wiseman et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 9-18; E. J. Young, *Commentary on Daniel* (1949); Harrison, *IOT*, pp. 1112 ff.

16 Latest edition, Kramer, *ANET*3 (and *Supplt*), pp. 646-651.

17 Latest edition, Kramer, *ANET*3 (and *Supplt*), pp. 611-619; this composition includes what were formerly thought to be two separate pieces.

18 See *ANET*, pp. 455-463.

19 But not directly; it overlaps 2 Samuel slightly (starting with the last days of David), and so should not be treated as a mere continuation.

20 Cf. Kitchen, *NPOT*, pp. 1-24, esp. 16-19, provisionally.

21 For latter, cf. *CCK*, pp. 1-5; Millard, *Iraq* 26 (1964), pp. 14-35, esp. 32-35. Further references, *AO/OT*, pp. 73, n. 61, and 95/96, n. 34 end.

22 As was amply demonstrated by Thiele, *MN*.

23 Best account, S. Smith, *Isaiah XL-LV* (1944), pp. 24-48; the speculations offered in pp. 49ff. are little advance on those criticized in his pp. 1-23 *passim*.

24 Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 46, 47, and on reality of at least a brief siege (correcting Weissbach and Rowley) *ibid.*, p. 152, n. 142.

25 Cyrus Cylinder, *ANET*, p. 315, cf. *NBD*, p. 286.

26 A point made in varying degrees from Eduard Meyer to the present; cf. R. de Vaux, *Revue Biblique* 46 (1937), 29-57 (his *Bible et Orient*, 1967, pp. 83-113 and English ed. to come); H. H. Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge I*, and *Esra der Schreiber* (both 1930); E. J. Bickerman, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* 65 (1946), 244-275; Albright, *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (1950), pp. 61-82.

27 Smith, *Isaiah XL-LV*, p. 41 and nn. 108ff.

28 ' Demotic Chronicle ', verso (cf. de Vaux, *Bible et Orient*, p. 92 and n. 7); texts of Udjahorresenet, G. Posener, *La première domination perse en Egypte*, 1936, pp. 15-16, 17-19, 22.

II was concerned with the cult of Jews at Aswan in Egypt (' passover papyrus ').[29] Sheshbazzar as governor with Zerubbabel (adjutant?) began a new temple in Jerusalem, but Samaritan interference delayed its completion till 515 BC.

b. Time of Xerxes I. The narrative of Esther is set in this reign, otherwise alluded to only in Ezra 4: 6.

c. Ezra and Nehemiah. In the seventh year of Artaxerxes I of Persia (458 BC),[30] Ezra the scribe came (with further migrants) to regulate spiritual life in Judea, including temple matters (Ezr. 7-8). A crisis arose over paganizing marriages, resolved by separations rather than face possible absorption of the Hebrew community and its role for the future (9-10). Thereafter, Ezra disappears from Palestinian affairs for a decade; being responsible to the Persian administration, he had probably returned to his office in Babylon.[31] Later, the cupbearer Nehemiah heard of the sad state of unwalled Jerusalem; in Artaxerxes' twentieth year (445 BC), he got permission to go and rebuild the walls as governor (Ne. 1ff.; 10: 1). In this task, plus a covenant and dedication of the walls, he was seconded by Ezra (8; 10; 12: 36). Abuses that had arisen in Ezra's absence, including more paganizing liaisons, were corrected (Ne. 5; 13), some on a second spell as governor from 433 BC (13: 6-7).

As builder, Nehemiah faced three foes. First was Sanballat, governor of Samaria;[32] second, Tobiah, governor in Ammon,[33] third and most dangerous was Geshem (or Gashmu), known now to have been local king of Qedar in north Arabia, a realm linked with the Persian court.[34]

d. Epilogue. After 433 BC, little is known of Hebrew history for some time. The recently-discovered Samaria papyri[35] indicate that Sanballat II, Hananiah and Sanballat III were governors in Samaria in the fourth century BC down to the coming of Alexander the Great. A Jewish community at Aswan in Egypt of the fifth century BC is long known,[36] while back in Babylonia various Jews had dealings with the banking firm of Murashu and Sons *c.*450-400 BC.[37] Thus, by the dawn of the Hellenistic age, Jews were to be found in both Palestine and far beyond, a situation intensified by Roman times and the period of the New Testament.

5. Literary prophets, late 6th century BC

a. Haggai prophesied in the second year of Darius I, to encourage the people to resume the rebuilding of the temple.

b. Zechariah followed up Haggai in his exhortations, with eight visions that year (Zc. 1-6); in the fourth year, he proclaimed obedience better than fasting (7-8). The rest of the book contains just two sections, each headed ' oracle ' (9-11; 12-14). There is hardly anything that can really be labelled as inconsistent with Zechariah's time. However, scholars are not lacking who would date these either long after Zechariah,[38] or (remarkably) earlier than he.[39] But it is possible that they are oracles given by Zechariah later in his career, and included with 1-8 in the one book.

c. Malachi is, strictly, undated. But as the Jews have a governor (1: 8) and a temple and cult (1-2), the Persian age is generally agreed. Probably some time after Haggai and Zechariah, he seeks to stir up God's people who have relapsed into slackness.

6. Post-exilic historiography

a. Ezra. This has two parts: events before Ezra (1-6), activities of Ezra (7-10). The former includes (i) the return in 538 BC, (ii) temple-building under Darius I (4: 1-5, 24; 5-6), and (iii) various opposition to the Jews under Xerxes I and Artaxerxes I (4: 6-23).[40] The latter covers essentially Ezra's activities in 458 BC; there is no reason to date the extant book much later or assume any author other than Ezra.[41]

b. Esther. Its local colour as a narrative is clearly Persian and no later. As history, it is often dismissed, but usually on rather subjective and flimsy grounds.[42] Mordecai may be known from contemporary Persian

[29] A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of Fifth Century BC*, (OUP, 1923), no. 21, pp. 60ff.; *ANET*, p. 491; cf. B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, 1968, pp. 128-131, 311-314, and pl. 9.

[30] So the date in the text of Ezra; many emendations and alternatives have been offered, but none of these is any better than that in the text, and the reasons offered for changes are often inadequate or superficial. For discussions, see references, *AO/OT*, pp. 77-78, n. 72, esp. J. Stafford Wright, Bright, Kitchen there cited.

[31] Kitchen, *TSFB* 39 (1964), *Supplement* (review of Bright, *History*), p. vi.

[32] Attested with his son Delaiah in an Aramaic papyrus of 408 BC, Cowley, *op. cit.*, nos. 30-31; *ANET*, 491/492.

[33] Tombs and later history of family, McCown, *BA* 20 (1957), pp. 63-76.

[34] See J. J. Rabinowitz, JNES 15 (1956), 1-10; other refs., Bright, *History of Israel*, p. 366, n. 20.

[35] For which see F. M. Cross, *BA* 26 (1963), pp. 110-121.

[36] From its papyri, Cowley, *op. cit.*, and E. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (1953), with an excellent Introduction; Porten, *op. cit.*

[37] Refs., S. H. Horn, *Biblical Research* 9 (1964), pp. 9-11.

[38] Mention of Greece (Ionians, Yawan) in Zc. 9: 13 in no way implies the Hellenistic age as sometimes thought; Greek mercenaries and traders were active in Palestine and the Near East from seventh century BC onwards (cf. e.g., Kitchen in Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, 1965, pp. 44-48).

[39] E.g. Tadmor, *Israel Expl. Journ.* 1 (1950/51), pp. 149-159, on Zc. 9: 1-11.

[40] On this passage, cf. Wright, *Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem*[2] (1958), pp. 17-19.

[41] In Ezr. 10: 6, Jehohanan son of Eliashib may have eventually become high priest (as a priest in Ne. 13: 4, 7), but this is not stated or implied for Ezra's own time.

[42] As, for example, by C. A. Moore, *Esther* (Doubleday, Anchor Bible 7B, 1971), pp. xlv-xlvi; contrast Young, *IOT*, pp. 355-357, and Harrison, *IOT*, pp. 1090-1098.

documents under Xerxes I.[43] The book explains the origin of a feast.

c. Nehemiah is almost throughout in the first person and devoted to his activities as governor of Judah, *c.*445-430 BC. The book begins with a proper title (1: 1, 'The Words of Nehemiah...'), and so should *not* be regarded as one book with Ezra, whatever later tradition may opine. It will have been written by Nehemiah about 420 BC or soon after.[44]

d. The priestly history — Chronicles. This work is notable for its use of genealogies[45] (esp. 1-9), and interest in the temple and cult. Such 'religious' chronicles are by no means foreign to the biblical Near East, early or late.[46] On date, the narrative ends with the decree of Cyrus, 538 BC (2 Ch. 36: 22-23). But the genealogies continue down further, especially that of David whose line runs through to grandsons of Zerubbabel in 1 Chronicles 3: 1-21, probably born *c.*525 BC.[47] Four following generations (verses 22-24) would follow with the last born within about 440/430 BC — which puts the effective date of Chronicles in the time of Nehemiah.[48] Authorship is unknown. It is fashionable to regard Ezra as the Chronicler, although there is no evidence for or against.[49] On historicity, the older *Alttestamentler* could hardly treat the Chronicler with enough contempt; but in fact, his work — like other such 'culturally late' compilations[50] — contains a mass of valuable data preserved to us from no other source. And when checks are available, his data can and do find confirmation.[51]

7. Other literature

a. Undated works. *Job* stands grandly alone in the Old Testament — dateless and undateable. His figure is partriarchal, and appears as a righteous man of old in Ezekiel 14: 14, 20. Dates offered for the book vary wildly, from Moses to the Persian age.[52] The literary form is interesting: 'A-B-A', prose prologue, high-flown speeches, prose epilogue. This scheme is visible in the *Eloquent Peasant* in Egypt (twenty-second century BC), again for a work embodying a dispute; Job is rooted linguistically in North West Semitic.[53]

b. Keeping the heritage. Thus, by about 400 BC (on the views propounded in this series of studies-in-brief), a considerable body of varied writings had accumulated. These, and doubtless other literature, were valued by the Jewish communities, and recopied and transmitted by its scribes from the fourth century BC onwards. From the whole, a body of writings — 'the Law', 'the Prophets' (prophetical books and narratives) and '(other) Writings' (psalms, etc., etc.) — emerged with the status of God-given Scripture, of eternal significance; some were doubtless so recognized sooner, others later. Thus came in due time the Old Testament.

43 An Amherst tablet, in Berlin; A. Ungnad, *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58 (1940/1), pp. 240-244, *ibid.* 59 (1942/43), p. 219; cf. also S. H. Horn, *Biblical Research* 9 (1964), pp. 1-12 and Moore, *Esther* (1971), p. l. and their further references.

44 The latest explicit reference is Ne. 12: 22, to records down to a Darius who would be Darius II (424-404 BC). Eliashib was already high priest by 445 BC, perhaps of advanced years. Joiada may have succeeded him before *c.* 430, and in turn Jonathan (Johanan) about 420, the latter's son Jaddua (see Ne. 12: 10, 11, 22) being possibly already 30 or 40 years old in 420 BC. This would *not* be a Jaddua under Alexander the Great as sometimes supposed.

45 The use and quotation of genealogies is a particular feature in the biblical Near East in the first millenium BC; they were used in Egypt (esp. the XXnd-XXVIth Dynasties) to back up priestly claims to office and more generally (examples, *ThIP*). In Mesopotamia, one finds scribal 'families' and even lists of 'scholars' in succession (latter, J. J. van Dijk, *XVIII Vorläufiger Bericht, Uruk* 1962, pp. 45ff.).

46 One and the same king Tuthmosis III has 'annals' of his campaigns, and dedicatory texts for the feasts of his god Amun (former, *ANET*, pp. 238ff.; latter, Gardiner, *Journ. Eg. Archaeol.* 38 (1952), 6ff.). In Mesopotamia are found what are termed 'religious chronicles' by A. K. Grayson, in *La divination en Mesopotamie ancienne*, 1966, p. 74, etc. In Sumer, for a 'temple-history' cf. that of the Tummal-sanctuary, S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago UP, 1963), pp. 47-49.

47 All the names of 1 Ch. 3: 21 should probably be taken as sons of Hananiah (cf. RSV *and* LXX). The calculation, at twenty-plus years per generation, is based on Jehoiachin being eighteen in 597 BC (2 Ki. 25: 18).

48 For similar calculations, cf. latterly J. M. Myers, *1 Chronicles* (Anchor Bible, 1965), pp. 20-22, and cf. pp. lxxxvi-lxxxix.

49 2 Ch. 36: 22-23 is based on the fuller Ezr. 1: 1-4 and so is (i) later and (ii) makes Chronicles link up with Ezra. This could have been done equally by Ezra or anyone else. A date for Chronicles about 420 BC or so is likely enough (I see no reason for augmented 'editions'), but would be too late for Ezra to be its author.

50 As those of Ptolemaic Egypt, for example (third century BC ff.) in the great temples — texts that are invaluable 'late' repository of data valid many centuries (even millennia) earlier. Large numbers in Chronicles are no more and no less a problem there than elsewhere.

51 As in the case of the Sukkiim (2 Ch. 12: 3), cf. *AO/OT*, p. 159, refs.

52 The Ezekiel mention sets a bottom date for the man, not needfully for the book, either earlier or later.

53 For the *Eloquent Peasant*, cf. translation in *ANET*, pp. 407-412; on N.W. Semitic aspect, cf. A. Blommerde, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job* (Rome 1969); Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968), pp. 226-7, favours a seventh-century date and preferred a north-west Semitic viewpoint to the supposed Arabic or Edomite affiliations of the work.

Abbreviations

ANET	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts rel. to the Old Testament* (Princeton UP), ^{1}1950, ^{2}1954, ^{3}1969 (its extra texts being available in a *Supplement* . . ,1969, same paging).
AO/OT	K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Tyndale Press, 1966).
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist.*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.*
CCK	D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings* (British Museum, 1956).
HHAHT	K. A. Kitchen, *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions* (forthcoming; delayed by external factors).

IOT	*Introduction to the Old Testament* (a) by E. J. Young, 3rd ed., 1964; (b) by R. K. Harrison, 1970 (both Tyndale Press).
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies.*
LAR	D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria,* I-II (Chicago UP, 1926-27).
MN	E. R. Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings,* [1]1951, [2]1965.
NBD	J. D. Douglas *et al.,* (eds.), *New Bible Dictionary* (IVP, 1962).
NPOT	J. B. Payne (ed.), *New Perspectives on the OT* (Word Books, 1970).
ThIP	K. A. Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (ready for press).
T(H)B	*Tyndale (House) Bulletin.*
TSFB	*Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin.*

The Third Arm: Pentecostal Christianity 1

Greg S Forster

'It appears to me that the same Spirit Who once inspired the authors of the Book of Common Prayer is back in business.'[1] *The Pentecostalist movement is one of the most noteworthy features of the contemporary religious scene. Mr Forster here gives a survey and critique of some aspects of Pentecostalism.*

This paper is an attempt to examine some facets of the theology and practice of Pentecostal Christianity. No attempt is made to cover the whole doctrine of the person and work of the Holy Spirit; only part of this is at issue in the debate between 'Pentecostal' and 'historic' Christianity.

When 'historic' Christianity, or denominations, are referred to, this means all the non-Pentecostal denominations, that is Anglican, Roman Catholic, and other nonconformist churches of all types, except those which are 'Pentecostal'. The term 'Pentecostal' is harder to define, if only because it can have several denotations.

1. It refers to the older Pentecostal groups, which have grown into denominations which approximate to the standard type. There are two such groups of major importance in Britain: the Elim Four-Square Gospel Alliance, which has roots in the Welsh revivals at the turn of the century, and in N. Ireland, and which was organized in the years following 1915; and the Assemblies of God, which were constituted as an association in 1924. There was at first a hesitancy in forming any organization, partly because of the high value placed upon 'spontaneity in the Spirit'[2] and partly because of hopes of uniting the historic churches behind the revival. The Assemblies of God are congregational in church order (there having been Baptist influence in their origins), though there is a tendency to centralize. The Elim alliance is centrally controlled, having started with the ministry of two brothers and a colleague.[3] A third group is the Apostolic Church, which arose from the 1904 Welsh Revival, and is organized in charismatic hierarchy. There are other groups, particularly of late among West Indian immigrants.[4] The distinctive Pentecostal message is a high doctrine of the gifts of the Spirit, particularly 'speaking in tongues', which is taken to be the sign of 'baptism in the Spirit'. This is regarded as a distinct stage in Christian experience, and as being nearly indispensable.

2. The term 'Pentecostal' can refer to those in the historic denominations who share this theology, and experience, while not having left their original denomination. Thus they do not lay so much stress on the exercise of spiritual gifts in the public worship of the church.

3. The term can refer to those who share the experience of the gifts of the Spirit, but do not share the high doctrine of them; they would hold that they do not necessarily signify any higher stage of relationship between the believer and the Spirit. The two latter meanings often receive the title 'Neo-Pentecostal'. The terms 'Anglicostal' and 'Baptistcostal' are also used, in informal contexts, to refer to Anglicans or Baptists of this persuasion.

'Baptism in the Holy Spirit' is a term which excites deep emotion and rivalry. For a Pentecostal 'baptism in the Holy Spirit is a second encounter with God, in which the Christian begins to receive the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit into his life... This second experience... is given for the purpose of equipping the Christian with God's power

1 This epigram derives from *Charisma in Hong Kong* (a collection of testimonies published by the Society of Stephen, Hong Kong).

2 F. L. Cross (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1957), p. 1043 s.v. 'Pentecostal Churches'.

3 B. R. Wilson, *Religious Sects* (1970) pp. 80ff. *Sects and Society,* pp. 21f.

4 D. Martin and M. Hill, *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Great Britain* III (SCM, 1970). The relevant papers are C. Hill 'Some Aspects of Race and Religion in Britain', and R. H. Ward, 'Some Aspects of Religious Life in an Immigrant Area in Manchester'. Also C. Hill in *Race* June 1971.

for service.'[5] On the other hand, a recent thesis on the biblical meaning of the term concludes: 'According to Luke and Paul, baptism in the Spirit was not something subsequent to and distinct from becoming a Christian... The gift of the Spirit (that is, Spirit-baptism) is a distinct element within conversion-initiation, indeed, in the New Testament, the most significant element and focal point of conversion-initiation.'[6]

But why talk about it?

It used to be possible to treat Pentecostalism as something outside the historic churches, where it could be left, and ignored. Over the last 15 years the position has changed. Not only has the movement been described by a leading American Presbyterian as 'the third, mighty arm of Christendom',[7] but also the 'phenomena' of Pentecostalism are being found increasingly among the lay and ordained members of the historic denominations. This is so not only among 'Protestant' churches, but among Roman Catholics, and the Catholic wing of the Anglican communion. The gifts of the Spirit, as listed in 1 Corinthians 12: 4-11, are manifested in 'back-room' meetings of the churches, and in some places provision is also made for their use during prayer book services, in the open church building.

In other congregations the occurrence of these gifts has been the cause of deep division, bitterness, and heart searching. Anyone who is likely to be in a position of leadership in a congregation needs to be aware of the issues involved, if only because a hasty and un-informed 'trigger reaction' to a label which belongs to a group holding different views to oneself may both prevent understanding and cause a division in the body of Christ. This paper will be a success if it helps to de-fuse this sort of trigger.

Other reasons for taking Pentecostal claims seriously, even if one ends by disagreeing, may be enumerated:

1. They refer to Joel 2: 23, and claim that the outbreak of the gifts of the Spirit in this century is God's 'latter rain', with which He is to bless His people before the final tribulation, and His return.

2. They see the gifts as God's equipment of His church to fight the dark cloud of evil spreading over the land. Even if it means that a new vista is open on the demonic assaults on the church, should one not take this new armour which God is providing?

3. From the beginning of the 'Pentecostal revival' there have been those who have seen it as the role of the new movement to draw the divided churches of Christendom together, in the 'unity of the Spirit', with new power and zeal.

4. In the past this has tended to result in yet another separate group, but of recent years such organizations as the World Council of Churches have shown interest, and the Neo-Pentecostals, who have not come out from among the historic denominations, have provided a link which spans liberal and catholic, as well as evangelical.

5. The church as a whole has inherited language about the Holy Spirit, but has tended to neglect Him. Pentecostalism is part of a growing awareness of this language, to which even the most secular theologian pays his respects.

Detailed exegesis of the verses which form the Pentecostal 'charter' would take more than a short article. They are conveniently listed by Cockburn, and may be refered to in commentaries and in Dunn's work in great detail.[8] It is perhaps worth noting that different exegetical methods will lead to different conclusions, and that some of the conflict lies in this. I intend to proceed by looking at the history, beliefs, and contemporary significance of Pentecostalism, and at some questions it raises.

Antecedents

It is possible to trace periods in Christian history when the gifts of the Spirit have been known and used in the church.[9] The distinctive Pentecostal churches, teaching Spirit-baptism as a second stage of Christian experience, belong to the twentieth century.

The background to the teaching is set in that tradition in the church which has thought of two stages

5 D. W. Basham, *A Handbook on Holy Spirit Baptism* (Gateway Outreach, 1969), p. 10. Basham is an American Disciples of Christ minister working with the Holy Spirit Teaching Mission, based in Florida.

6 J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (SCM, 1970), p. 226. Dunn is a Church of Scotland minister lecturing in theology at Nottingham. This book is a revision of his PhD thesis.

7 H. P. van Dusen, writing in *Life Magazine*, June 1958. The idea goes back to Bp. L. Newbiggin, *The Household of God* (SCM, 1953), pp. 87f. The tag has been taken up both within and without Pentecostalism.

8 Dunn, *op. cit.*; I. Cockburn, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Its Biblical Foundations (Fountain Trust, 1971).

9 E.g. Irenaeus (bp. of Lyons second century AD), talking about the completeness of our salvation says, 'For this reason the Apostle says "we speak wisdom among those who are complete", describing as complete those who have apprehended the Spirit of God, and through the Spirit of God speak all languages, and he himself also spoke in this manner. So too we hear (lit. 'have heard') many of the brethren in the assembly possessing prophetic gifts, and speaking in all sorts of languages through the Spirit, and bringing out into the open the secrets of men, as is for the best, and explaining the mysteries of God.' (My tr., from the Latin and Greek in Harvey's edition of Irenaeus Adv. Haer V.vi.)

More recently instances have been on the fringe of the church; Gladys Wilson, *Quaker Worship* (Bannisdale Pr., 1952) refers to Edward Burrough, an early Quaker leader (*c.* AD 17) The most definite example is from 1830; cf. Andrew Drummond, *Edward Irving and his Circle* cited disparagingly by R. Knox *Enthusiasm* (OUP, 1950) p. 550ff. (Irving was expelled from the Church of Scotland on account of the 'goings on' in his London congregation.)

in the Christian life.[10] Within Methodist churches, and those under Methodist influence, there has been in particular the doctrine of Christian perfection. It was assumed by those in this tradition that the converted continue to commit sins after conversion (distinguish this from the Calvinist stress on man's nature remaining sinful even after conversion); but it was held that Christians could come to the experience of perfection, or ' full salvation ', as a stage beyond justification.[11] They did not claim that a Christian was, *ipso facto,* unable to commit sins, but rather that the sanctified man was aware that his whole being was motivated by the desire and power to show the love of God in his life, and hence that, in some Christians at least, the propensity to sin departed.[12] This could easily degenerate into sinless-perfectionism, or the claim that after such an experience the believer could not sin, but this was very far from Wesley's intention. (He was very much a moralist, and had rejected Calvin's teaching on predestination because, as he had observed it, it led to antinomianism.)

Some entries in Wesley's *Journal,* referring to the experience of perfection, may allude to glossolalia. But this is doubtful.[13] Part of the difficulty of deciding whether this is a correct reading of the evidence is the fact that Wesley did not have the vocabulary of modern Pentecostalism to describe it, nor an expectation of such experience. Thus, lacking any theoretical base, any incipient glossolalia that there was would neither have been understood, nor institutionalized within the revival. For example, we find (as an isolated instance — the only one in more than a year's journal) that at a small house-meeting in London, ' Toward morning one of them was overwhelmed with joy and love and could not help showing it by strong cries and tears. At this another was much displeased, saying, it was only nature, imagination, and animal spirits. O thou jealous God, lay not this sin to her charge! and let us not be wise above what is written.'[14] There is no explicit reference to unknown languages here, within the context of believers' experience, nor elsewhere in the more frequent references to cries of anguish from those under conviction of sin, and not yet saved, and which were taken as signs that the devil was fighting for that person. If Wesley did know of glossalalia, he neither encouraged nor taught it.

Within this tradition of teaching, both within and outside the Methodist churches proper, there arose the expectation that God would bless His people with a greater devotion to Him, in this sort of way, and so men and women were to be found who would seek for this blessing over and above their conversion. The term ' baptism in the Spirit ' was used in this context from the early nineteenth century, though it only caught on after *c.*1870. ' Experiencing Pentecost ' was also used.

There is good evidence that the American Evangelists Finney, Moody and Torrey spoke in tongues, and that in some of the Welsh revivals non-Welsh-speakers found fluency in that language in prayer, but in none of these cases was this institutionalized as part of the second blessing ' baptism in the Spirit ' experience.[15]

Pentecostal writers often cite the testimonies of men within the nineteenth century holiness tradition as if they were Pentecostal in the modern sense, without qualification.[16] Harper refers to Müller, Chadwick, and Murray. Andrew Murray spoke much of Pentecost. He was a South African of Scottish Presbyterian stock, who trained for the ministry in Holland. In 1880, suffering from a throat ailment which seemed to preclude further preaching, he ' was led to a faith healing home in London, and was taught what an unspeakably solemn and blessed thing it was to ask the Lord to come and by the Holy Spirit take possession of my body as its health and strength '.[17] He spoke much of the Holy Spirit, and His work in changing the moral and interpersonal lives of the disciples, and of the believer, bringing joy, love, boldness and power, but of tongues he says only that ' though they knew not at once to say in words what it meant, the Spirit woke in them the consciousness that he was indeed true God . . .'.[18] In discussing ' baptism in the Spirit '[19] he recognizes that God deals differently with different individuals; not every convert must need go on to seek ' the baptism ', though many are filled with the Spirit subsequent to conversion; perhaps even in a great majority of Christians there is this difference of experience corresponding to the Old Testament and New Testament operations of the Holy Spirit, and to the pre- and post-Pentecost experience of the disciples.

Samuel Chadwick came from Burnley; he became Chairman of the Methodist Conference, and stood firmly within the holiness tradition. He nowhere re-

10 Fuller historical coverage is given by J .D. G. Dunn, *Spirit Baptism and Pentecostalism, SJT* 23; iv, 1970, pp. 397 f. General surveys are D. J. Du Plessis in *International Review of Christian Missions* no. 186, April 1958, p. 193 f. and *The World Pentecostal Movement* in Coxill and Grubb *World Christian Handbook* (Lutterworth, 1968) pp. 5 f.

11 Wesley wrote many hymns on this theme, e.g. ' Love Divine, all loves excelling '; this is clearest in the 4 verse version in Golden Bells or the Baptist Hymnal.

12 J. Wesley. *On Perfection,* Sermon LXXXI, *Sermons,* vol. II, (9th ed., 1825).

13 So B. R. Wilson, *op. cit.,* p. 21, Mgr. R. A. Knox, *op. cit.,* p. 551. The phenomenon may, according to Knox, have been found in a French group which Wesley opposed.

14 J. Wesley, *Journal,* Monday Dec. 24, 1739, *Works* vol. I (1856) p. 240.

15 B. R. Wilson, *loc. cit.*

16 Cf. e.g. M. C. Harper, *Power for the Body of Christ* (Fountain Tr., 1964), pp. 9 f., 14f.

17 A. Murray, *Absolute Surrender* (1957 edn, London, p. 8, originally 1895).

18 *Aids to Devotion* (Oliphants, 1961) p. 67.

19 *The Spirit of Christ* (Oliphants, 1963) p. 213.

fers to tongues in his writings, though he does refer to a Pentecost experience. This was when in 1882, early in his ministry, he tore up the precious sermons on which he had been relying, and fell back on God. What the further details of this may have been were perhaps recorded in his private journal, but neither he nor his biographer Lambert saw fit to publish this.[20]

George Müller was a German emigré, who finally settled in Bristol, and was a leader of the early Brethren. He hardly stands in a holiness tradition. The events to which Harper refers surround his appropriation to himself of the Calvinist doctrines of election, particular redemption, and final persevering grace, and the realization that ' the word of God is our standard '. This led to an improvement of his physical health.[21]

There is nothing corresponding to the sign of tongues in the writings of these nineteenth century saints. Hence there is a definite discontinuity between them and twentieth century Pentecostalism. But at the same time there is a continuity also; though they came from different traditions, and interpreted it in different ways, they each experienced subsequent to conversion an empowerment for service which corresponds to Pentecostal baptism in the Spirit. If this is so the movement has the respectability of greater antiquity, and can claim to unify the divided traditions from which it draws.

The growth of Pentecostalism

At the turn of the century, at several centres, notably Bethel Bible College, Topeka, Kansas (in Jan. 1900) and then at the Apostolic Faith Mission, Azuza St., Los Angeles, Christians studying the accounts in Acts and 1 Corinthians, and seeking to apply the experience of the early church to themselves, found that ' the signs which followed them that believed ' were given to them also. Pentecostals (as they soon came to be called, though the term till then was used by some ' historic ' holiness movements) look back on the events at Azuza St. in 1906 as the beginnings of the ' World-wide explosion of Pentecostalism ' when the new understanding of the Scriptures began to have popular impact. Expansion seems not to have been due merely to diffusion; C. L. D'Epinay[23] describes this ' latest of the great internal reformations of Protestantism ' thus: ' In the United States at first, then almost simultaneously in Wales, Scandinavia, South Africa, and India (and one might add, in Sunderland, England[24]) sometimes without any connection between them, whole congregations were seized with a new ardour which drew them to seek Pentecostal baptism, the baptism of fire which seals the gift of the Spirit. The Chilean outburst is not one of the chief occurrences, nor the most spectacular . . . . '

Even for churches which accepted the holiness teaching this was a new and alarming departure.[25] Numerous splits took place, which have gained for the Pentecostals a reputation, which they themselves recognize, of being prone to schism. The next fifty years were a time of expansion, both through the ' revival ' of historic churches, and the drawing of members from them, and also by direct evangelism. This process still continues; a mission to an area is followed by the establishment of a local church, which then proceeds to fortify its adherents and draw in others by a continuous programme of Sunday evening rallies at which the gospel is preached, and seekers invited to come forward for counselling about becoming a Christian, baptism in the Spirit, or healing.[26]

A significant change took place in about 1951; an event which serves to highlight this was the tentative contact made in that year between David Du Plessis, then Secretary of the World Conference of Pentecostal Churches, and the World Council of Churches. The formation of this Pentecostal Conference in 1947, showed the awareness of the world-wide coverage and responsibility of Pentecostalism, and its place in the total Christian scene.[27] This opened the way for Pentecostals within the historic churches.

In the present situation, while members of the separate Pentecostal churches may be as adamantly sectarian as before,[28] there is a growing sense among Neo-Pentecostals that they have a particular role in bringing about ' the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace ' in the church, spanning as they do both the denominations and the old party lines within them. Michael Harper in a recent article discusses this,[29] and holds that unity in experience will be the uniting factor as the Spirit bears witness to Christ. He is aware of the deep suspicion which this causes for those who cannot see how, for instance, a Catholic's claim to be more devoted to Mary after ' baptism in the Holy Spirit '

20 *The Testament of Samuel Chadwick* ed. Lambert (Epworth, 1957).

21 *Autobiography of G. Müller,* ed. G. F. Bergin (Nisbet 1905) p. 33f.

22 Cf. Dunn, *SJT, loc. cit.* for the historical data.

23 C. L. D'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses* (Lutterworth, 1969) p. 7. This is a sociological study of Chilean Pentecostals, by a theologian.

24 My brackets. Information from Harper, *As at the Beginning* (Hodder, 1965) p. 36f. Harper is General Secretary of Fountain Trust, a movement active in promoting Pentecostal belief in Britain.

25 The most noted case of this is the C.M.A., which rejected Pentecostalism at first, but some of whose leaders later admitted that they were wrong. Cf. Dunn, *SJT, loc. cit.* and Harper, *The Third Force in the Body of Christ* Fountain Tr., p. 26f.

26 This pattern is based on Wilson's accounts of Elim churches. *Op. cit.*, and *The Pentecostal Pastor, in Patterns of Secretarianism* (Heinemann, 1967) ed. Wilson.

27 Cf. Du Plessis, *loc. cit. IRM* p. 199. Note that WPC slightly antedated WCC in its first meeting, though both bodies had been mooted before the war, which delayed them.

28 I recall a baptismal candidate being proudly introduced as ' converted out of the Anglican church '.

29 Editorial in *Renewal,* the magazine of the Fountain Trust. The same edition, Dec. 1970, reports a WCC conference at Salamanca. Cf. also Harper, *Third Force . . .* p. 25.

can be a genuine work of that Spirit.[30] His answer, which he supports from the events of Acts 10, where Gentiles were united with Jews after the signs of experience, is that the Spirit leads into truth, not vice versa; he warns against exalting experience above truth, and truth above experience.

This will allay some fears, though not among those who regard ecumenism as a diabolical device anyway.

In refering to Neo-Pentecostals we have jumped ahead of history. In the early years Pentecostals were driven out of the historic churches; of late the situation has changed. Harper[31] traces this to a high episcopalian church in California, where the priest, instructed by some lay-people, ' got baptized '. One feels that this was the tip of an iceberg, rather than something completely new in the historic denominations. From the late fifties, at any rate, individuals and whole churches in the Protestant denominations, and more recently among Roman Catholics, have been ' going Pentecostal ' without feeling obliged to leave their church. The publication of David Wilkerson's *The Cross and the Switchblade* in 1962 was a significant stage in the opening of the doors.

All this is not to say that there has been no opposition, whether from peers, or from further up the hierarchy. Rationalizers are disturbed at the thought of enthusiasm. The respectable are shocked; the conservative are disturbed that liberal and radical Christians claim to be baptized in the Spirit; they see the assurance of our faith not in signs and wonders, but in personal adherence to the God revealed in the historic faith once delivered to the saints.

Pentecostal beliefs

On most points of doctrine the Pentecostal denominations are orthodox along the lines of a conservative in the historic churches. They practise believers' baptism, and are, in the case of Assemblies of God and Elim at any rate, pre-millennialist. Only with respect to their teaching on Spirit-baptism are they notably distinct. Their theology tends to be codified and taught in song, rather than large works of dogmatics. As examples two choruses from the Elim selection[32] may be cited;

' As I walked through the land, with the Book in my hand,
The land where my Saviour had died, . . .
As I walked through His land with His book in my hand,
Oh, I thought of Him crucified, . . .
His virgin birth, His sinless life, His wonderful rising again;
As I walked through the land with the Book in my hand
I thought of Him coming again.'

' There's a foursquare Gospel revival sweeping the world today,
Giving joy and gladness, whatever people say,
Meeting the need of the masses, a need which nothing can fill
But Jesus the Saviour, Jesus the Healer, Baptiser, Coming King.'

(The term foursquare is explained by the attributes of Christ in the final line.)

Few Pentecostals would regard personal enjoyment of the gifts which follow upon baptism in the Spirit as the end to which their experience tends. It is rather a door to a wider ministry of the Spirit in the body of Christ, to His glory. Nor would they limit the work of the Spirit to His gifts alone.

For some baptism in the Spirit was, and is, equated with holiness in the earlier sense; for others it is a third level of progression.[33] Other groups have held that one is not converted without an experience which involves the signs which go with baptism in the Spirit.[34] Today holiness, as a second stage in experience, has lost the centre of the stage to Spirit-baptism involving the sign of tongues, for which moral preparation and devotedness may be taught as necessary precursors.[35] Spirit-baptism is seen now, particularly among Neo-Pentecostals, as empowerment for service, rather than as having moral implications.[36] For this reason the objection thrown at holiness teaching, that in God's sight we are saints right from conversion, is off target when aimed at Pentecostals. (*To be continued.*)

30 I have merged Harper's apologia with an explicit objection raised by G. Thomas ' Spiritual Gifts, a Survey of Some Recent Literature ' in *Banner of Truth*, Nov. 1970.

31 *As at the Beginning*, p. 60f.

32 *Elim Choruses*, compiled by W. G. Hathaway (Elim Publishing Co., n.d. pre 1945).

33 For those in the holiness tradition, the third stage was beyond ' full perfection ', while for those (often of Baptist tradition) who did not already have any ' second blessing ' it was naturally only a second stage itself. (I owe this point to R. Quebedeaux, a research student at Mansfield College, Oxford, from whose advice I have benefited in writing this paper; though he bears no responsibility for my mistakes.)

34 The ethos of this sort of group is well expressed in James Baldwin's novel *Go Tell it on the Mountain*.

35 E.g. W. H. Turner, *The Baptism and Gifts of the Spirit*, privately circulated mimeograph. It would be wrong to suggest that Pentecostals teach that Spirit baptism is a reward for high morality or devotion. Cf. Harper, *Power* . . . p. 39.

36 Passages such as Acts 1: 8 are cited. Cf. Basham, *loc. cit.*, and the aim of Fountain Trust; ' to encourage Christians . . . to receive the power of the Holy Spirit . . . '

Political Obedience in Romans 13: 1-7

Bruce N Kaye

A considerable amount of research has been done on the intellectual and religious background of the New Testament. But there is much in the New Testament which cannot be understood properly unless its social or political situation is known. For example, how can the exegete really understand what Paul means in 1 Corinthians 7: 21 if he does not have some understanding of how the system of slavery worked in the first century? There is room for much research in this field, and in the present essay Mr Kaye attempts to illumine our understanding of Romans 13: 1-7 in the light of its background.

In 1960 E. A. Judge wrote a very important monograph on *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (Tyndale Press, London), in which he made the very simple but quite fundamental point that no idea of social obligation can be 'properly understood except in the light of the situation to which it was addressed'.[1] I suspect that the application of this principle would deliver us from some of the problems that seem to arise in a passage like Romans 13: 1-7, so that we should not share the mistaken views of Brunner[2] and Cullmann[3] that this passage is at root a statement of a theory of the state and that this concept of the state requires our submission.

The first task, then, is to identify as precisely as possible the situation addressed and to seek an understanding of the imperatives in the passage in the light of this. Since the real interest and difficulties lie in the arguments which Paul uses to support these exhortations, the second task should be to look elsewhere in his writings to see if similar social institutions or situations are referred to and what attitude is taken to them. One must emphasize that the purpose in doing this is to assist the exegesis of Romans 13: 1-7 and *not* to take counter-principles from other parts of the New Testament. Some, for example, have turned to such passages as Acts 5: 29 ('We must obey God rather than men') in order to avoid the implication that the Christian should submit even to tyrannical governments. This is most unsatisfactory since the Romans passage has no 'conscience clause', its commands are quite unconditional, and it is sufficiently a unity to demand its own exegesis. So first we must look at the passage itself.

The clearest reference to the situation addressed is in the exhortations of verses 6 and 7. They refer to those to whom one pays taxes, revenue, fear and honour; these four come under the general heading of those to whom a debt is due, and the injunction is to give them their due. Cranfield says, 'the distinction between *phoros* (taxes) and *telos* (revenue)... is that between direct and indirect taxes'.[4] Unfortunately, although it is true that Herodotus uses *phoros* (3: 13) when describing a city fixing its direct taxes, a similar sense is found for *telos* in Plato (*Republic* 425d) and later in inscriptions and papyri (e.g. P. Oxy. 1473, 30, third century AD). At the time of writing direct taxation was collected by the city authorities on the basis of census information. There were two main types of direct taxes, *tributum capitis* payable by all adults (in some places only by male adults) and *tributum soli* which was basically a land tax but probably took into account other capital assets. Indirect taxes such as customs dues and an inheritance tax on Roman citizens were collected by contractors and not municipal authorities.[5] Such meagre evidence as there is goes against Cranfield's distinction and thus the terms do not afford much help in siting the social context. This is also true in regard to *phobos* (fear) and *timē* (honour), even though the words refer to the rulers as in verses 3 and 4.[6]

It is, however, verses 3 and 4 which offer more light on the elucidation of the social context of Paul's exhortations. Cranfield rightly says that these verses are puzzling, since in them 'Paul seems to take no account of the possibility of the government's being unjust and punishing good work and praising the evil'.[7] He suggests three possible explanations. First, that Paul is oblivious to the possibility; secondly, that he is speaking of the 'true and natural duty of the magistrate' (Calvin); or, thirdly, that the promise is absolute and that even when the power intends to punish the Christian, this will nevertheless turn out to be praise. For this third interpretation Cranfield refers to Barth, Pelagius and Augustine, and he thinks that it is preferable to the other two. The first he thinks unlikely, and the second one-sided. I think Cranfield

1 *Op. cit.*, p. 72.
2 E. Brunner, *The Divine Imperative.*
3 O. Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament* (revised ed., 1963).

4 C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Commentary on Romans 12-13* (1965), p. 77.
5 On these points see, for example, M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (1957²).
6 Cranfield has argued at length for the interpretation of *phobos* as referring to God, but the objection of awkwardness, which he recognizes, tells against his position. The survey of 'fear' which is the kernel of his argument tends to overlook the possibility that the word may be used in different ways and with different degrees of strength, although he does recognize this possibility in his discussion of verse 7.
7 *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

is right in his comments on the first two alternatives, and right in rejecting them. He is also right when he says that the third possibility is difficult. He overlooks a fourth alternative, namely that these verses are descriptive of the situation to which Paul was addressing himself.

The question arises whether such an evaluation of the administration of government can be contemplated for the time when Nero was emperor. He has such a bad reputation that it is thought difficult to imagine that Paul's comments can be taken as descriptive of the situation at the time. However, Nero was only seventeen when he became emperor in AD 54 and he was strongly under the influence of his mother Agrippina, particularly in palace affairs. It was not until AD 59 that he was rid of her influence when she was killed by Anicetus, a freedman and tutor of Nero. This murder was at the instigation of Nero, or at least with his agreement, and almost certainly his desire to be rid of his mother's influence was encouraged by Poppaea Sabina with whom he had become infatuated. After this imperial policy began to show his influence, but this led not to debauchery and corruption but to the development of the arts. The degeneration of the policy, as revealed in the historical sources, was in large measure due to his advisors and associates; in fact one suspects that Nero has received rather a bad press from the chroniclers of the time. In any case the question at issue is not the later period of Nero's reign, but the period before AD 59.

It is taken that Romans was written between AD 54 and 59, and during this time the effective government was strongly influenced by Seneca and Burrus. If one subscribes to the view that Nero was vicious and cruel from the beginning and that the good government of the early part of his principate is to be explained by his lack of interest in public affairs and the influence of others,[8] this does not alter the fact that there was good government during this period. Indeed Tacitus indicates that Nero himself was inclined to humane reform particularly in the matter of indirect taxation (*Annals* 13). In addition there were able governors, such as Galba who was at various times in Aquitania, Upper Germany and Africa, Suetonius Paulinus in Britain, and Corbulo in Asia, Cappadocia and Galatia. Contemporary sources, therefore, do not falsify the suggestion that Romans 13: 3, 4 are a comment on the actual situation at the time of writing.

We turn, then, to the exegesis of the passage, and the first thing that strikes the reader is the extended reasoning given for the exhortations. This is unusual in the context, since in chapter 12 long lists of exhortations are found with no detailed reasons in support of them. If we ask why there is so much detail in chapter 13, we can answer in a variety of ways, depending probably on how we interpret the passage. If we take it as being of general significance, then we could say that the Romans needed to be given this detailed theology since probably they did not know it or perhaps were not sure about it. Alternatively, if we take the passage as referring to the immediate situation only, then Paul offers his long explanations because he felt the need to justify his favourable attitude to the government. This may have been the more necessary because he knew of some ascetic, ' other-worldly ' tendency in Rome. The difficulty is that the passage does not say why he gives the extended explanation, nor is there sufficient indication of Paul's awareness of the Romans and their attitudes to enable us to form any reasonable conclusion. Any answer to this question must therefore be pure conjecture, and cannot be used to support an exegesis of the passage.

Since the interpretation of the passage is so controversial, it might be of some assistance if we noted other references to similar social institutions in order to assess Paul's attitude to them. In general, he assumes that Christians will continue to maintain normal social relationships with their fellow-citizens. He himself apparently did not try to escape when imprisoned (though he avoided arrest by King Aretas); he told slaves to seek freedom but only through the means provided by the system (1 Cor. 7: 21). An exception would appear to be an unfavourable attitude to the law courts in 1 Corinthians 6: 1-11, but this is in regard to litigation between Christians. Such matters should be settled within the Christian group. His comments relate only to internal Christian discipline, and there is no suggestion that those who have recourse to the courts will not receive just treatment. The argument is simply that it is inappropriate for a Christian to have open litigation in the courts with another Christian.[9]

While an argument from silence is not conclusive, it does seem fair to say that Paul adopts a generally favourable attitude towards the government administration of his day. He certainly mentions it, and in such a way that, had he wanted to do so, he would certainly have expressed any opposition in principle that he had to it.

When we return to Romans 13: 1-7 we note that there are only four exhortations: *hupotassesthō* (be subject) in verse 1; *hupotassesthai* (be subject), verse 5; *teleite* (pay taxes), verse 6; *apodote* (pay), verse 7. The first two are substantially the same exhortation, and the last two are particular forms of the first two. Verses 1 and 2 argue for the first imperative and verses 3 and 4 add further argumentation in support. The imperative is repeated in verse 5. The argument in verses 3 and 4 is pragmatic and often taken to pre-

[8] This seems to be the view of Dio Cassius, *History of Rome*, 61.

[9] Paul does not discuss in this chapter, or indeed anywhere, the situation of a Christian being taken to court by an unbeliever or the possibility of a Christian taking an unbeliever to court. Private arbitration was, of course, a perfectly legal alternative to public litigation if the parties involved agreed, see A. H. J. Greenidge, *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time* (Oxford, 1901), L. Wenger, *Institutes of the Roman Law of Civil Procedure* (New York, 1940).

suppose that the ruler approves the good and punishes evil. But the passage does not *suppose* this; it *says* it quite explicitly. If the verses are taken as arguing a support for the imperatives (or in support of the ethical exhortations implied in 'do good... if you do evil'), then it is a particularly obtuse argument. In the context it is much more likely that Paul assumes that the Romans would do good and avoid the evil, and that what this argument is seeking to establish is that the rulers will approve of such action. In other words he is saying something about the rulers, as to what they approve and what they do not approve.

If we take it that verse 3 is concerned with simply describing the rulers then we should note the effect which this has on the way we take the preceding verses. The argument in verses 1 and 2 is dependent on the two statements of verse 1b, '... there is no authority except from God', and 'those that exist have been instituted by God', but these are not argued for in verse 2 which contains, rather, an implication from the premises: '... therefore he who resists the authority resists what God has appointed'. Verse 3, therefore, is most naturally to be taken as an argument in support of the second statement of verse 1b, 'the present powers are (have been) arranged by God'. In other words the 'theological' description of the powers is supported by observing what they actually do. This also explains how the second statement can be repeated in a slightly different form in verse 4a: 'He is God's minister to you for good'.

What I suggest is that this passage refers to the actual powers to which the Romans were subject, and that they should submit to these particular powers because they have been arranged by God, and this is known particularly because they operate for the good. In other words, the theological projection of verse 1 refers to the particular Roman authorities, and it is made possible because of the value judgment which is placed on their activities. I suspect that we shrink from making such theological projections and thus find it difficult to think that this is what Paul is doing here. We tend to stay at the level of making the value judgment (and justifying the ethical course of action from it) without, as it were, referring the matter to the activity of God in the situation. Paul was not so reticent; he did not separate his moral judgments from his theological judgments so much. He quite candidly, for example, tells the Thessalonians that God has chosen them, and his reason is that they received the gospel (1 Thes. 1: 4). I suspect that we would not like to make such a theological judgment about the Thessalonians until they had Christianly fought their way to a Christian grave.

The implication of this interpretation is that it is incumbent on Christians to examine the powers that exist and seek to make a value judgment in regard to them. Do they tend to the good or not? If they do, then they should submit to them; if not, then they should not necessarily feel obliged to submit to them. This is not an argument for revolution against governments which do not tend to the good; it is an argument for non-submission. Where active opposition is demanded, the form of that opposition is still subject to the general imperatives of love that are incumbent upon a Christian.

From our standpoint in history it is apparent to us that governments are not generally wholly good, nor wholly bad. Paul, of course, was in a similar position. As he looked back over the history of the Jews or of the Mediterranean world, he could see, as well as we can, that governments generally are not wholly good, or wholly bad. In Romans 13: 1-7 he is making his theological projection in relation to the particular government that impinged on his readers and himself. If, say in AD 63, he was not able to make the same positive value judgment, then he would have to reverse his theological projection, as the book of Revelation seems in fact to do. Paul is not saying that the Roman system of government is ordained by God, but only the particular government at the time of writing. That particular government does not have to be wholly good for him to be able to say it is ordained by God. It is almost universally not the case in the Bible that people or groups of people who are said to be ordained by God are wholly good.

In a complex and inter-related world society such as we live in today the business of making such value judgments on existing authorities (which may not be simply restricted to 'political' authorities but may include ecclesiastical institutional authorities) is a difficult matter, but one which has to be undertaken with all the seriousness it demands. Mostly it is done for Christians by (Christian) leaders and public speakers, and often in a slick and superficial way. The Christian at the grass roots — least of all the theological student — cannot avoid his responsibilities so easily. It is not open to the Christian to hide behind the quite wrong idea that goverment *per se* and hence all governments are divinely ordained. He must understand the situation he is in, and must make a judgment on the powers as they operate, and act accordingly.

A Bibliographical Guide to the Study of Church History: 3 The Evangelical Revival and the Modern Church

Harold H Rowdon

Chronologically the bibliography on early church history (TSF Bulletin *59, Spring, 1971, pp. 14-18; 60, Summer, 1971, pp. 20-23*) *should be followed by a section on the Reformation; we regret that we have had to hold this over to a subsequent issue, but now offer a guide to a later period which often figures in theological syllabuses.*

Strictly speaking, this is a bibliography of some ecclesiastical and religious movements since the French Revolution, with a glance over the shoulder at the Evangelical Revival in England. Throughout, it is a selection of some of the books which should be of use in undergraduate studies, with side-glances at some which are not so useful. For a very much fuller discussion of post-1930 publications on these subjects, reference should be made to J. Daniélou, A. H. Couratin and J. Kent, *The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology*, vol. 2 (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969), pp. 302-306.

The lines followed in the composition of this guide are set out in the general introduction in *TSF Bulletin* 59, Spring 1971 *Bulletin*, p. 14.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL

1. Source material

A. C. Outler (ed.), *John Wesley* (OUP, 1964) is a convenient collection of extracts. *The Journal* (8 vols., 1909-1916) and *Letters* (6 vols., 1931) are for consultation only! *Whitefield's Journals* (Banner of Truth, London, 1960) are more readily accessible than the writings of most of the early evangelicals.

2. General surveys

A. S. Wood, *The Inextinguishable Blaze* (Paternoster, London, 1960) is a judicious account of the revival to the end of the eighteenth century, and the best starting-point for serious study. J. E. Orr, *The Light of the Nations* (Paternoster, Exeter, 1965) is packed with information on the subsequent world-wide spread of evangelical Christianity. Unfortunately, the material appears to have been ill-digested. G. R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party of the Church of England* (Church Book Room Press, London, 1911) has not yet been superseded as a brief survey of its subject, and is still of value.

3. More specialized studies

a. Origins. These are discussed in an important essay, 'The Origins of the Evangelical Revival', by J. D. Walsh, in G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh (eds.), *Essays in Modern English Church History* (A. & C. Black, London, 1966), pp. 132-162.

b. Biographies. Worth-while 'potted' biographies of leading early evangelicals are contained in two works by M. L. Loane, *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession* (Lutterworth, London, 1950) and *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession* (Lutterworth, 1952). J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford 1735-1871* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1953) is a work of meticulous scholarship which reveals the number and influence of Oxford evangelicals. Thoroughly competent biographical studies include G. C. B. Davies, *The Early Cornish Evangelicals 1735-90* (SPCK, London, 1951); A. S. Wood, *Thomas Haweis* (SPCK, London, 1957); and C. H. Smyth, *Simeon and Church Order* (CUP, 1940). The latter deals more widely with the evangelicals than its title suggests. For Simeon, W. Carus, *Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Charles Simeon* (numerous editions) is worth consulting; H. C. G. Moule, *Charles Simeon* (IVP, London, 1965) is straightforward biography; and there are valuable essays in A. Pollard and M. Hennell (eds.), *Charles Simeon (1759-1836)* (SPCK, London, 1959). A pioneer effort to create out of biographical data a coherent account of *The Early Evangelicals* made by L. E. Elliott-Binns (Lutterworth, London, 1953) is marred by extensive inaccuracy.

c. The Clapham Sect. E. M. Howse, *Saints in Politics, the 'Clapham Sect' and the Growth of Freedom* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1952) is a useful general account. Closer studies are to be found in M. Hennell, *John Venn and the Clapham Sect* (Lutterworth, London, 1958) and S. Meacham, *Henry Thornton of Clapham 1760-1815* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1964). Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians* (CUP, 1961) is a large work with plenty of valuable material but too many specious arguments.

d. Wesley and Methodism. From the immense literature on Wesley, the following deserve special mention: V. H. H. Green, *John Wesley* (Nelson, London, 1964), a concise, critical account with bibliography; A. S. Wood, *The Burning Heart: John*

Wesley, Evangelist (Paternoster, Exeter, 1968), a valuable, complementary work. The standard history of Methodism, edited by W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman and G. Eayrs, is being replaced by R. E. Davies and E. G. Rupp (eds.), *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain* (Epworth, London), to be completed in 4 volumes (vol. I, 1966).

J. W. Bready *England Before and After Wesley* (SPCK, London, 1938) is informative, but overstates its case — that the Evangelical Revival saved England from revolution. The influence of Methodism on working class movements has been investigated by R. F. Wearmouth in a number of works which, similarly, tend to exaggerate the undoubted influence of the movement: *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century* (Epworth, London, 1945); *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England* (Epworth, 1937); and *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working-Classes 1850-1900* (Backus, Leicester, 1954).

Attention has recently been drawn to the life and work of Thomas Coke in a comprehensive and model biography by J. Vickers: *Thomas Coke, Apostle of Methodism* (Epworth, London, 1969).

e. Whitefield. L. Tyerman, *Life of George Whitefield* (2 vols., London, 1876-77) is still basic, though it is likely to be superseded by A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, of which the first volume has appeared (Banner of Truth, London, 1970). A. D. Belden, *George Whitefield — the Awakener* (Rockcliff, London, 2nd ed., 1953) is a brief, readable account.

II FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT DAY

1. Source material

A limited selection of source material is to be found in H. Bettenson (ed.) *Documents of the Christian Church* (paperback, OUP, 1943), a little volume which should always be close at hand when studying church history. More plentiful material is to be found in S. Z. Ehler and J. B. Morall (eds.), *Church and State through the Centuries: a Collection of Historic Documents with Commentaries* (Burns & Oates, London, 1954); pp. 234-617 are devoted to the period 1789-1949. Relevant volumes in the series *English Historical Documents* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London), may also be consulted.

D. Nicholls (ed.), *Church and State in Britain since 1820* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967) is a slightly arbitrary collection of material bearing on the idea and vindication of a Christian commonwealth, separation of church and state, and advocacy of a pluralist position.

Extensive extracts from the writings of leaders of the Oxford Movement may be consulted in E. R. Fairweather (ed.), *The Oxford Movement* (OUP, 1964) or O. Chadwick (ed.), *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (A. & C. Black, London, 1960). The latter is usefully arranged, and includes a particularly perceptive introduction running to 54 pages.

Liberal Protestantism, edited by B. M. G. Reardon (A. & C. Black, London, 1968) has a useful introduction and extracts from leading German, French, British and American exponents of Liberal Protestantism. *Roman Catholic Modernism* (A. & C. Black, London, 1970) is an equally useful collection by the same editor. R. T. Handy (ed.), *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920* (OUP, 1966) contains extensive selections from the writings of Washington Gladden, Richard T. Ely and Walter Rauschenbusch.

Numerous topics are documented in A. O. J. Cockshut (ed.), *Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century: Selected Documents* (Methuen, London, 1966). There is a pithy general introduction, as well as brief comments on the various documents, which include Wilberforce's *Practical View*, various *Tracts for the Times*, Arnold's *Sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy, Essays and Reviews*, and Colenso's preface to *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*.

The development of the Ecumenical Movement has been carefully documented by G. K. A. Bell in the four volumes of *Documents on Christian Unity* (OUP, 1924-1958).

2. Works of reference

Extremely useful is K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1959-62) now available in paperback (Paternoster, Exeter, 1971). In these five hefty volumes there is a mine of information and a good deal of assessment. It should hardly be necessary to add that it is not advisable to use this work as a textbook! Another multi-volumed work to which profitable reference can constantly be made is Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. Vols. III, Part 2; IV and V (OUP, 1961, 1962, 1965) relate to the period under review. This work is invaluable for the history of worship and its theological context. Vols. IV-VII of K. S. Latourette's great *History of the Expansion of Christianity* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1947) constitute the indispensable reference work for its subject in this period. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948* (SPCK, London, 1954), the standard history, is best used as a work of reference. It is now complemented by vol. II, *The Ecumenical Advance: 1948-68*, ed. H. E. Fey (SPCK, London, 1970).

3. General surveys

A brief but valuable introductory survey worthy of being read, marked, learned and inwardly digested, is to be found in A. R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1961). Useful bibliographies are included. Somewhat fuller, but rather diffuse, is the relevant part of J. H. Nicholls, *History of Christianity 1650-1950* (Ronald Press, New York, 1956). The bibliographies, which are extensive, reflect the transatlantic provenance of this book! The chapter on 'The Religion of the People' in G. Kit-

son Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (Methuen, London, 1962) is an excellent general survey.

4. More specialized studies

a. The Church of England. F. W. Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, has been largely superseded by more recent studies. S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People 1789-1889* (SPCK, London, 1933), now available in paperback, provides a useful survey of its period, especially the thought. O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (A. & C. Black, London, 1966-70), can hardly fail to be the standard work for some time to come. Its two volumes constitute a magisterial work, based on primary as well as secondary sources. Vol. II is especially important on account of its chapters on 'Science and Religion', 'History and the Bible' and 'Doubt'.

W. L. Mathieson, *English Church Reform 1815-1840* (London, 1923) is still valuable, but needs to be used in conjunction with O. J. Brose, *Church and Parliament: the Reshaping of the Church of England 1828-60* (OUP, 1959).

Well worth referring to is G. F. A. Best, *Temporal Pillars* (CUP, 1964), the definitive history of Queen Anne's Bounty, which contains valuable general information about the Church of England in this period. P. T. Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait and the Church of England 1866-1882* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1969) is a detailed study of great value.

R. Lloyd, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century* (2 vols., Longmans, Green, London, 1946, 1950, now available in one volume) is not always accurate, and neglects the evangelical element in the scene. G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (2 vols., London, OUP, 1935) is a veritable mine of information on the Church of England in the earlier part of the present century.

b. The Oxford Movement. A good, short introductory study has been provided by B. Willey in the chapter on 'Newman and the Oxford Movement' in his *Nineteenth Century Studies* (Chatto & Windus, London, 1949), pp. 73-101. R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-1845* (1891, new edit., Archer Books, London, 1966) is a classic, written with an unashamedly favourable bias. A rather different picture of the same movement, written by a prominent evangelical, is to be found in E. A. Knox, *The Tractarian Movement 1833-1845* (London, 1933). Y. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London, 1925) has been widely acclaimed as a perceptive work on the subject.

C. S. Dessain, *The Life of John Henry Newman* (Nelson, London, 1966) is a compact but authoritative life. Mention must also be made, in passing, of W. Robbins, *The Newman Brothers* (Heinemann, London, 1966), an intriguing study of the lives of John Henry and Frank.

There is little to choose between the numerous accounts of Anglo-Catholicism, which are mostly uncritical. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845* (London, 1932) may serve as an example. P. T. Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1969) contains a detailed account of the legal problems posed by 'ritualism'.

c. Evangelicalism. The history of evangelicalism in the nineteenth century remains to be written. K. Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action: an Appraisal of their Social Work* (Bles, London, 1962) is an important work indicating the enormous volume of evangelical social action and giving a remarkably balanced assessment of it. The term evangelicals is used in rather a broad sense. R. G. Cowherd, *The Politics of English Dissent: the Religious Aspect of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848* (British edition, Epworth, London, 1959) is a critical examination of the part played by evangelicals (in a broad sense) in liberal and humanitarian reform movements. G. F. A. Best, *Shaftesbury* (Batsford, London, 1964) is a handy and competent account of the life and work of Lord Shaftesbury.

D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends* (Murray, London, 1966) contains a brief discussion of the crisis within evangelicalism in the 1820s (pp. 5-15). See also T. C. F. Stunt, 'John Henry Newman and the Evangelicals', *JEH* 21 (1970), pp. 65-74. There is a useful general discussion of nineteenth century evangelicalism in G. F. A. Best, 'Evangelicalism and the Victorians', in A. Symondson (ed.), *The Victorian Crisis of Faith* (SPCK, London, 1970).

The Gorham Controversy can conveniently be studied with the aid of J. C. S. Nias, *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter* (SPCK, London, 1951).

The mid-century revival has been chronicled by J. E. Orr in *The Second Evangelical Awakening in Britain* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, 1949) and *The Second Evangelical Awakening in America* (MM&S, 1953). A popular abridgement came from the same author and publisher in 1955.

J. F. Findley Jr., *Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1969) is a scholarly biography which places Moody in the setting of American evangelism (about which it has some important things to say) but does not throw a great deal of light on British evangelicalism. Short biographical sketches of J. C. Ryle, H. C. G. Moule, E. A. Knox and H. W. K. Mowll are to be found in M. L. Loane, *Makers of our Heritage* (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1967). J. B. Harford and F. C. MacDonald, *Handley Carr Glynn Moule, Bishop of Durham* (London, 1922) is still of interest.

d. Christian Socialism. Brief introductory surveys are to be found in G. C. Binyon, *The Christian Socialist Movement in England* (London, 1931) and M. B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple* (London, 1947).

The first phase of Christian Socialism is treated

with thoroughness and sureness of touch by T. Christensen, *Origin and History of Christian Socialism 1848-54* (Universitetsforlaget, Aarhus, 1962) which has largely superseded the admirable pioneer work of C. E. Raven (*Christian Socialism*). The contribution of Ludlow to the rise of Christian Socialism is assessed in N. C. Masterman, *John Malcolm Ludlow: the Builder of Christian Socialism* (CUP, 1963).

Maurice's connection with Christian Socialism enables us to consider him here, though his importance is far wider. The most compact of the numerous modern biographies is F. Higham, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (SCM, London, 1947). The basic biographical study was written by his son: Sir Frederick Maurice, *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, chiefly told in his own Letters* (2 vols., London, 1884). This needs to be corrected by reference to T. Christensen, ' F. D. Maurice and the Contemporary Religious World ' in *Studies in Church History*, vol III, ed. G. J. Cuming (Brill, Leiden, 1966). Maurice's thought can be studied with the aid of A. R. Vidler, *F. D. Maurice and Company* (SCM, London, 1966). This comprises a revised version of Vidler's Hale Lectures on 'The Theology of F. D. Maurice ' and short studies of Maurice's relationship with Coleridge, Carlyle, Hare, Erskine, Hughes and Westcott. W. Merlin Davies, *An Introduction to F. D. Maurice's Theology* (SPCK, London, 1964) contains an interpretative abridgement which provides a valuable introduction to Maurice's *The Kingdom of Christ*, and also an examination of Maurice's *Faith of the Liturgy and the Doctrine of the XXXIX Articles*. A. M. Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology* (CUP, 1951) relates the theological conflicts faced by Maurice with subsequent theological developments, but does not altogether avoid the hazards pointed out by Christensen (*art. cit.*).

The later phases of Christian Socialism are the subject of the very detailed work: P. d'A. Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914* (OUP, 1968). This meticulous account comes perilously close to obscuring the wood by means of its trees, and the author is not always sure-footed in theological territory. D. O. Wagner, *The Church of England and Social Reform since 1854* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1930) is worth consulting.

Among the useful works in which Christian Socialism is treated *inter alia* are K. S. Inglis, *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1963) and S. Mayor, *The Churches and the Labour Movement* (Independent Press, London, 1967).

e. English Nonconformity. Older books, such as those by C. S. Horne and Skeats and Miall, are of slight value. The sketch contained in Horton Davies, *The English Free Churches* (OUP, 2nd ed., 1963), chs. VII and VIII, forms a good introduction. W. G. Addison, *Religious Equality in Modern England 1714-1914* (SPCK, London, 1944) remains useful. For the rest, it is mainly a question of using the best denominational histories. The relevant sections in A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (Kingsgate, London, 1947), R. Tudor Jones, *Congregationalism in England 1662-1962* (Independent Press, London, 1962) and W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman and G. Eayrs (eds.), *A New History of Methodism* (London, 1909) — the latter until the appearance of vols. II and III of R. E. Davies and E. G. Rupp (eds.), *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain* (Epworth, London,) — these help to fill a serious gap. The chapter on the nonconformists in O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, vol. I, and the occasional references in vol. II fail to do justice to the subject.

f. The Roman Catholic Church. A readable, general survey from an unashamedly sympathetic point of view is to be found in E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1958).

Among works on the papacy, special reference must be made to the following: E. E. Y. Hales, *Pio Nono* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1958); J. B. Bury, *History of the Papacy in the 19th Century* (London, 1930), which is mainly devoted to an intensely critical investigation of the Syllabus of Errors and the 1870 Vatican Council by a historian of the liberal school; and R. L. Camp, *The Papal Ideology of Social Reform: a Study in Historical Development* (Brill, Leiden, 1969), a very thorough work.

The two volumes by C. S. Phillips on *The Church in France* have now been largely superseded by A. Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France* (2 vols., Nelson, London, 1961, translated and abridged from the 1948 French original). This is readable, though detailed, and is based on a good deal of original and local research. Special studies include J. McManners, *The French Revolution and the Church* (SPCK, London, 1969) and A. R. Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy: a Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Reformation* (SCM, London, 1954) — both indispensable works on their subjects.

The fortunes of Roman Catholicism in England are briefly surveyed in E. I. Watkin, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Reformation to 1950* (OUP, 1957). This may be filled in by reference to such books as G. A. Beck (ed.), *The English Catholics 1850-1950* (Burns-Oates, 1950) and J. Hickey, *Urban Catholics: Urban Catholicism in England and Wales from 1829 to the Present Day* (Chapman, London, 1967). E. R. Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1968) includes extracts from relevant documents.

A. R. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (CUP, 1934) is the basic study of its subject. J. J. Heaney, *The Modernist Crisis: von Hügel* (Chapman, London, 1969), though a somewhat disappointing book, contains a useful short sketch of the ' movement', pp. 219-234. Books by M. D. Petre— *Modernism — its Failure and its Fruits* (London, 1918), *Von Hügel and Tyrrell* (London, 1937) and *Alfred Loisy: his Religious Significance* (CUP, 1944)

— may be consulted with profit. So may the article on 'Modernism' in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*

C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement: its Origins and History* (SPCK, London, 1948) remains indispensable.

g. The rise of biblical criticism. Two chapters in *The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. III: The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* serve as useful introduction — 'The Criticism and Theological Use of the Bible, 1700-1950', by W. Neil and 'The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship and Recent Discussions of the Authority of the Bible', by A. Richardson. The whole subject is placed in its context in the development of modern thought in A. Richardson, *The Bible in the Age of Science* (SCM, London, 1963), an extraordinarily useful little book. H. D. McDonald, *Theories of Revelation: an Historical Study 1860-1960* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1963) is a full discussion of its subject, with direct reference to the literature of the period.

A. O. J. Cockshut, *Anglican Attitudes* (Collins, London, 1959), contains introductory chapters on *Essays and Reviews,* and Colenso. B. Willey, *More Nineteenth Century Studies* (Chatto & Windus, London, 1956) is important for *Essays and Reviews.* So is M. A. Crowther, *Church Embattled* (David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1970) which is also useful for its informed discussion of the impact of German ideas on England. W. B. Glover, *Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the 19th Century* (Independent Press, London, 1954) is a detailed study which covers more ground than its title suggests.

C. W. Dugmore (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible* (SPCK, London, 1944) contains several relevant lectures, the most striking being 'The Failure of Liberalism to interpret the Bible as the Word of God', by T. W. Manson.

h. The modern missionary movement. S. C. Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1964) provides an obvious starting-point. Selection of more specialized works must here be even more arbitrary than usual. J. van den Berg, *Constrained by Jesus' Love: an Enquiry into the Motives of the Missionary Awakening in Great Britain in the Period between 1698 and 1815* (J. H. Kok, Kampen, 1956) includes a careful account of the formation of the major missionary agencies W. R. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations* (Harper, New York, 1952) is a valuable history of the International Missionary Council and its background. R. P. Beaver, *Ecumenical Beginning in Protestant World Mission* (Nelson, New York, 1962) is a detailed account of the operation of the 'comity' principle in missions. Valuable yet brief treatment of particular topics is to be found in the books of M. A. C. Warren, especially *The Missionary Movement from Britain in Modern History* (SCM, London, 1965) and *Social History and Christian Mission* (SCM, London, 1967). Among the many books of S. C. Neill, special reference must be made to the valuable pioneer work on *Colonialism and Christian Missions* (Lutterworth, London, 1966).

i. The Ecumenical Movement. For those who enjoy the biographical approach, S. C. Neill, *Men of Unity* (SCM, London, 1960) is a godsend. N. Goodall, *The Ecumenical Movement* (OUP, 1961) contains a lucid description of the structure of the World Council of Churches. G. H. Tavard, *Two Centuries of Ecumenism* (Burns & Oates, London) is a readable introduction from a RC angle. Among the many special studies are E. Duff, *The Social Thought of the World Council of Churches* (Longmans, London, 1956); H-R. Weber, *Asia and the Ecumenical Movement 1895-1961* (SCM, London, 1966) and D. Hudson, *The Ecumenical Movement in World Affairs* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1969), a study of the influence of the movement on national governments and international authorities. Biographies include B. Matthews, *John R. Mott, World Citizen* (New York, 1934), a semi-popular study of an important figure; F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: his Life and Letters* (OUP, 1948) — Temple's importance goes far beyond the Ecumenical Movement; R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester* (OUP, 1967); and B. Sundkler, *Nathan Soderblom: his Life and Work* (Lutterworth, London, 1968).

R. Rouse, *World's Student Christian Federation* (SCM, London, 1948) is the history of a body closely linked with the Ecumenical Movement. Of special interest to evangelicals will be D. Johnson (ed.), *A Brief History of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students* (IFES, Lausanne, 1964) and J. B. A. Kessler Jr., *A Study of the Evangelical Alliance in Great Britain* (Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, Goes, Neths., 1968, obtainable through SU or EA). Some of the interpretative comments in the latter may be found irritating rather than helpful!

A useful survey of some liturgical developments is to be found in J-D. Benoit, *Liturgical Renewal: Studies in Catholic and Protestant Developments on the Continent* (SCM, London, 1958).

j. Christian thought. J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1896) still has its uses. V. F. Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century 1800-1860* (London, 1913) is rapidly being left behind by more recent specialist studies. L. E. Elliott-Binns, *English Thought 1860-1900: the Theological Aspect* (Longmans Green, London, 1956) carries Storr's survey to the end of the century.

Among surveys of more recent thought, J. K. Mozley, *Some Tendencies in British Theology from the Publication of Lux Mundi to the Present Day* (SPCK, London, 1952) stands out as particularly perceptive. D. D. Williams, *Interpreting Theology 1918-1952* (SCM, London, 1953) covers a wider area more sketchily. On the other hand, A. M. Ramsey, *From Gore to*

Temple: the Development of Anglican Theology between Lux Mundi and the Second World War 1889-1939 (Longmans, London, 1960) is a full account of narrower territory. J. MacQuarrie, *Twentieth Century Religious Thought: the Frontiers of Religious Thought 1900-1960* (SCM, London, 1963, now in paperback) is useful. A. R. Vidler, *20th Century Defenders of the Faith* (SCM, London, 1965) contains brief but helpful studies of Liberal Protestantism, RC Modernism, English Liberal Catholicism, Neo-Orthodoxy and Christian Radicalism.

Readers' Forum

Robin E Nixon

' We read in Acts of baptism being administered in the name of Jesus. Does this mean that the command to baptize in the name of the Trinity recorded in Matthew 28: 19 is not authentic? '

This is a well-known problem. We can take as our starting-point the evidence given to us in Acts. Reference is made to baptism ' in ' or ' into ' the name of Jesus in Acts 2: 38; 8: 16; 10: 48; 19: 5. This means that the sacrament was seen as a mark of allegiance to, or commitment into the ownership of, Jesus. There is no reason to think that, if the normal formula had included the names of all three persons of the Trinity, Luke would have regularly omitted the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Was there then a variety of practice in the earliest days? This would seem to be unlikely and does not answer the question why the leading apostolic figures should be described in Acts as deviating from the norm given by the risen Lord.

If then the earliest practice at the heart of the Christian mission was to administer baptism in the name of Jesus, it is clear that the apostles could not have received a command to baptize using the name of the Trinity as a formula. We are therefore left with the alternatives: either Matthew 28: 19 was never spoken or it has to be interpreted in a different way.

Some have argued (as Professor Tasker in the Tyndale Commentary) that Jesus was not giving a liturgical formula but a theological description of the meaning of the sacrament. In that case the apostles would have needed to be very discerning to appreciate the difference, and the practice of the subapostolic age in using a Trinitarian formula seems much more logical than what the apostles did.

It is most likely therefore that these words were not used by Jesus. There is some evidence that Matthew presents some of the sayings of Jesus in a form to which they may have developed in the church at the time at which he was writing. For example if the Lord's Prayer was given only once by Jesus, it is likely that Matthew's version is a more interpretative rendering of the shorter version found in Luke. So the Trinitarian formula might be an interpretative rendering of an original word of Jesus that baptism should be administered in his name. This interpretation would have been reached in the early years of the church as their ' Trinitarian religion ' began to be supported by a ' Trinitarian theology '. Baptism in the threefold name would be a logical and legitimate extension of the Lord's command.

It is worth mentioning that there is some slight manuscript evidence for an original reading ' make disciples of all nations in my name ' omitting any reference to baptism. It has been shown that this reading would make the closing words of Jesus a piece of rhythmic poetry (such as was used for much of His teaching) and would link up particularly well with other uses in Matthew of ' in my name '. (See H. Kosmala in *Annual of Swedish Theological Institute* IV, 1965, pp. 132-147; V, 1967, pp. 87-109 and D. Flusser, *ibid.*, 110-120). However in the present state of our textual knowledge it is hard to deny that Matthew wrote the Trinitarian formula and what might have been a neat solution to the problem is rather flimsily based. But if we allow that the Holy Spirit gave to the evangelists inspiration not only in recording but also in interpreting the teaching of Jesus we should not find that too great difficulties are raised by this verse.

Book Reviews

The Founder of Christianity by C. H. Dodd
Collins, 1971. 181pp. £1.75.

C. H. Dodd's sketch of the character, teaching and ministry of Jesus is an outstanding achievement and is certain to become at least as influential as his earlier writings. The book is intended for a wide audience (Scripture references and a handful of notes are placed at the back of the book) and it is to be hoped that this book soon appears in a cheap paperback version on bookstalls at railway stations as well as in churches. But theological students as well as New Testament specialists will also profit greatly from this succinct summary of a lifetime's work on the Gospels.

After a brief survey of the background of the Gospels, Dodd discusses the historical value of the New Testament documents. The documents, Dodd argues, ask to be treated seriously, though not uncritically, as a record of things that happened. ' Certainly they are primarily documents of the faith of the earliest Christians; but it must be added that this faith acted as a preservative of genuinely historical memories without which it would never have arisen ' (p. 33). What a superbly balanced assessment of the whole historical Jesus debate of the last couple of decades!

Some of the characteristic personal traits of Jesus are then outlined: the authority of Jesus is stressed strongly — it ' must have rested on some indefinable personal quality in Jesus himself . . . the authority he exercises is that of Almighty God, just because he is himself loyally obedient to him ' (pp. 49f.). The central chapters sketch out the teaching of Jesus, and include a discussion of hotly disputed territory: Messiah, Servant and Son of man. Not surprisingly, there is a strong emphasis on realized eschatology. But the presence of the kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus is not the only theme Jesus proclaims: ' the kingdom of God, while it is present experience, remains also a hope, but a hope directed to a consummation beyond history ' (p. 115). Similarly, the ultimate coming of the Son of man lies ' beyond history ' (p. 118). While many will wish that Dodd had clarified what he means by ' beyond history ', or had expressed himself rather differently, one can no longer accuse him of failing to take the future element in the teaching of Jesus seriously.

In the final three chapters Dodd offers a reconstruction of the ministry of Jesus, from His baptism and relationship to John, right through to the trial and crucifixion, the empty tomb and the appearances of the risen Jesus. Dodd readily admits that he had to read between the lines on occasions, but here, as elsewhere in the book, Dodd's conclusions are eminently balanced and worth careful study. Of particular interest is his preference for the Johannine chronology at several points and his reconstruction of the ' feeding ' incident. The latter, Dodd suggests, was an impressive symbolic action which concluded a long day of teaching ' which may have been something like a last appeal to the Galileans to understand and embrace his true purpose ' (p. 133f.). A good deal of weight (perhaps more than it can bear) is placed upon John 6: 15, ' Jesus, aware that they meant to come and seize him to proclaim him king, withdrew again to the hills by himself.' The political side of the story was later of little interest to the church and was forgotten except in one branch of the tradition, that followed by John. Dodd sees this incident as the crucial turning point in the ministry of Jesus; from now on there is little further activity in Galilee and Jesus relies on a more intimate group of fully committed disciples. But if the feeding incident *was* such a dramatic watershed, surely (on Dodd's view of the historicity of the Gospel traditions) more than a passing hint would have been preserved in the church's traditions of the ministry of Jesus?

While Dodd's discussion does not always carry conviction on individual points, the portrait of Jesus which emerges is most moving. The reader will not only be reassured that we do know a good deal about Jesus of Nazareth, but will also be forced to face up to the claims of Jesus and his call for commitment.

Graham N. Stanton London

Jesus in the Church's Gospels: Modern Scholarship and and the earliest Sources by John Reumann
SPCK, 1970. 558 pp. £3.75.

This book provides a most useful exposition of the teaching of Jesus in the light of modern research on the nature and origin of the Gospel traditions. It is difficult to think of a volume which will be more useful to the theological student or minister who is beginning to explore contemporary discussion of the main themes of the teaching of Jesus. The main part of the book is written with non-specialist in mind; it is well written, set out clearly, and from time to time the point under discussion is clarified by a most useful illustration. The general reader is provided with a short glossary of technical terms and a very full annotated reading list for further study. There are 150 pages of notes and references. The notes include fairly detailed discussions of the main lines of current scholarly debate; they will be of particular interest to theological students, though at times they tend to be rather verbose and they are not always particularly relevant to the subject-matter of the main text.

A book of this nature could easily have become a catalogue of scholarly opinions, but Reumann never loses sight of the text of the Gospels and its theological implications. It is rare to find a book on the teaching of Jesus which warms the heart even though its primary intention is to provide a critical discussion of the message of Jesus. The difficulties of the Synoptic Gospels are faced honestly and divergencies in the order and wording of the Gospels are often examined with the aid of useful diagrams.

In his introduction Reumann explains that there is a wide gap between Anglo-Saxon and German scholarly study of Jesus and indicates that his own stance is often closest to that of Bultmann and Bornkamm, though he is appreciative of the more traditional approach of British New Testament scholarship. But Reumann's own position on most of the debated issues is much less radical than he implies; Jeremias and Moule seem to have influenced him more deeply than the Bultmann school.

The order in which Reumann presents his material is most interesting and reveals some of his main concerns. After a brief sketch of the political and religious conditions of the Palestine of Jesus' own day, Reumann discusses the origin of the Gospels and the degree to which they reflect the facts of history and the faith of the early church. In order to test how much we can learn about Jesus of Nazareth from our Gospels, the author turns first of all to the Passion narratives. The Lord's Prayer is then taken as a further ' testing ground '; Reumann argues that two factors are at work with regard to the teachings of Jesus in the New Testament: a staunch *fidelity* to what

He had said, and an amazing *freedom* in handling His words, under the Spirit, in a more meaningful way.

Before turning to the main themes of the teaching of Jesus, Reumann discusses the resurrection narratives and the implications of the resurrection for our understanding of Jesus and the Gospel traditions. By adopting this rather strange order, Reumann presses home his insistence that a biography of Jesus in the traditional sense is no longer possible and the resurrection ' renders dubious any mere quest for the Jesus of history, for one discovers through historical studies that the records are constantly illuminated by the resurrection light. It demands commitment to a Jesus who is lord and not just a human figure, for the resurrection has stamped Jesus in the New Testament records as not just a figure of the past but one of continuing significance ' (p. 113).

The remainder of the book covers all the main aspects of the teaching of Jesus: kingdom, parables, miracles, Jesus' teaching about His own Person, the future, the church and, finally the Spirit. But although both the themes and their treatment are fairly conventional and although Reumann seldom offers any original insights, his discussion is never dull and is often most stimulating.

Graham N. Stanton London

Luke: Historian and Theologian
by I. Howard Marshall
Paternoster Press, 1970. 238pp. £1.75.

Dr Marshall needs no introduction to the readers of these pages, who long have benefited from his scholarly and editorial abilities. His present work follows a recent commentary on Luke, written for *The New Bible Commentary Revised*, but it is on a considerably more technical level. Directed primarily to theological students, it raises and seeks to answer several questions that stand before the cutting edge of contemporary scholarhip. Specifically, what is the relation of history and theology in Luke-Acts? In presenting the Christian message does Luke build on tradition or create his own new scheme? What is Luke's basic theological theme?

The author begins with an assessment of the current scholarly approach to Luke-Acts. In an extensive interaction with modern literature on the subject he underscores two points. On the one hand it is good that recognition has been given to the role of the Evangelist as a theologian. Luke is not just a reporter but, by his selection, arrangement and interpretation of his traditions, he makes his own contribution to the interpretation of the mission and teachings of Jesus. However, it is equally unfortunate that those scholars — primarily but not solely Professor Conzelmann of Göttingen — who have done most to call our attention to the importance of Luke's role have too often drawn a false dichotomy between history and theology. In what is perhaps the best chapter in the book, ' History or Theology ', Dr Marshall offers a convincing critique of this approach. It is a chapter that should be read by every student engaged in the historical study of the New Testament. In conclusion, he writes, ' Modern research has emphasized that [Luke] was a theologian. The evidence which we have considered has shown that because he was a theologian he had to be a historian. His view of theology led him to write history ' (p. 52).

The following section of the book develops the thesis that ' the central theme in the writings of Luke ' is salvation. It continues the sustained interaction with the views of other scholars and contains many insights quite apart from the specific topic addressed. With respect to the theme Dr Marshall surveys the Gospel and Acts to show the prominence of the motif of salvation. He concludes with an interpretation of Lukan passages that treat the appropriation of salvation by the individual.

One may freely admit the significance for St Luke of ' salvation offered to men '. I am left with the impression, however, that the identification of this as ' the ' theme is Dr Marshall's achievement rather than the Evangelist's, the result of the careful collation of many passages rather than the conclusion imposed by the writing itself. What are the requisites for identifying the central theme of a writer? It would seem that they must include not only the prominence of a motif but also its decisive importance in the structure, unity and distinctive thrust of the work. Furthermore, the answer must satisfy such historical questions as the purpose of the writing and the audience addressed. If I doubt that Dr Marshall's answer has satisfied these requirements, I am equally unsure that my own would prove more persuasive.

E. Earle Ellis New Brunswick

The Obedience of Faith. The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans by Paul S. Minear
SCM Press, 1971. 128 pp. £1.40.

The author of this study takes issue at the outset with most commentators of the epistle to the Romans. Scholars, he claims, have ' followed wrong roads ' and have thus entertained ' faulty conceptions of the situation in Rome, of the resulting reactions of the apostle, and thus of the whole character of the letter ' (p. ix). Minear's thesis is that the entire argument of the epistle is aimed at the situation delineated for us in chapters 14 and 15, especially in the former (*cf.* p. 22), and his interpretation of these chapters is that there were diverse groups within the church at Rome resulting in distinct congregations so separated from one another by disputes that common meetings were impossible and the probability is, he thinks that there were 'forms of Christian community . . . as diverse, and probably also as alien, as the churches of Galatia and those of Judea ' (p. 8). Of these groups or factions there were at least five.

First there were ' the " weak in faith " who condemned the "strong in faith" ' (*ibid.*); second, ' the strong in faith who scorned and despised the weak in faith ' (p. 10); third, ' the doubters ' (p. 12); fourth, ' the weak in faith who did not condemn the streng ' (p. 13); and fifth, ' the strong in faith who did not despise the weak ' (p. 14). Minear considers, therefore, that the epistle is to be understood as organized in relation to these various groups and congregations, and he proceeds to show how the various sections of the epistle are directed to the situation created by this diversity. Paul's argument throughout is aimed at reconciliation. And it should not be overlooked how important a place Paul's projected missionary visit to Spain occupied in this polemic. The success of this visit depended to a large extent on the support of the church at Rome and such support required unity in the bond of peace (cf. pp. 2f.).

One example may be given of the way in which Minear seeks to apply his thesis that each section of the epistle is addressed to a particular faction. He recognizes the difficulty in the case of 12: 1 - 13: 14 in view of the ' generalized nature of the teachings themselves ' (p. 83). Yet a ' bolder answer ', he thinks, is justified. These chapters, in his opinion, ' are a continuation of Paul's dialogue with Group Two in 11.13ff., and a preparation for his appeal to the same Group in 14.1f.' (*ibid.*). The ' evidence of continuity ' rather than of shift in address convinces him of this and then he proceeds to stress the links in the conversation (pp. 83ff.).

In assessing the thesis presented there are some observations.

1. Minear is undoubtedly right in controverting the view of many that the problems of chapters 14 and 15 were unimportant and trivial. Apart from the space devoted to the problems any careful reflection on Paul's teaching in these chapters should evince how far-reaching for faith and the ethic bound up with obedience of faith are the principles propounded by the apostle in these chapters. When we are confronted with similar situations in the church of today we discover the gravity that ensues and the basic importance of the resolution these chapters provide.

2. There is no need to dispute the presence of several house-churches in Rome. 16: 5 speaks of the church in the house of Prisca and Aquila. Although there is not sufficient evidence for Minear's dogmatism for several such congregations, yet it is possible that what was true in the case of Aquila's house could be exemplified in other instances. But the present reviewer considers that evidence for the kind of dissension and division that Minear's thesis demands, dissension that made ' common meetings impossible ' and ' denied a common witness ' (pp. 3, 8) is not to be found. In other words, Minear has accentuated the diversity and its consequences far beyond warrant from the data, and the effect is that his construction betrays an artificiality alien to the grandeur of the themes and of their development in Paul's major epistle.

3. It is true that Paul was sensitive to the situations existing in the churches to which his epistles were addressed. Romans is no exception. But Romans more than any other epistle is controlled by a commanding theological interest in the topics that are basic to and definitive of the Christian faith. However germane to this interest was Paul's resolution of the difficulties dealt with in chapters 14 and 15, Minear's thesis fails to bring to bear upon the interpretation of the epistle an appreciation of the incomparably broader and deeper theological, more specifically soteriological and eschatological, orientation and direction of Paul's thought, so eminently unfolded in this epistle.

John Murray Bonar Bridge

New Testament History by F. F. Bruce
Nelson, 1969. xiii + 434pp. £5.25.

This big volume is one of the most indispensable handbooks for the theological student published in recent years. Admirers of British lucidity and sobriety in biblical criticism have never been disappointed by Professor Bruce, and here again he has treated us to his own speciality of meticulous scholarship, sound judgment, and a delightful style. It is remarkable how a book that is surely well within the grasp of a beginner in New Testament studies can be so full of learned, curious, and illuminating information for the professional scholar.

The first third of the book (pp. 1-144) treats the prehistory of the New Testament period, with chapters on Jewish history from Cyrus to Augustus, Herod and his successors, the Roman province of Judea, the Greek philosophical schools, the high priests, the Jewish parties (separate chapters are devoted to the Essenes as reported on by ancient authors and to the Qumran community), the messianic expectation, and a sketch of Jewish religion at the beginning of the Christian era. A chapter on John the Baptist (pp. 145-154) leads into a study of the ministry and death of Jesus (pp. 155-194). Thereafter the plan of the book follows the narrative of Acts, concluding with three chapters (pp. 349-408) on the fall of Jerusalem and on Christianity in the last decades of the first century.

This history naturally invites comparison with two similar works, Floyd V. Filson's *A New Testament History* (SCM, 1965) and Bo Reicke's *The New Testament Era* (Black, 1969). Bruce treats the background of the New Testament in considerably greater detail than Filson, and is more orientated to events in the Roman Empire: in Filson's section on the early church and Paul, barely two pages are devoted to imperial history, whereas Bruce much more usefully integrates with every stage in the expansion of Christianity the story of contemporary events in Rome and elsewhere. Though Bruce interrupts his narrative from time to time to dwell on the theological significance of some major event (e.g. Chapter 22, ' The Jerusalem Decree '), he never falls into preacher's rhetoric, a weakness which mars many pages of Filson's book. For depth and breadth of coverage the present volume is clearly far superior.

Bo Reicke's plan is different, as his subtitle, ' The World of the Bible from 500 BC to AD 100 ', indicates. His history is not orientated to the New Testament story (Jesus and Paul are mentioned only incidentally at various places), but is largely concerned with the history of Palestine as a whole. One will learn more from him than from Bruce about Ezra and Nehemiah, Herod, Roman provincial administration, Jewish temple ritual, but he sheds very much less light on the New Testament. The fuller documentation by Bruce partially compensates for his necessarily briefer treatment of such topics; though Reicke's book has its advantages, for most of the needs of the New Testament student F. F. Bruce's will undoubtedly be found the most satisfactory.

If there is a weakness in this book, it is that, for the most part, conclusions and not arguments are presented. For many readers this will be no ground of complaint, and it would doubtless not have been as interesting (or short!) a book had the author felt it necessary to defend his conclusions at each point. But on one major question, that of the historical value of the New Testament as source material, there is surprisingly little said. Even Filson's History contains a chapter on the sources. Professor Bruce says in his preface that he is writing ' as a historian, not as a theologian ', and that is perfectly in order, but the historian no less than the theologian has an interest in evaluating the reliability of his documents. On this he will only say, ' We may congratulate ourselves on having such a well-tested and thoroughly analysed body of source-material at our disposal ' (p. 159), with a footnote: ' The New Testament writings were not, of course, designed as historians' source-material, and apart from Luke—Acts are not written in historiographical style; but historians will not be deterred on that account from using them as source-material; nor will they be intimidated by theologians who assure them that their task is impossible and illegitimate.' His stout resistance to *a priori* rejection of the historical worth of the New Testament documents is indisputably justified, but there is a difference between accepting that the New Testament contains literature that may be used as source material for historical reconstruction and treating it as a first-rate historical source that is reliable through and through. The fact that the New Testament documents have been ' well-tested and throughly analysed ' does not carry with it the implication that the attitude to them taken in this volume is the only possible one. There are many attitudes that may be adopted in the middle ground between the extreme scepticism of a Bultmann and an over-ready acceptance of all that the evangelists report, and it would have been helpful to see Professor Bruce's defence of his own position over against some of the middle-of-the-road positions taken up by the majority of scholars.

It can be replied that the fact that by adhering to the accounts of the Gospels and Acts there can be told a coherent and consistent story which can at numerous points be easily dovetailed with external historical evidence is an important argument for the essential reliability of these documents. That is so, and Professor Bruce's book is a splendid demonstration of this argument. But when W. G. Kümmel, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, presented at length his own views with only a passing glance at the views of others, the reviewer in this journal rightly remarked that such a method ' detracts from the book's usefulness as a student's text-book ' (A. C. Thiselton, in *TSFB* 51, Summer 1968, p. 17).

Sometimes one could wish for a little more insight into the historian's mind. How, for instance, do miracle stories strike Professor Bruce — as a historian? Does the report of a virgin birth not excite his interest? And especially, is he satisfied, as a historian, that the changed behaviour of the disciples is adequate evidence for the resurrection of Jesus (p. 195)? What weight does he attach — as a historian — to the narratives concerning the risen Jesus? Does the resurrection of Jesus not deserve, in a history, more than a few lines? If the Christian community really numbered 3,000 on Pentecost, is that not a historical fact worthy of record? Is it adequately evaluated in the statement, ' The disciples' public witness met with widespread acceptance in Jerusalem, and their following increased rapidly ' (p. 205)? How authentic are the speeches of Acts? Peter's temple speech of Acts 3 seems accepted without question on the basis of its Christology (p. 202), and the authenticity of Paul's Areopagus address is argued for (pp. 295f.), but on the other hand Professor Bruce is prepared to allow that ' apologetic interests (may) have dictated the form in which Luke has summarised Paul's defence ' in Acts 24 (p. 338).

Particular points at which further discussion or references to dissentient views would have been helpful are: Professor Brandon's thesis *Jesus and the Zealots* is briefly criticized, but without explicit reference to Brandon (p. 173); there is no reference to the view that only one messiah was expected at Qumran (p. 119); the date of Jesus' birth is not mentioned and to the attendant problem of the census of Luke 2: 2, which bears significantly on Luke's reliability as a historian, only a footnote, offering one possible solution, is devoted (p. 30); the date and destination of Galatians are not discussed, though the Galatians 2 visit to Jerusalem is taken as identical with that of Acts 11, not Acts 15 (p. 254).

There is a good bibliography and four indexes; a Scripture index would have been a desirable addition, and would be perhaps of more service than the index of places.

As will be observed, the criticisms expressed in this review concern only one major point and several rather minor ones. Even if all the criticisms are valid, the book is still a notable achievement, both in its parts and as a whole; no one else could have written a more lucid 20-page sketch of the Qumran community or a more balanced 40 pages on the life and teaching of Jesus, and only Professor Bruce has in fact produced a New Testament history that is as readable as it is reliable.

D. J. A. Clines Sheffield

New Testament Theology, vol. I: The Proclamation of Jesus by Joachim Jeremias, trans. J. Bowden
SCM Press, 1971. xv + 330pp. £3.50.

The name Jeremias has become a household word in the world of New Testament scholarship, and deservedly so. Now after a long and illustrious career, the good Göttingen professor emeritus is in the process of producing what his British publisher rightly calls his ' crowning achievement ': a multi-volume New Testament theology, of which *The Proclamation of Jesus* is volume one. Those already familiar with Jeremias's many articles and monographs, and particularly who have read his *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, The Parables of Jesus, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* and *Abba,* will recognize many of the same features and emphases, though the synthesis of material in this most recent publication is fresh and quite a bit of new data is provided.

In contrast to Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament* and Conzelmann's *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament,* Jeremias views New Testament theology as directly rooted in Jesus' proclamation of the eschatological kingdom (reign) of God. Jeremias' whole first volume, in fact, serves as something of a protest against the widespread Bultmannian habit of considering the theology of the New Testament as the innovative product of Hellenistic Christendom, which can only incidentally and indirectly be related to the convictions of the earliest Aramaic believers and the consciousness of Jesus Himself (though which, in some non-propositional fashion, is to be related to the faith of those earliest believers and of the prophet of Nazareth). Jeremias, therefore, begins with the question, ' How reliable is the tradition of the sayings of Jesus?' And in three very significant chapters he elaborates the thesis that the Bultmannian ' criterion of dissimilarity ' in identifying authentic words of Jesus needs to be supplemented by the further criteria of language and style. Investigating the semitisms of the Synoptic Gospels, the manner of speech employed by Jesus in the Gospels, and some important characteristics of His teaching—employing extensively both form-criticism and first-century Palestinian parallels — Jeremias concludes regarding the basic core of *logia* material: ' In the synoptic tradition it is the inauthenticity, and not the authenticity, of the sayings of Jesus that must be demonstrated ' (p. 37).

Section two begins the theological treatment *per se,* raising the question as to the origin of Jesus' message and where one starts in understanding his proclamation. In five chapters Jeremias develops the thesis that it was through the eschatological preaching of John the Baptist that Jesus' consciousness regarding the coming kingdom of God and his own relationship to the divine programme was born (not directly from John the Baptist, for there are significant differences, but at his baptism by John and in association with the ministry of John) and that Jesus responded positively to this divine call in his ' temptation in the wilderness ', rejecting all contemporary notions of a political messiahship. Section three identifies in four chapters the central theme of the public proclamation of Jesus: the presence of the Spirit of God in His own ministry and the imminent coming of the eschatological kingdom. Contrary to most interpretations of such passages as Luke 17: 20f., Jeremias insists that Jesus' understanding of the kingdom (reign) of God was thoroughly eschatological, not ' realized ' or ' spiritualized '. The whole of Jesus' ministry was to gather the eschatological people of God in preparation for the anticipated soon coming of the eschatological kingdom of God. Section four, in three chapters, discusses the question, ' What did Jesus expect regarding the future?' It concludes, in agreement with ' consistent eschatology ', that Jesus' own thought was exclusively concerned with imminent consummation and that His expectations remained unfulfilled, and yet, in defence of Jesus' authority for the church and of ' proleptic eschatology ', that Jesus acknowledged that God could graciously prolong the time of fulfilment. Thus while Jesus Himself was thoroughly eschatological and expected the imminent coming of the kingdom, the church could remain true to Him in accepting an extended ' period of grace ' during which time sinners could be called to repentance in preparation for the coming eschatological kingdom. Section five, in six chapters, treats the nature of the new people of God called by Jesus to prepare for the coming kingdom: their ' trust which does not allow itself to be dissuaded ' and the implications of this confidence for the various areas of life. Section six, in three chapters, considers Jesus' own consciousness of His person and ministry, arguing that while He thought of Himself as a prophet, He knew Himself to be more than a prophet. He knew Himself to be the ' Bringer of Salvation ', the one who brought ' the dawn of the time of salvation ' and who would be the eschatological ' Son of man ' with the coming of the kingdom, but who now must suffer ' a prophet's fate ' in martyrdom — essential part of a prophet's office, according to the thinking of the day. Section seven concludes with an eleven-page treatment of the resurrection, attempting to discover the core of truth behind the ecclesiastical accretions and suggesting that the resurrection was originally understood as Jesus' enthronement (equivalent to His *parousia*), the resurrection appearances as Christophanies which probably occurred over a number of years and were

later compressed by tradition into forty days, and the appearance to the 500 (1 Cor. 15: 6) as probably the Pentecost outpouring of the Spirit.

Five features, at least, characterize this first volume of Jeremias's *magnum opus* (and, of course, are true of his many other publications as well). In the first place, Jeremias is thoroughly *historical* in his thinking and treatment. This interest was evident as long ago as 1923 when the first parts of his *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu* appeared, and it has been prominent in all of his writings since. His extensive knowledge of first-century Palestinian history, culture, geography and language comes to the fore in the present volume both by way of authenticating the basic reliability of the portrait of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and explicating his teaching and the circumstances of that teaching. This reviewer has always found Jeremias's historical work illuminating and stimulating, even when in disagreement at points and even when Jeremias exceeds the limits of a particular discussion by extraneous excurses (e.g. on the tax- and toll-collectors, p. 110, or on Gehennah, p. 129).

Secondly, Jeremias is thoroughly *critical,* though in his criticism he has accepted not only the methods but also many of the presuppositions of contemporary German higher criticism (which, of course, have permeated most of biblical scholarship). Thus by means of form criticism and redaction criticism he continually endeavours to separate the pre-ecclesiastical and pre-literary ' bed-rock of the tradition ' from the varied literary representations which are ' often redactional and frequently inappropriate '; though he objects strenuously to an ' exaggerated scepticism ' such as he sees in his Bultmannian colleagues and he seeks to authenticate by his criticism the basic reliability of the Gospels' portrayal. Yet, somewhat like the liberals of old, Jeremias drives a wedge between Jesus and the Evangelists' understanding of Jesus, and holds that Jesus is normative for Christian faith but the reinterpretations of the Evangelists are often only historically interesting. Jesus, for Jeremias, spoke only in functional terms and was exclusively eschatological in outlook; the church, on the other hand, thought more ontologically and Christologically as they saw the ' period of grace ' extending, and their understanding became intertwined with that earlier stratum authentically representing Jesus.

To the evangelical, such an approach poses insuperable problems. While the evangelical must deal seriously with the factor of theological interpretation which each of the Gospels exhibits (the subject of redaction criticism), the style, language and form of the various units of Gospel tradition (the subject of form criticism), and the relations between the Gospels in their employment of the various units of Gospel tradition (the subject of source criticism), he is not prepared to assert such a discontinuity between Jesus' teaching and the Evangelists' understanding as Jeremias presupposes and seeks to demonstrate. F. J. A. Hort aptly enunciated the evangelical position when he said: ' Our faith rests first on the Gospel itself, the revelation of God and His redemption in His Only begotten Son, and secondly on the interpretation of that primary Gospel by the Apostles and Apostolic men to whom was Divinely committed the task of applying the revelation of Christ to the thoughts and deeds of their own time. That standard interpretation of theirs was ordained to be for the guidance of the Church in all after ages, in combination with the living guidance of the Spirit ' (*Epistle of St James,* p. ix). Furthermore, it still remains true that the veracity of the Evangelists' report as to the ' basic ' teaching of Jesus is seriously jeopardized by attempts to demonstrate that the Evangelists misinterpreted Jesus' meaning. Certainly the Gospels evidence circumstantial adaptations of Jesus' words and circumstantial applications of Jesus' teachings, so that it may never be possible in any particular intance to be certain that we have the *ipsissima verba.* But without confidence that the Gospels give us the *ipsissima vox* of Jesus *and* a proper interpretation by the Evangelists in the context of their situation, the question of authenticity seems lost.

A third characteristic of Jeremias in his interpretation of Jesus is that he is rigidly *eschatological.* He may sound like an advocate of ' realized ' or of ' inaugurated ' eschatology when he speaks of Jesus as the one who brings ' the dawn of the time of salvation ', but his thought is more in line with ' consistent ' or ' thorough-going ' eschatology in his asserting that the kingdom (reign) of God was for Jesus exclusively an event of the imminent future. In reality, Jeremias's position is more aptly described as ' proleptic ' or ' anticipated ' eschatology, though he personally prefers ' antedonation ' eschatology. But such a restricted view has the effect of forcing all of the evidence into one pattern and rejecting as inauthentic everything that cannot conform. Thus Jeremias concludes, for example, that Luke 17 with its emphasis upon the suddenness of the coming of God's kingdom presents an authentic reminiscence of Jesus' thought but Mark 13 (par.) in its stress on signs preceding that coming belongs to the church; that the mission sayings of Jesus that stress extreme urgency are authentic but those that envision a long interval of time are ecclesiastical misrepresentations; that the core of the eschatological Son of man sayings are authentic but those without the eschatological thrust have been added; and that the *Similitudes of Enoch* (chapters 37-71 of Ethiopic Enoch) are pre-Christian (they support this eschatological interpretation) but the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are post-Christian (they do not), though the external evidence for the two compilations is similar. Jeremias is not prepared to admit a measure of paradox in the teaching of Jesus or a broader category of eschatology which would allow varying emphases in varying contexts. Rather, he rigidly interprets everything in the Gospels by his eschatological norm, and thereby, I believe, warps the evidence. He has a legitimate key for interpretation, undoubtedly, but attempts to use it as a skelcton key to unlock every door. In many cases, unfortunately, he has forced the lock.

Fourthly, Jeremias is *rationalistic.* His treatment of the miracles of Jesus and the resurrection of Jesus is predicated on the assumption that miracles do not happen and therefore almost any explanation for their presence in the records is better than that given by the Gospels themselves. Chapters 10 (miracles) and 25 (Easter) are particularly loaded with such expressions as ' we can at least imagine ', ' it could have been ', ' it may be '. Here he is in complete agreement with Bultmann (admittedly so, p. 89) and classical liberalism. His rationalism likewise asserts itself in his treatment of the person of Jesus, holding, as he does, that Jesus spoke only in functional and eschatological terms, thought of Himself as the ' Bringer of Salvation ' and the coming eschatological ' Son of man ', but was devoid of such an ontological consciousness as we see in the various ecclesiatical strata of the reports. But it is difficult to see why the one who thought of God as uniquely His Father (as Jeremias has taken pains to point out) could not also have thought of Himself as uniquely God's Son, and that with ontological implications. And furthermore, Jeremias errs in asserting that ' Son of God ' was ' completely unknown as a messianic title in Palestinian Judaism ' (p. 258), as 4Q Florilegium on 2 Samuel 7: 14 now indicates.

Finally, despite some things said above, Jeremias must be judged as being basically *constructive.* There is a tone of warmth, of vitality and of reverence in his writing, which is appreciated. But more than that, there is a positive thrust in his work that is based upon depth of research and clarity of thought and that is consciously meant to be helpful. To a great extent, every scholar and his writing must be judged in the context of his day. And in the prevailing climate of opinion today, Jeremias is dominantly constructive. Evangelicals may rightly be disturbed by many of his presuppositions and by certain ways in which he employs his critical methodology. But we are indebted to Jeremias for his strong historical emphasis, his attempt to employ criticism more constructively, and his many individual insights on the New Testament which have often opened whole new areas of thought and appreciation.

Richard N. Longenecker Deerfield, Illinois

IVP/TP Book News

'At all periods of Old Testament history the ancient Hebrews were brought into contact with other nations in the Near East . . .' In these opening words of R. K. Harrison's book *Old Testament Times* (IVP, £2.25) the scope and point of his new work are summed up. The author, already well known for his *Old Testament Introduction*, takes us from Ancient Mesopotamia 100,000 BC through to the period of the Maccabees, ending with a quick look at the Qumran community. On the way he describes the historical and cultural background to each part of the Old Testament, illustrating the story with numerous photographic illustrations. The result is not just a book full of background information about the archaeology of the Near East during the period, but also one that discusses many particular Old Testament historical questions, such as the relationship of the Genesis account of the Flood to the non-biblical accounts, the date of the Exodus, etc.

In the New Testament field a book to look for is *Jesus and the Old Testament* (TP, £2.75) by R. T. France. Most students of the New Testament will have been perplexed at some time or other by the apparently peculiar use of the Old Testament in some parts of the New. Dr France's book, which started life as a PhD thesis for Bristol University, throws light on many difficult questions. For example: when Jesus spoke of His sufferings and resurrection being fulfilment of the Old Testament, what passages had He in mind? What was the significance of His use of the title Son of man? Did He think of Himself as the Isaianic Servant? As well as considering such specific problems — there is also an important discussion of the problems of Mark 13 — the book gives guidance on the wider question of interpreting the Old Testament, on typology and prediction. Last but not least, the book is significant as a contribution to the debate about the reliability of the Gospel tradition. Dr France argues that it is wrong to start with the assumption that the Gospels are unreliable; he claims that his researches show the opposite starting-point to be superior.

Still in the biblical field the appearance of all the *Tyndale Commentaries* in paperback is an event to be welcomed, as is the publication in May of the first commentary on the minor prophets. This is on *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi* (95p paperback, £1.20 casebound) by Joyce Baldwin, who is on the staff of Trinity College, Bristol.

Other recent publications include Derek Kidner's *Hard Sayings* (IVP booklet, 18p) in which he grapples with many of the moral difficulties of the Old Testament, and M. A. Smith's from *Christ to Constantine* (IVP, 75p paperback, £1.50 casebound). J. D. Manton's *Introduction to Theological German* (TP, £1.75) is the only work of of its kind, and it aims to help the person with little or no German who wants to get to grips rapidly with German theological writing.

Of general appeal is J. N. D. Anderson's *Morality, Law and Grace* (TP, 50p paperback, £1.15 casebound). Professor Anderson writes as an expert in law and in comparative religion and Christian theology. He brings his wide knowledge to bear on such basic issues as determinism and free will; should the law be concerned with private morals? Has a Christian the right to impose his views on others? Can there be ethics without religion? And he considers particular questions such as censorship in a permissive society and the Christian's attitude to war and revolution.

Index to issues 61-63

Articles and authors

Book reviews

Printed in England by Green & Co. (Lowestoft) Ltd., Crown Street, Lowestoft.

ture during our occupation. As we develop a participatory community, engaged with oppressed peoples in their struggles, we are drawn ever more deeply to our religious roots—the foundations of our faith, the healing of divine grace. Participation is not something we add to our being. Participation is the root meaning of life redeemed in the divine Word.

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin
Vol. I, No 4. New Series 1978

Church History and the Bible

by Karlfried Froehlich

A native of Germany, educated at the universities of Goettingen and Basel, the Reverend Karlfried Froehlich is Professor of the History of the Early and Medieval Church. After the completion of doctoral studies under Oscar Cullmann, Dr. Froehlich taught New Testament and Church History at Drew University Divinity School. He is the editor of Oscar Cullmann: Vorträge und Aufsätze *(1967) and co-author with Drs. Kee and Young of* Understanding the New Testament *(Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965).*

Inaugural Lecture, February 23, 1977

It seems appropriate that an inaugural address should present some basic methodological reflections about the field of study which, by virtue of my appointment, I have the duty, joy and honor of teaching among you. This expectation is not only a venerable tradition of this venerable institution, but, I am happy to say, constitutes a direct link to the venerable middle ages. In the heyday of the medieval university, the master in theology began his first course of lectures with a *principium*, an inaugural speech of methodological scope. We have dozens of such *principia* preserved in manuscript, written both by well-known theologians and by the many obscure teachers from the 13th through the 16th centuries. Only recently has scholarly interest begun to turn to this body of material which may well present a major clue to the development of the late medieval treatise on biblical hermeneutics. Since all masters had to lecture on the Bible first, the conventional form of the *principium* seems to have been a *laus sacrae scripturae*, a praise of Holy Scripture. I see myself at least in formal contact with this host of academic fathers when I propose as the topic of my reflections "Church History and the Bible."

I.

Church History is a *theological* discipline. It is this not by choice, but by definition. To speak of "church" always implies a theological decision, a theological principle of identification. Specifically implied is a judgment about the limit, nature, purpose, and even the social reality of the phenomenon one regards as "church." In one word: implied is an ecclesiology. Even though today one's ecclesiology may be quite ecumenical, covering a wide, almost infinite range of what one is willing to endorse as "church," the term always reflects a prior commitment to a reality which, from the standpoint of secular society, must appear as "sectarian," however value-free the adjective may be used.

That Church History is a theological discipline, has to be reclaimed today.

When Karl Barth started to rethink the structure of the entire theological enterprise in his *Church Dogmatics* from the angle of the priorities for the church of his day, church history seemed to get a seat in the very back row. The famous quote from vol. I/1 of his *Church Dogmatics* reads:

> So-called church history does not answer a question which must be raised

independently, concerning the Christian talk about God. It is therefore not to be regarded as an independent theological discipline. It is *the* indispensable *auxiliary science* of exegetical, dogmatic, and practical theology.

Of course, no self-respecting intellectual wants to run just an auxiliary enterprise for others, and even if he does, resents being told so. The loud protest of professional church historians has claimed that Barth's devaluation of church history was the inevitable consequence of its theologization. If church history is seen as a *theological* discipline, so it seemed to many, it must needs become the servant of any prevalent dogmatism, the propaganda tool of churches who will want to bend the patient historical facts which can no longer defend themselves, to their sectarian purposes. However, this protest did not just arise from the hurt pride of professionals or from the moral posture of defending a defenseless past against manipulative misuse. It arose from the immense respect for monument and document, for historical evidence and its contingent character, which the age of historicism had taught historians and should have taught theologians as well. This respect had always driven church historians into seeking closer contacts with secular historical scholarship during those decades, in the hope of finding greener pastures of freedom to investigate sources and of "objectivity" in interpreting them—of an objectivity which seemed to be the only appropriate attitude for the one who respected the past.

The inner emigration of church history from the theological disciplines and the concomitant radical secularization of ecclesiastical historiography has become a characteristic feature of the academic scene in America. The American Church History Society is holding its meetings in conjunction with those of the American Historical Association, and even if it were to change this practice, the major option would be joining hands with the American Academy of Religion, one of the most powerful constituents of the Council on the Study of Religion, whose membership is drawn from all settings in which religion is taught as an academic subject. Church historians accordingly tend to define their work in terms of a descriptive science, for which any theological commitment has at best an extra-curricular function. It is even more likely to be regarded as forcing one's discipline into a circle of dogmatic chronicle where everything is self-explanatory, or as obscuring the much more important keys to its interpretation which are offered by social history, psycho-history, or the history of culture. Church historians are uneasy with their task in this company and often enough prefer to teach the "history of Christianity" or other, more neutral and objective titles. Much of this tendency no doubt is due to the peculiar sociology of academe in America which, in its supremely tolerant approach to *all* subject matter, including religion, as a possible subject for scientific investigation, has a distinct advantage over the traditional framework of central Europe where theological schools still hold the first place among the "faculties" of a university while in the public mind the very place of anything that smells of religion has long since become questionable and plainly anachronistic.

It is this situation of polite invitational

peer pressure to fill a predetermined slot that makes it necessary to reclaim church history as a theological discipline. Respect for the monument and document, respect for evidence is certainly an irrevocable heritage of the era of historicism. But respect is not just the result, it is the presupposition of a fruitful relationship, the precondition for a fair and equitable encounter between engaged and engaging partners.

It must be remembered that Karl Barth's dictum about church history as an auxiliary science was not meant to be a defamation of a reputable branch of learning. It was meant as an attack on the oppressive weight of the historical sciences, quite specifically against the imperialism of a church history from whose pontifications in the name of scientific method there seemed to be no recourse in the church or in the other fields of academic theology. It was an attempt to restore at least some fair balance out of respect for the church and its integrity, and out of the realization that even in history method does not in itself assure the knowledge of truth.

Thus, to speak of church history as a *theological* discipline, despite all the dangers, is not just a predicament. In the face of the ever-present threat of an imperialism of historical scholarship in a scientific age it is also a blessing which saves the church historians a great deal of unfruitful apologetic, by giving his dialogue with the past a necessary place and focus and a primary audience within a much wider potential range of people who might want or find it necessary to listen. Obviously, historians wish to know "wie es eigentlich gewesen" (Ranke's phrase), what has actually happened, but they want to know it *in a perspective*, as Father Georges Florovsky once put it. "Commitment is a token of freedom, a prerequisite of responsiveness."

2.

Church history is also a historical discipline. It is part of the far more comprehensive enterprise of historical study, and again it is this not by choice but by definition. As church *history* its material participates in the universal scope of the totality of the humanly experienced past which is properly subjected to investigation by the critical methods developed in this particular brand of knowledge.

Thus, church history cannot claim a special category of holy history which would not be open to investigation by historical criticism. Some thirty-five years ago, Oscar Cullmann re-introduced the term "Heilsgeschichte" in the theological debate. He never understood *Heilsgeschichte* as describing a group of specially elevated, inherently sacred events whose nature is inaccessible to the general historian's mind. Rather, *Heilsgeschichte* describes a faith judgment on the coherence of specific events within the scope of universal history, which judgment *is* traceable, and can be traced, by historical-critical analysis of the evidence, beginning with the New Testament. With all historical disciplines church history shares fully not only the potential but also the problems of the historical-critical method about whose limits much has been written since Croce, Collingwood, and Löwith. There can also be no difference in the kind of subject matter. Church history's subject is always part of universal history, of the totality of humanly experienced past, event as well as interpreta-

tion. Regardless of what exact segment church history will have to treat, it is and remains part and parcel of this totality. This has consequences. For the church historian to emigrate from the theological disciplines does not mean that the task will ever be anything less than the grasping of this totality. If there is no sacred corner for church history, there is no sacred corner for any other kind of history either. All such unassailable corners are eventually passed by as utterly irrelevant in the historical process of life, if they do not face up to the challenge of the "horizon of universal history" (Pannenberg), the "*whole amplitude* of human concerns" (Florovsky).

That church history is a historical discipline has to be repeated today with unequivocal clarity. We experience much pious romanticism in churches, ecclesiastical bodies, and Christian individuals. It seems that about any plausible account of church history by any properly endorsed expert in pulpit or teaching chair can be and is being mistaken for that history itself and serves as sectarian self-justification or as the reenforcement of communal prejudice, particularly when it comes in the reassuring garb of modern scientific jargon. Today, the historicizing of myth is perhaps a greater danger than the mythicizing of history has ever been, and pious fraud in this regard is often hard to detect in a community, Christian or not, which is struggling for self-identity and a definable place in a pluralistic society.

In the years around the second World War, several students of Karl Barth in Germany took Barth's definition of church history as an auxiliary science and applied it rigorously to the task of separating right from wrong in the church struggle and its aftermath. Church history was relevant only insofar as it helped to separate the sheep from the goats. It had become a "decisional," an existential discipline. Such an application may have its relative right in this and other times of crisis. But it only underscores the precarious position of an "auxiliary science," a "Hilfswissenschaft," and its modern protestant proponents are seldom aware of the closeness to the attitude of Cardinal Manning who hailed the decrees of the First Vatican Council as the much needed "victory of dogma over history."

Against any such imperialism of dogma and present ephemeral need it is necessary to hold the fact that church history is by definition a historical discipline which remains responsible for the totality of the humanly experienced past, not just for any convenient segment. In this context, the legitimate call of history may come through not so much by listening to the "engaged" historians of our time who make no apology for their standpoint because everybody has one anyway. It may come through, more importantly, by hearing those less fervent voices of the quiet workers who are carrying on the great legacy of historicism in their application of the historical-critical methods to the production of critical editions, the correction of historical detail, the retracing of the biographical steps of this or that seemingly obscure figure. As a matter of fact, every good historian has started somewhere in this kind of terrain. The church historian can spare him- or herself considerable trouble in constructing a plausible argument if he or she keeps close to results and procedures of a lot of dull, but solid scholarship.

Looking once more at Karl Barth's controversial dictum, we should point out that Barth in fact acknowledged the importance of historical method and critical research. Church history, he said, is *the* indispensable auxiliary science for all other aspects of the theological enterprise. This can only mean that he presupposed its use without any question. On this point, times may have changed. Against the pious ostracism of history rampant in our time we may have to spell out again the absolute requirement of sober historical research as the basis for any ever so relevant approach to church history. There is no shortcut to relevance.

Of course, there can be no doubt that the discipline of history itself has fallen on evil days: not in terms of output or of manpower tied down by it in academe, but in terms of its place in the public consciousness. The posture of the historian as a scientist has quite naturally led to the demand for "scientific proof" in history, and no subsequent disclaimer that there really is no presuppositionless, objective history could ward off the resulting confusion, when historians failed to deliver the original promise. For many people, history has become too difficult and too unprofitable to get excited about. It is no longer fiction but it is not science either. The spectacular rise of structuralism in recent years may be a good indication of this general mood: for its approach to reality it no longer uses a historical model with all the concomitant hermeneutic ambiguity, but a linguistic one. Whatever the value of the movement may be, it seems today to satisfy better than the historical disciplines the hunger for scientific or pseudoscientific method in the mind of the time. History is in a deep crisis of meaning.

But to speak of church history as a *historical* discipline is not just a predicament. In the face of the ever increasing tendency to use history for apologetics, to ride it as an easy vehicle to pious relevance, it is a blessing to be confronted with the unpredictable otherness of the historical past such as critical and honest scholarship encounters it. To do church history in terms of confronting humanly experienced past in its givenness holds out the promise of something really *new*, of seeing really *new* light, of becoming open to truly *new* horizons, of experiencing change in ourselves, precisely because we cannot change the past. History itself in its inexhaustible universal horizon is the given, and as such the best dialogue partner to help us discover that life never needs to be dull.

3.

Both as a theological and a historical discipline church history has to do with the Bible: As a *theological* discipline because church and Bible belong inextricably together. One of the fundamental tenets of the ecclesiology of the Reformers was that there can be no church without the Bible as the central witness to the Word of God in Jesus Christ. On the other hand, one of the fundamental results of the modern ecclesiological debate in the ecumenical context has been the insight that there is no Bible without the Church—the Church which received the apostolic witness, selected the canon, and gave the biblical witness unity by its interpretation. As a *historical* discipline, church history has to do with the Bible

because church history cannot be entered at any arbitrary point. It is unalterably oriented toward a fixed point, the primary document of which is the New Testament and its interpretative annexation of the Old. Thus, from both sides, the theological and the historical, the task of reflecting on the relationship of church history and the Bible is an intrinsic methodological necessity.

It seems to me that the major contribution to this task in recent decades has come from Gerhard Ebeling, now of Zürich, Switzerland, and it may be appropriate to mark an anniversary today. It was 30 years ago almost to the day that Gerhard Ebeling delivered his inaugural lecture as a *Privatdozent* in the field of church history at Tübingen University. The title of his essay was: "Church History As the History of the Exposition of Holy Scripture."

Ebeling proceeded by first analyzing the place of church history in the theological enterprise, stressing like Barth (but without the note of an auxiliary science) the interdependence of all of its branches since the advent of a pervasive critical methodology. He then characterized three conceptions of church history—the Catholic, the enthusiastic, and the one represented by the Reformers—as an outgrowth of different understandings of the relation between church and history, squarely placing his own formula in the line of the Reformers. However, he found a difficulty with even the Reformers' stance in their lack of a clear definition of the relation due to their *ecclesiological* distinction between "visible" and "invisible" church. His own formula was then not meant to simply tie church history to the discernible manifestations of the concrete word of the Bible, or to any speculative history of the "Word of God." Particularly the former point has often been overlooked. For Ebeling, church history was not just Bible history, but the extremely complicated history of a self-interpreting and an interpreted Bible. In the third part, Ebeling spelled out the help he expected from the formula: It would assist in delimiting the exact province of church history, it would help define its nature in terms of the ongoing stream of traditioning throughout the centuries, and it would determine its theological character (in good Barthian terms) as "the radical critical destruction" of tradition as a barrier instead of a pointer to Christ.

The context in which the proposal has to be seen was no doubt Karl Barth's theology of the Word of God, and the rise of the hermeneutical question in New Testament exegesis which owed much to Barth's impulse. Particularly in Barthian circles, the enthusiasm for the Ebeling thesis was considerable. Ebeling had not found it necessary in his lecture to touch on biblical hermeneutics directly, repudiating an understanding of the Bible without history. As a matter of fact, the hermeneutical situation at the front seemed to be far beyond such concerns for a student of Rudolf Bultmann. The exciting thing for his readers was that he now seemed to fight an understanding of church history without the Bible in the framework of a historical-critical approach to both. Thus his title (and often no more than that) was read as a program asking for a new method in historiography: "Auslengungsgeschichte," the history of the exposition of Scripture. At the First Patristic Conference at Oxford in 1955, two young church historians, David Lerch and Lukas Vischer, presented an outline of how such a "discipline" might function. It is interesting that there is no reference to Ebeling in their paper. This suggests that different interests were riding the crest of the wave. Soon after this initiative, two new monograph series started to be published in the new field: "Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese" and "Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik," but again without Ebeling among the editors. Lerch and Vischer had argued as follows: By understanding a particular interpretation as part of a history-of-exegesis process, the discipline on the one hand could shed light on the exegesis of the text itself; on the other hand, it could open up ways into a largely unexplored area of primary materials in the commentary literature of all centuries, and it could also be of corrective value in the history of theology, where the quest for "immanent development" and "influences" dominated too much. It could finally open a new hermeneutical vista on the Bible itself: "The history-of-exegesis material becomes a mirror of the mystery which the text itself is witnessing to."

While the (otherwise Barthian) sentence is deficient in failing to include the history of possible distortions of the text, I have become convinced myself that historical "understanding" of a Biblical text cannot stop with the elucidation of its prehistory and of its historical "Sitz im Leben," with its focus on the intention of the author. Understanding must take into account the text's post-history as the paradigm of the text's own historicity, i.e., as the way in which the text itself can function as a source of human self-interpretation in a variety of contexts, and thus, through its historical interpretations, is participating in the shaping of life. I still regard making accessible the sources of early and medieval exegesis as an enterprise well worth my own time and effort as a scholar. But I have become aware that more than the biblical exegetes who all too often have their very restricted agenda of squeezing the text for meaning, it is art historians, literary historians, political scientists, and church historians who want and know how to read these materials as sources.

4.

Thirty years after the initial event it seems wise to assess the situation. For this purpose I have found helpful a review article on the Ebeling thesis by Friedrich De Boor, published in 1972, and a 1971 issue of the journal, "Verkündigung und Forschung," with contributions by younger church historians such as Wolf Dieter Hauschild, Gustav Adolf Benrath, and Klaus Scholder, who survey the field of the history of exegesis. The reviewers agree in their basic impression that the results of work in the new discipline have been disappointing and have not fulfilled the high expectations of the early years. Exegesis itself did not profit much, since it has not been clear for exegetes studying the history of biblical interpretations what exactly they could and should be looking for in the "pre-critical" materials. The commentaries of the fathers with their own rich and varied agendas did not answer the precise critical questions that were raised, and the tracing of random texts in their history of exposition yielded at best interesting details and the impression of a bewildering zig-zag course. The same impression

of a certain help- and aimlessness prevails when one uses the first recent commentary on a biblical book which, by design, includes sections on the history of exegesis, Brevard Childs' *Book of Exodus* (1974). The history-of-exegesis sections, while presenting most interesting material from Jewish and Christian sources, look somewhat contrived and respond to the requirements of a principle more than to an organic need. In fact, Childs wants to reeducate scholarly and pastoral exegetes whose training he thinks has rendered them incapable of making sense of pre-critical materials so that these could in a meaningful way inform the living interpretation of the Bible in the church today. I find the intention highly laudable and the implicit encouragement to biblical scholars to become church historians existentially appealing. But good intentions are no assurance of success. The church historian will have to remain doubtful of the value of random selections of sources which can hardly provide a plausible developmental picture. He will have to ask himself, however, how much more would in fact be needed. Perhaps this would differ with every passage. But if no solid critical attempt is made to sort out the diffuse material, the developmental organization can hardly hide the fact that we have here no more than a modern *catena*. Of course, *catenae* are most interesting sources if one knows how to read them, but to teach this reading skill was supposedly the purpose, not the presupposition of this commentary. I personally think that without much more detailed study independent of the production of commentaries and without effective teamwork similar single-handed enterprises have little chance of success, particularly when an exegete is doing the whole job. In the meantime, the value of such efforts, however limited, for a new generation of exegetes may lie exactly in the confrontation with strikingly different patterns of exegetical thought and practice which have a logic of their own, and in the timely warning that historical method must lead into ever increasing contacts with other disciplines rather than to an ever greater concentration on a restricted specialty.

Historians of doctrine or of theology who have contributed to the history of exegesis seem to have achieved somewhat better results. Yet here, too, the overall value of the work is judged to be rather limited. No really new aspects have come to light, though individual insights have been deepened and guesses have been corrected. Dissatisfaction seems to center on various diachronic attempts to trace the history of a passage through the centuries. The success, it is maintained, depends entirely on the selection of a good passage, one which *has made* history rather than just *having* one. But who would have known that Prov. 8:22-25 was the touchstone of the Nicene controversy on the Arian side? And how *can* one know? On the other hand, in cases which would have seemed logical choices, the outcome has been quite unexpected or disappointing, as in one case where the conclusion of a thorough study on Rom. 13 was that the exegetical literature contributed little or nothing to the formation of medieval political theory and ethics. The reviewers find this hit-and-miss game distressing. I must confess that I am more optimistic here. In his delightful 1964 presidential address on "Theodosius' Horse," the church historian Albert Outler said: "Every segment of the human maze sprawls past the boundaries of reason and marches with infinity." What we need first is a knowledge of the material regardless of its aimed usefulness, inroads into the vast maze the coherence of which we can only guess. The surprises in the field are normal for work in relatively unknown sources, and much initial effort has to be wasted as long as there is no glimpse of a pattern as yet. It is the cumulative effect of surprises that removes surprise and will make a surer approach possible. We may still need quite a number of less successful studies tracing the history of specific texts as well as the underlying history of hermeneutics before we will really know what questions to ask and how to make selections.

Finally, despite positive response to Ebeling's thesis, there seems to be no comprehensive attempt anywhere to write church history from the angle of the history of the exposition of Scripture. Ebeling himself, one author noted, has never tackled the task. Hauschild frankly doubts the potential of the Ebeling thesis as a historiographic device: Ebeling's program, he writes, "has not produced a corresponding treatment of the history and doctrine of the Ancient Church, because this would even hardly have been possible." I am still wondering about this flat denial of historiographic relevance for the thesis. Is it the last word? Could such a treatment be tried? Should it?

Early critics have charged, and the meager results of the more recent work have reenforced the impression that Ebeling's thesis cannot stand unrevised today. His definition was "too narrow." The history of the exposition of scripture does not yet make church history. The history of the *means* by which God calls together his people is no surrogate for the history of this people. On the other hand, Ebeling's understanding of "exposition" as including the historical expression of Christian life in many forms has been criticized as being much "too wide." It "blurs the contours," leads into limitlessness and allows for no clear principle of selection any more. Even De Boor who is generally sympathetic toward Ebeling's stance regards "all attempts to substitute the history of hermeneutics or of the exposition of scripture for church history or the history of doctrine . . . as an error."

5.

One critic, Hauschild, at least allows the possibility that this may not be all Ebeling's fault. Contrary to the use some enthusiasts have made of his slogan for *their* agenda, Ebeling's title did not propose a clear definition of church history in identity terms. The English translation in the volume of his essays: "Church History *Is* the History of the Exposition of Holy Scripture," if it is not a typographical error, is a mistranslation of the German: "Kirchengeschichte *als* Geschichte der Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift." Hauschild suggests that rather than being read as the charter of a new discipline or a program for church history writing, Ebeling's definition should be seen as the "interpretive horizon," the *Deutehorizont*, within which church history can be properly understood. Not a developmental history of exposition, but the continuous event of such interpretation is what Ebeling drew attention to.

If Hauschild is correct, then Ebeling's start, despite all the interest in a theological foundation, may well have been

the *history* side of church history. History was the basic given, the proper subject matter to be understood; history in its widest sense as the sum of the humanly experienced past, yet in a historical perspective. And Ebeling's proposal may then have been to approach this vast realm of the given with the ordering question of the manifold encounter with the Bible, a historical phenomenon itself; an encounter which is undeniable for most of Western history and can serve as the basic principle of selection. Church history as the history of the exposition of scripture would then not start with a concept of the *church*, however defined theologically or sociologically, a church whose story could be traced just under the aspect of its carrying the biblical message. Nor would it start with the *Bible*, either as the seed for the story of a growth process or as a supra-historical norm dividing history at any given crossection into legitimate and illegitimate events. Church history would have to start with history in its widest possible sense. We remember the charge by critics that Ebeling cast the net too wide, that the limits of a manageable discipline were blurred. But this is precisely the point: *Anything* in Western culture could be the start for church historical concern. The limit is set solely by the direct or indirect encounter with the historical scriptures, presupposed or suspected in a specific case. The revolutionary aspect of Ebeling's thesis was that it drew attention to an interpretive horizon in Western history which historians so far had no use for: the immense power of biblical language (understood or misunderstood) that not only shapes now but has shaped a great deal of human life and action in a decisive manner.

It is my opinion that such an approach does hold considerable historiographic potential. It may not lead (except marginally) to diachronic histories of the exegesis of particular passages by themselves, nor to a history of hermeneutics, but, using partial results of both, it could encourage a style of history writing that would expose this normative power of the biblical language not only as a post-factum reflection or rationalization, but also as the historical start for thought and action.

Let me give an example. I think that the early history of Mariology, the devotion to the Virgin Mary, may be written as a history of biblical interpretation. As far as we can tell, there are no early independent sources of information about Mary in second century Christianity except what we find reflected in the canonical gospels and writings. Therefore, all of the later tenets of mariological doctrine must be somehow related to the interpretation, under the impact of other historical forces, of the hints to Jesus' mother which we have there. This applies already to the creation of the earliest writing with an independent interest in Mary, the apocryphal "*Protevangelium of James*." From the late second century on, its stories about Mary's childhood and Jesus' birth set the pace for a growing veneration of Mary as well as for specific features of Marian doctrine. But the *Protevangelium* itself should be understood as a pious reflection upon the slim biblical basis. According to the most recent critical editor and interpreter, the author's method was to enrich the canonical birth stories by a deep and devout imagination nourished everywhere by biblical types and allusions, but not by independent sources.

Here we find already the concept of Mary's virginity in giving birth and after birth, both likely to be expansions of the meaning of the title "virgin" in Mt. 1:27 (quoting Isa. 7:14) and Lk. 1:32, where it refers to a virginal conception only. To support this particular expansion, Jesus' brothers who are mentioned in the gospels, are declared to be the sons of Joseph's former marriage, a standard explanation which (on the basis of a specific interpretation of Lk. 1:34) was later replaced by Jerome. It seems easy to trace the late tradition of Mary's house in Ephesus which even affects tourist traffic today to an imaginative combination of Jesus' word on the cross: "Woman, behold your son" (Jn. 19:27) with the assumed johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the tradition of this John's later residence in Ephesus. After all, Jn. 19:28 says that the disciple took her "into his own." But even the unfavorable details about Mary which Origen quotes from the pagan, Celsus, are traceable, it seems to me, to interpretations of the canonical basis of the *Protevangelium*. Jesus' illegitimate birth from a soldier named Panthera, while perhaps reflecting early Jewish polemics, in fact interprets the scriptural account of the virgin birth. The portrayal of Mary as a poor peasant girl rests on Celsus' understanding of Nazareth as a small Jewish village, her "spinning for hire" seems to be an unfriendly reading of the skills the *Protevangelium* attributes to her, just as the emphasis on Mary as a "nobody" may polemicize against the same hook's legend of her noble, wealthy, and well-known family background.

To be sure, mariology is an example from the history of Christian thought and doctrine where the connections to the biblical language can be most easily seen. But it would be equally possible to investigate other historical phenomena from this angle: a movement such as early Franciscanism, a political event such as a medieval tyrannicide, a work of Romanesque art, a group of pieces of early English vernacular literature. As a matter of fact, art historians and literary historians seem to have felt the need to get into church history in the horizon of a history of biblical interpretation long before church historians have been awakening to its potential.

If the history of the exposition of scripture is suggested as no more than the "interpretive horizon" for church history, it need not be the only historiographic device in the field. Other approaches would remain equally valid and must constantly be tried. All of them are partial and provisional and remind us that it is in the nature of history as a given that it presents its understanding as a never ending task. Those who expected the Ebeling thesis to provide a universal key expected too much. In fact, they probably misread his argument. What should be clear, however, is that the concrete form of historiography which writes history from the angle of the history of biblical exposition does have a place in historical studies and will therefore have a future in church history, notwithstanding its problems of scope and method and the justified criticism of its results to date.

6.

Our theme was: Church history and the Bible. There was once a time, when church history reigned as queen among the theological disciplines. For Harnack, biblical studies were part of church

history, and theology was in the category of belles-lettres.

There was another time when systematic theology wore the crown. For Karl Barth and many of his friends, church history was an auxiliary science, and exegesis appeared in small print in the *Church Dogmatics*.

There was still another time when biblical studies seemed to be queen. Bultmann saw theology as part of the hermeneutical task of interpreting the Bible, and critical history was the tool. Who will be next? Which queen will be elected? Let us face it. Ours is no time for royalty. There will no longer be queens. As in so many other branches of knowledge all parts of the theological enterprise have become so interlocked, so interdependent that the lines are drawn mainly for the division of labor. Despite the stubbornness of our structures, we have no other choice but to cross lines, to become "dialogical" in our professional work. Other disciplines in the theological community may already be far advanced in the experience of this mode of existence. Church history still has a long way to go in order to be truly itself in this dialogical situation. We spoke of the dilemma of the church historian. On the one hand, there is the constant temptation of inner emigration which often hampers the dialogue with his theological peers. On the other hand there is the commitment to a "sectarian" stance in the eyes of the other historical disciplines which leaves him as somewhat of a stranger in the dialogue with them.

I think that on this long way the Ebeling thesis can assume a significant role. It seems to have the advantage of focusing the discipline's attention on a central point. Within the theological disciplines all dialogue has an open or hidden point of reference, the dialogue with the Bible as the primary "document" of the Christian faith. To say this is no endorsement of a hierarchical curricular sequence of "Bible and Church History." Rather, church history has as much to do with the Bible as systematic or practical theology and as the academic discipline of biblical studies. To see church history in the interpretive horizon of the history of the exposition of scripture seems a proper answer to the challenge of this situation. But as an interpretive horizon it also provides the distinctly historical basis for the dialogue with the other historical sciences. I regard doing church history in this way as a singular opportunity for the field in which I have chosen to teach to find its valid place as a historical science among the theological disciplines, but also to contribute in the ongoing dialogue with the historical disciplines outside the seminary something of the very essence of my and of any theological discipline.

I Was Baptized Once, But What Happened?

Sermon by Bryant M. Kirkland

Since 1960, the Rev. Bryant M. Kirkland has been minister at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City. A native of New Jersey and an alumnus of Wheaton College and Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Kirkland has received honorary degrees from a number of colleges and universities. He is a visiting lecturer in Preaching at Princeton as well as President of the Board of Trustees.

There has been an increasing number of infant and adult baptisms in The Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church. There are two reasons for this growth. One is a general deepening of the spiritual life of the congregation. The other cause has been a rethinking of the meaning of the ceremony and a willingness by many to participate publicly to discover the richness of the experience. This has applied equally to parents bringing their children and to mature adults receiving baptism for the first time in the circle of encouraging friends.

But many of us do not remember the event of our own baptism, even though our parents and grandparents will never forget the feelings of love they had at that time. All we may remember of the occasion is what we have been told during intervening years. Naturally, as a result, our own baptismal experience does not loom large in our thinking until we ourselves present children for dedication or have the privilege of serving as a sponsor to the child of a friend. However, at this point you may be asking yourself, what is the relevance of the subject of baptism to me in the middle of all my real problems? The answer is that it may offer a clue to you for something spiritual which may be missing in your life, something wistful in your private thinking, something flat in your usual zest and enthusiasm. Baptism may be understood afresh as the first step in a lifetime of spiritual adventure.

The use of water in ceremonial baptismal washings is an ancient symbol of deep meaning in many cultures throughout the world. It is a graphic, tactile and visual symbol of commitment, cleansing, and commencement of a new inner life. Its power of remembrance lies in the delightful body response to a drink of cool water and to the refreshing toning which follows bathing and hand-washing. The difficulty today, however, is that the symbol and its rich meanings have been divided up into various emphases and the rite has been separated from its value as a lifelong process of growth.

The aspect of commitment is what the parents feel in their joy and wonder as they dedicate the miracle of a new life to God. They claim His covenant promise to bless and guide them as a family and not just as individuals in solitary isolation. Those who stress adult baptism tend to emphasize the cleansing symbol of the washing away of recognized sins. Of course, infants cannot express such responsibility and who knows what is their inner consciousness. The Christian friends who practice total immersion highlight still another aspect of the baptismal cere-

Reprinted for private circulation from
THE JOURNAL OF RELIGION, Vol. XXI, No. 4, October, 1941
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

NEW PERSPECTIVES IN CHURCH HISTORY

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

WE ARE in great need of a fairly thorough reorientation in our study of the history of Christianity. That is the next and urgent task in this important field. As traditionally presented by most historians, what is generally termed church history gives a distorted view of the course of Christianity and of its place in the human scene. What is required, and required by the facts, is a change of focus. The change of focus which is demanded is so radical as to be almost revolutionary. It must take three forms. First, it must broaden the view of the student in such fashion as to embrace the entire history of Christianity rather than confine itself only to the Christian church. Second, from the very beginning, instead of being centered upon the Occident and especially upon Europe, the field of vision must be made to take in all the human race so that in each period Christianity is viewed as belonging to the ongoing stream of the history, not of one segment of the human race, but of all mankind. Third, as an important corollary of the second alteration in perspective, much greater emphasis must be placed on the last four centuries and especially on the past century and a half, for, seen against the background of the world as a whole, it will become apparent that Christianity has been a growing, rather than a waning, force in human history. May we take up these points one by one and develop them a little more at length?

I

The first needed change in focus, a transition from the history of the Christian church to the history of Christianity, does not, fortunately, require much elaboration for many are seeing its importance. No objectively minded scholar would wish to cease to study the development of the church. It is chiefly through

the church that Christianity has been transmitted from generation to generation. The church is in large part the creation of Christianity. Yet Christianity and the church are not identical. The church as the historian must describe it is an institution or, rather, a number of institutions. To center one's attention upon an institution, even though not confining one's self entirely to it, is to run the risk of separating it from its environment. Moreover, Christianity has had effects quite outside the church itself. A comprehensive history of Christianity must include every phase of the impact of that faith upon mankind. It must embrace the origin and development of the churches as institutions, their forms of organization, their leaders, their ideals, their controversies, their rise, and their development. It must give an account of the course of the thought of Christians about their faith—what is usually called the history of Christian doctrine. It must describe the changing forms of Christian worship, the manner in which Christians, either as communities or as individuals, have sought to draw near to God, to receive his grace, and to praise and honor him. It must take account of the impact of Christianity upon individuals, of the alterations, either sudden or gradual, which have been wrought in their inner lives and their conduct. It must endeavor to determine the effect of Christianity upon its environment, not only in shaping the churches, their beliefs, and their worship, but also outside the churches—art, music, literature, education, philosophy, political and social institutions, economics, and all the other phases of human civilization. So, too, the history of Christianity must attempt to describe the effect of the environment upon the faith itself.

We must not be led by this brief outline, so quickly sketched, to the easy assumption that the history of Christianity, viewed in this comprehensive way, can be readily written. To compass the enormous literature, even for some of the phases of the story, is a task to appall the stoutest hearts and to absorb the full powers of first-class minds. It is not a light undertaking to ar-

rive at a definition of Christianity which will be accepted by all scholars. It is still more difficult, when once a passably admissible description is achieved, to determine with accuracy either the effect of Christianity upon its environment or the effect of the environment upon Christianity. Yet the program, difficult though it may be and impossible of completion in any final or unchallengeable form, must be embarked upon if Christianity and its place in human history are really to be understood.

II

The second suggested change, the placing of the study of the history of Christianity against a geographical background as inclusive as the human race, is more novel than the first and therefore demands a somewhat greater amplification. Christianity professes to be a universal religion. It claims to have a message for all men. From its first century it has had imbedded in its revered original documents a commission to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . . . , teaching them to observe all things" which its founder had commanded. It has been a missionary religion. While the majority of its adherents have not thought in terms of all mankind, in theory its leaders have often claimed to do so, and from time to time individuals and minorities have dreamed in world-wide terms and have endeavored to make their dreams effective. If the record of Christianity is to be true to the genius of that faith and is to be correctly appraised, in every period it must be seen against the background of all the globe. Any other procedure is a grotesque, even though unintentional, distortion of the picture. All too frequently historians, as well as the ordinary run of folk, have been guilty of myopia. Or, to change the metaphor, they have looked at the passing panorama of the history of Christianity through the wrong end of the telescope. They have so centered their attention upon one section of the world or upon the church as an institution that they have ignored other parts of the world or human culture outside the church. Yet there can be no true

estimate of the effect of Christianity upon its environment unless at every stage in its history Christianity and the impress which it makes upon humanity are viewed in terms of all the race. Until this is done we cannot know whether at any one time or over its course as a whole Christianity is a waning or a growing factor in the life of the world.

Even a brief survey of facts which are, or should be, well known may make clear the importance of this perspective. Historians rightly esteem as a notable achievement the gaining by Christianity in its first five centuries of the professed adherence of the peoples of the Roman Empire. Yet in speaking of that accomplishment they usually ignore the fact that the Roman Empire embraced only one of the cultural areas of mankind. To be sure, during the first two centuries of the Christian Era the Roman Empire may have been the most populous of these areas. By winning that Empire, moreover, Christianity became an integral part of the Greco-Roman world and of the cultural stream which issued from it into the later Europe. However, the Roman Empire was by no means the only cultural center of the time. The Persian Empire was its powerful and deadly rival. India, while politically disunited, was the scene of a pulsing life from which during these first five Christian centuries were issuing influences through merchants and colonists, and especially through Hinduism and Buddhism, which were affecting wider areas than were being touched by Rome or by Christianity. Southeastern, central, and eastern Asia and some of the islands of the Malay Archipelago were feeling the impact of Indian life and thought. During the first two centuries the Chinese Empire, then under the powerful Han dynasty, attained an extent about equal to that of the Roman Empire, and in population, wealth, and culture was probably not far behind the Mediterranean world. Confucianism, in full vigor and supported by the Han emperors, was becoming the prevailing philosophy of the Chinese Empire, the basis of its unity.

In the period covered by the thousand years between A.D. 500

and A.D. 1500, Christianity was the dominant faith only in parts of Europe and in a few sections in western Asia. Beginning with the seventh century it lost much of northern Africa and western Asia to Islam. It achieved a greater territorial extent than in the first five centuries, but throughout most of the vast areas in Asia and Africa over which it was carried it was represented by minorities. Only in western Europe did it enter as a major ingredient into a rising new culture. Christianity persisted in the wealthy Byzantine heir of the Greco-Roman world, but that heir had nothing like the strength of its parentage and was of waning importance. Captured by its charm and vigor, modern Occidental scholars, inheritors of its culture, tend to emphasize medieval western Europe and to see in it an apex of the influence of Christianity. Yet from the standpoint of the contemporary human scene as a whole medieval western Europe was not so notable an achievement of Christianity as had been the winning of the Roman Empire by that faith. In wealth and political importance, the western Europe of the Middle Ages, when compared with the great empires of the period, was much less prominent than the Roman Empire had been in its day. In wealth and in areas ruled, Charlemagne and the Holy Roman emperors were minor princes in comparison with their contemporaries, the T'ang and Sung emperors of China, the greatest of the caliphs, or the Mongol emperors. In culture, when contrasted with the T'ang and Sung emperors, they were barbarians.

It is hard for us of the modern age, accustomed to the dominance of western European peoples, to realize that in the Middle Ages, from the standpoint of the world as a whole, western Europe counted for very little. Its culture had much that was creative and admirable. Christianity entered more largely into its warp and woof than into that of the Greco-Roman world. Yet, except for its commercial and missionary outposts in Asia, far less extensive than those of the Moslem Arab world, the western Europe of the Middle Ages was confined to the western end of the Euro-Asiatic continent. To the objective appraisal of

the hypothetical visitor from Mars making a tour of the world of that era it would presumably have been on the fringes of civilization and of quite secondary importance. The Martian might have been interested in the wide geographical extension of Christianity—in the fourteenth century greater than that of any other religion—but Islam, Buddhism, and Confucianism would probably have appeared to him more strategically located in the powerful cultural centers and of greater account in the human scene.

Even after the phenomenal expansion of European peoples in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, with an attendant spread of Christianity which carried that faith around the globe and planted it in the Western Hemisphere, Europe and Christianity were not so outstanding as they were to be in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Ming emperors ruled over more people than did even Charles V and Philip II. K'ang Hsi reigned over many times as many people as were governed by his leading contemporary European monarchs, Louis XIV and Peter the Great. As late as the eighteenth century Chinese culture with its Confucian matrix and its minority strains of Buddhism and Taoism, centered in China, and with Korea, Japan, and Annam as satellites, formed the ideals of many more millions of people than did Christianity. It must be a matter of debate, moreover, as to which had the higher civilization, Christendom with its center in Europe or the Confucian world with its stronghold in the Middle Kingdom. Earlier, in the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth century, the Moslem Ottoman Empire was more powerful than any state in Christian Europe. In the sixteenth century, Islam, represented in the Near East by the Ottoman Empire, in Persia by the Safavi dynasty, and in India by the young and energetic Moguls, probably dominated fully as many people as did Christianity.

This comprehensive geographical perspective will not mean that the historian of Christianity will devote the smaller part of his space to the Occident. He is writing a history of Christianity,

not of the world, and it is in the Occident that Christianity has had most of its development. As heretofore, most of his attention will of necessity be devoted to the West. If he adopts this change of focus, however, all of his work will be done consciously with the entire globe in view and with more attention to Christianity in non-Occidental lands than has been common with members of his craft.

III

From this second change in the traditional focus in the study of the history of Christianity, namely, the constant maintenance of the perspective of the human race as a whole, it is a natural step to the third change. This would place upon the last four centuries and especially upon the past century and a half a much greater emphasis than is customary.

As the history of Christianity is usually written and taught, the impression is all too often given that the climax was reached with the Protestant and Catholic reformations and that everything which has happened since then has been in the nature of a postlude. It is as though the Christian drama had come to an end with the Reformation and that subsequent events have been akin to curtain calls. Both the scholar and the reader are led to the conclusion that in the last four centuries Christianity has been a waning force.

This conclusion seems to gain corroboration from many of the developments of these centuries, and particularly of the last two centuries. The rationalism of the eighteenth century challenged Christianity and discredited it with many of the intellectuals. The continuation of that rationalism into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and its reinforcement by the scientific approach have threatened to usher Christianity out of educated circles. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have witnessed in the Occident more open skepticism and more clearly avowed rejection of Christianity than has been seen since the Moslem Arab conquests of the seventh and eighth centuries. Much of the secularism of modern life does not pay Christianity even the

compliment of sturdy denial. It simply ignores it. Our own generation has witnessed in vast reaches of what has been termed Christendom the apparent triumph of new paganisms, of systems which are more or less openly at variance with Christianity and which in some countries seek actively to uproot it. Even governments which still pay lip service to Christianity are more and more usurping functions which have been traditionally left to the church. In this the states of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have differed from the absolute monarchies of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. The latter, while insisting upon controlling the church, were content to allow it to retain its traditional administration of education, marriage, and care for the sick and the underprivileged. The modern states, not only those which are termed totalitarian but also the democracies, have tended either to deprive the church of these functions or to offer as an optional alternative secular education, marriage, and philanthropy.

The church is thus being elbowed out of its rearing of the young, its regulation of the marriage tie and family life, and its charge of the poor. Since the church is the channel through which Christianity has been transmitted, Christianity itself appears to be fading out of Western culture. This conclusion seems further supported by the failure of Christianity to produce in recent times any theological systems comparable with those of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, or John Calvin. At first sight, then, ample evidence appears to support the current view that Christianity reached its time of greatest influence either in the European Middle Ages or in the century of the Reformation and that the writers and teachers of the history of Christianity are but duly apportioning their space and their attention when they spend but little time on the post-Reformation years.

If, however, the history of Christianity is viewed from the standpoint of mankind as a whole, the facts force on us quite a different conclusion. Christianity is then seen not to be a waning but a growing force. Its advance has not been even. In

some areas and periods great losses have been experienced. That the past century and a half have witnessed serious and even ominous reverses in the Occident no one who knows the facts would question. Yet if the course of Christianity be surveyed with attention fixed not simply on the Occident and on ecclesiastical organizations but on the effect of Christianity as a whole upon all of mankind, the conception of Christianity as dwindling is seen to arise from myopia. Christianity has been a growing and not a declining factor in human history, and a correct distribution of space will assign so much larger a proportion to the post-Reformation years that the earlier centuries will be but an introduction, even though a lengthy and necessary introduction, to the main part of the narrative.

To substantiate this sweeping and at first sight dubious generalization would require more space than can properly be allowed to this paper. However, we must take the time to enumerate a few of the facts out of which the conclusion arises. It must be obvious that never has Christianity been so widely spread geographically as in the past century and a half. In the last seventy-five years that extension has been especially marked. The expansion has been in part by migration of professedly Christian peoples. Through it churches have come into being or have been strengthened in new nations of European stock—the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and some of the countries of South America. Expansion has also been by conversions among previously non-Christian folk. In the non-Occidental world no nations of importance and relatively few tribes exist in which at least some conversions have not been registered. In a number of widely scattered peoples, usually those of "primitive" culture, the majority have been won. In larger nations with advanced cultures highly resistant to the introduction of a new religion the percentage of Christians, while still small, has, in general, been growing notably in the last twenty-five years.

Even more significant is the fact that Christianity is increas-

ingly becoming an integral part of the cultures of non-European peoples. In the past quarter of a century this phenomenon has been particularly marked. The nineteenth and twentieth century geographic extension of Christianity has gone hand in hand with the political and economic expansion of European peoples and with the penetration of the world by Occidental culture. The churches founded and nurtured by Occidental missions among non-Occidental peoples have tended to be dependent financially, intellectually, and in leadership upon the churches of the Occident. More recently, however, marked progress has been registered by the "younger churches" in achieving independence. The gain in indigenous leadership and in self-government has been rapid and notable, especially since the war of 1914–18. Financial independence has not been so quickly achieved, but even there, partly because of the declining incomes of the missionary societies of the Occident, it is much nearer than it was twenty-five years ago. Ecclesiastically there is conformity to the theologies and denominational types introduced from the Occident; but in ways which have often escaped notice because they have been unexpected this recently transplanted Christianity is beginning to reflect its new environment. Also of major importance is the influence which Christianity has been exerting upon non-Occidental cultures. In the chief non-Occidental nations this has been all out of proportion to the size of the Christian communities. In the largest of them, such as India, China, and Japan, it has been rapidly mounting. One needs only to cite the prominence in China of Sun Yat-sen and the Soong family, to a large extent products of the Christian movement, and in India of Gandhi, who confesses the importance which the New Testament has had in shaping his ideals and his program, to become aware of the profound effect which Christianity has recently had upon nearly half of the human race, a half heretofore but little touched by it. The part which Christianity has played in the last hundred years in reducing languages to writing, in introducing new forms of education and

of medicine, and in reshaping the ideals of entire peoples in the non-Occidental world has been without equal in the history of Christianity, and, for that matter, of any other religion.

Even in the Occident, where, if one views only one side of the picture, Christianity has seemed to be losing ground, the past century and a half have witnessed gains which may have more than offset the losses. The fashion in which millions of Christians have voluntarily contributed financially to the propagation of their faith at home and abroad has in magnitude been without precedent in the history of Christianity or of any other religion or set of ideas. In number the new movements which have emerged from the Christian stream, some of them for social reform and some of them new religious orders, denominations, and societies, have been unequaled in any previous period of similar length. The Roman Catholic church has lost many adherents, but it has also gained many. The very divorce from the state which in several countries has been wrought by the anticlericals has served to strengthen the authority actually exercised by the pope. Never before has that largest of the Christian churches been so closely knit together under the direction of the see of Peter. To a certain degree the Roman Catholic church, from being the community faith of much of Europe, has become an embattled minority consciously set against many of the currents of the age. Never, however, was it so world wide in extent as it has been in the present century. Moreover, through what is usually termed the ecumenical movement, Christians of the non-Roman communions are coming together. In no previous period have so many varieties of Christians been drawn into fellowship as now in the nascent World Council of Churches. We need to remember, moreover, that, while in the present century what was once Christendom has been racked by war, from impulses tracing their origin largely to Christianity concrete enterprises have come into being on a larger scale than at any previous time for peaceful international co-operation.

Could the facts sketched so rapidly in the past few para-

graphs be elaborated, it would be even more apparent that if all mankind is brought within the purview of the historian and not simply certain geographical and racial segments of it, Christianity has never been so potent in the affairs of men as in the past century and a half. In the past quarter of a century, in spite of its two world wars and of striking losses, Christianity has gained in its influence upon mankind as a whole. If Christianity is to be seen in its true perspective, then much more attention must be paid to its history in the last four centuries and especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries than has usually been given.

The approach to the history of Christianity advocated in these pages does not invalidate the vast accumulations of earlier scholarly endeavors in the field. It must utilize them. By bringing them into focus in the manner we have suggested, they can be made to contribute to a better understanding of Christianity, of its place in the history of the race, of the fashion in which it operates, and of its limitations and its great strength in shaping human life. Never does any individual life and still less does any community, large or small, conform fully to the standards set by Christianity. In more than one century and in many areas and peoples Christianity has lost ground. From some areas it has completely disappeared. At times it operates as the group religion of an entire nation or culture. In other times and places it is represented by a minority, more or less at variance with the majority. Yet often its influence far outstrips the boundaries of any ecclesiastical organization or fellowship. Moreover, Christianity has had a strange ability to survive the death of cultures with which it has been associated and, after a period of storm and stress, with discouraging losses, to experience a revival which has made it even more potent in shaping the life of mankind as a whole. It is this story which the future historians of Christianity should strive to understand and to tell.

HISTORY : Christian interpretation K.S. Latourette The Christian Understanding of history The American Historical Review vol. LIV No. 2 (Jan 1949), pp 259-276. Presidential address, Amer. Historical Assoc., Dec '48

I Differences in understanding of history: Xns disagree on when the Kingdom (the doing of God's will) will come, and how. Slowly (somewhat as evolutionary process)? Imminent and sudden, as world gets worse? Is the Kgd the Church?

II Agreements. —

① God is the creator of the universe and rules throughout all its vast reaches, whether, to man, the unimaginable distances and the uncounted suns or the inconceivably minute world of the atom, whether in what men call matter or in what they call spirit. This means that man lives and history takes place in a universe, that all of reality is one and under the control of God, and that the human drama is part and parcel of the far larger unity of God's creation. Ultimately and in His own way, so the Christian view maintains, God is sovereign in the affairs of men ... p 263.

② God created "man in His [own] image [and in so doing] .. gave to man a certain measure of His own free will. Man's freedom is limited by various factors, among them heredity and physical and social environment, but his freedom is still real. Human history is in large part tragedy, and the tragedy consists in man's abuse of his freedom ... (p. 263

3. "God, who is always working in the universe and in history, meets this perversion of man's will ... in two ways, by judgment and by mercy. Through what are sometimes described as His inexorable laws written into the structure of the universe and so in man's own constitution and environment, God judges man and whatever man sets up in place of God.. But God wishes man to repent, and as often as men truly truly repent.. He forgives them and gives them fresh opportunity to grow toward the purpose He has

(over)

for them (p 264)

4. Ultimately God will triumph. History moves toward a culmination. Whether within or beyond time God's will is to be accomplished.." (p 264)

5. "Thus far the Christian understanding of the universe and of history resembles several non-Christian views." Judaism ("largely true of"); Islam ("to a certain extent"); and "partial parallels" in Theistic or non-Theistic systems in China, ancient Persia, etc. "The distinctively Christian understanding of history centers upon historical occurrences. It has at its heart not a set of ideas but a person..., in Jesus. God became flesh. (p. 264) Crucifixion.. "Here.. were displayed both the power of God and the wisdom of God." Resurrection.. Here "God demonstrated that physical death.. does not end all.. (p. 265)

6. Following the crucifixion and resurrection "God continued to operate through what Christians call the Holy Spirit." The Spirit remakes men and enables him to "enter upon the radiant, eternal life which from the beginning was God's plan for men", a life of "faith, hope and especially love." (p 265)

7. Those who have that life "form a fellowship, the Church, which takes on a visible form.. within history but which is never completely identical with any historic expression and continues beyond history." (p 265

8. "The course of history is God's search for man. God is judge, but He judges man that He may save him and transform Him. God's grace, the love which man does not deserve and cannot earn, respects man's free will and endeavors to reach man through the incarnation, the cross and the Holy Spirit. Here, to the Christian, is the meaning of history and its unifying core." (p. 265).

HISTORY. GOD in History. [George A. Buttrick, Christ and History, N.Y. + Nashville: Abingdon, 1963]

Optimistic 'progressive school' - Condorcet - "no bounds have been fixed to the improvement of human faculties; that the perfectibility of man is absolutely indefinite..." (p. 46, citing Marquis de Condorcet, Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind (Phila.: Lang + Ustick, 1796), with. p. 11).

Pessimistic: Karl Löwith, - "Man's historical experience is one of steady failure... only our means of oppression and destruction (as well as reconstruction) are considerably improved and adorned with hypocrisy" - p. 47 (citing K. Löwith, Meaning in History (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 191.

HISTORY, God In. (His ways + Mans) - (John Goldingay, "Isaiah 1-35" in Encounter with God Scripture Union: Philadelphia) Jan-Feb. 1981

Isaiah 10:1-23 How are we to understand the way God works in the affairs of the nations This passage of Isaiah suggests that God's activity for his ends and man's activities for their ends, are interwoven in an intricate way. Here, ~~history~~ comes about because God wishes to punish injustice, and thus the aggressor is his agent (1-6) But this aggressor is not consciously serving God - he is ~~not consciously serving God - he is serving his~~ serving God - he is serving his own vindictiveness (7) and his own pride (8, 9, 12-14). He is serving his own contempt for God (5, 12) and his own ambition and greed (13, 14). Thus there is a strange reversal of proper roles - the agent becomes more important than the one he serves (15). So in his turn the agent of God's justice will himself be dealt with (16-19), while the original recipient of God's judgment will be restored (20-27).

HISTORY: Historiography. two schools - Positivism + Idealism (D.W. Bebbington, Patterns in History. A Christian View. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity, 1979).

HISTORY: Hegel's philosophy of history (dialectic). [Summarized by A.T. van Leeuwen, Christianity in World History: The Meeting of the Faith of East and West, tr. by H.H. Hoskins. (N.Y. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964), p. 24.

Three principal phases in human history:

1. Asiatic – the thesis. As in China, India + Near East "the individual is totally subject to the will of the ruler, and the state is an absolute monarchy. Thus Asia was the scene of man's infancy," summarizes v Leeuwen. Nature, not spirit was the prevailing influence.

2. Mediterranean – the antithesis. Classical Greece + Rome, reacting vs. Asiatic absolutism "achieved some measure of individual freedom" and "came to maturity".

3. Germanic – the synthesis. The third and final stage is that "in which Germanic culture triumphs and man becomes aware of his freedom, yet freely assents to the subsumption of the individual in the universal idea".

HISTORY . MARXIST

"Marx, an amateur - proportionately influential as he was proportionately unimpressed -
- Gerald Heard, "Is God in History?" (NY: Harper & Bros., 1950), p 8.

HISTORY: MARXIST (D.W. Bebbington, Patterns in History. A Christian View. Downers Grove IL: Intervarsity Press, 1979)

unknowable Hegelian roots. Hegel reacted against Kant's distinction between phenomena ('things as they appear') which are knowable, and noumena ('things as they are in themselves'). No such distinction: the mind can know the real world because Mind made the world (Mind = God). Absolute idealism "The real is the rational and the rational is the real". Dialectic: unity out of opposites produces the German state (ideal) not family + civil society. Mind, as part of God's Mind, participates in creative process.

Marx: takes ~~dialectic~~ + human participation in making history from Hegel; and materialism from Feuerbach. Sees man making history by production - "the fundamental fact". Because Germans failed to recognize this "they have never, therefore, had an earthly basis for history and consequently never a historian". (p. 122, citing Marx and Engels, Collected Works vol. 5, pp. 41 f.). Vs. Hegel: not man's mind that shapes their being (world), but "their social being that determines their consciousness". p. 122 (citing Karl Marx + F. Engels, Selected Works (Moscow, 1951) vol. 1, p. 329. "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" (1859))

Marxian periods: Asiatic, ancient, feudal and bourgeois. Each determined by modes of production and who controls it: "The handmill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam mill, society with the industrial capitalist." - p. 123 (citing K. Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy (London 1941) p. 92)

Marx + Engels: Marx did not view history totally as inevitable dialectic; insists that man makes ~~from~~ history by production; Engels sees history as Hegelian dialectic, but did not go as far as "younger Marxists". He called "most amazing rubbish" their assertion that the economic side of life alone determined all other aspects of human existence, says Bebbington. p. 127 (citing Engels to J. Bloch, Sept. 1890 in Marx + Engels, Selected Works. vol. 2., p. 444. He rejects a "simple cause determinism" - p. 128.

(over)

HISTORY: MARXIST (D.W. Bebbington, Patterns in History. A Christian View. Downers Grove IL: Intervarsity Press, 1979)

unknowable Hegelian roots. Hegel reacted against Kant's distinction between phenomena ('things as they appear') which are knowable, and, noumena ('things as they are in themselves'). No such distinction: the mind can know the real world because Mind made the world (Mind = God). Absolute idealism "The real is the rational and the rational is the real". Dialectic: unity out of opposites produces the German state (ideal) out of family + 'civil society'. Mind, as part of God's Mind, participates in creative process.

Marx: takes ~~dialectic~~ + human participation in making history from Hegel; and materialism from Feuerbach. Sees man making history by production - "the fundamental fact". Because Germans failed to recognize this "they have never, therefore, had an earthly basis for history and consequently never a historian". (p. 122, citing Marx and Engels, Collected Works vol. 5, pp. 41 f.). Vs. Hegel: not man's mind that shapes their being (world), but "their social being that determines their consciousness". p. 122 (citing Karl Marx + F. Engels, Selected Works (Moscow, 1951) vol. 1, p. 329. "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" (1859))

Marxian periods: Asiatic, ancient, feudal and bourgeois. Each determined by modes of production and who controls it: "The handmill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam mill, society with the industrial capitalist." - p. 123 (citing K. Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy (London 1941) p. 92)

Marx + Engels: Marx did not view history totally as inevitable dialectic; insists that man makes ~~his~~ history by production; Engels sees history as Hegelian dialectic, but did not go as far as "younger Marxists". He called "most amazing rubbish" their assertion that the economic side of life alone determined all other aspects of human existence, says Bebbington. p. 127 (citing Engels to J. Bloch, Sept. 1890 in Marx + Engels, Selected Works. vol. 2, p. 444. He rejects a "single cause determination" - p. 128.

(over)

HISTORY: Its Rhythms — East vs. West (C Northcote Parkinson, East & West. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963)

Parkinson (better known, perhaps, for "Parkinson's Law"). He distinguishes alternate waves of dominance:

I. Oriental: — Civilization begins in Mesopotamia or Egypt, before 3000 BC. Appeared shortly thereafter in India 3000 BC (Mohenjo-Daro) and China before 1450 BC Shang dynasty

II. Greek — Homeric invasion of Asia 1250 BC. Agamemnon & Achilles.

III. Persian — Medes & Persians 550 BC. Cyrus the Great & Darius. "Of the four great Oriental civilizations — Mesopotamia, Egypt, India and China — the Persians managed to absorb three into one political organization." (p. 8). Darius attributes this to his god — "I brought (this) about by the favour of Ahura-mazda." [p. 10, citing R. Ghirshman, Iran, trans. by the author, Lond. Pelican, 1961; p. 153]

IV. Greek — battle of Marathon 490 and Salamis 480 BC. Alexander in the Punjab, establishes authority there 327 B.C.; dies 323 BC. Darius the Persian killed 331 BC. "Asia has never been purely Asian, save in the Far East, since Alexander's day" — p 75.

V. Phoenicia (Carthage). First Punic War 264-241 BC. — & destruction of Carthage 146 BC.

VI. Rome. Defeat Carthage 146 BC; and Greece (the first Macedonian War 215-205 BC; Second 200-196; Third 171-167; 4th 149-148) and final defeat of Greece 146, which was placed under the Roman governor of Macedonia.
The Persian wars: Caesar (53 BC),

VII. The Asian reaction. (1) 324 BC Chandragupta Maurya begins to unify N. India. Seleucus Nicator defeated in India 306 BC
(2) 257 Conversion of Asoka, grandson of Chandragupta, to Buddhism, "most purely Asian of the great religions" (p. 109)

(3) The expansion of Buddhism thru Asia. "first of the missionary religions" begins with Asoka.

Reaches China 65 AD - when Dharmaraksa + Kasyapa Matanga found the White Horse Monastery. (p. 118) Buddhists come by land thru Bactria; by sea to S. China Regular Buddhist contact between India + China from 4th to mid-8th c. (p 118)

(4) The division of the Roman empire, east and west, begins with founding of Constantinople, 324 AD.

(5) The rise of Islam. "Seek for learning though it be as far away as China", said Muhammed. (p. 149).

VIII. The renaissance of the west

(1) Defect of Muslim advance -

HISTORY
- GOD IN

Latourette, K.S., "The Christian Understanding of History", The American Historical Review, LIV, No 2 (Jan., 1949), pp. 259-276).

Herbert Butterfield: Writings on Christianity and History, ed. by C.T. McIntire. (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1979).

His closing advice - in Christianity and History: "Hold to Christ, and for the rest be totally uncommitted." (liii).
Butterfield - Master of Peterhouse Coll. (1955-68); Regius Prof. of Modern Hist. (63-68).

Historical causation - (complexity). Of two products of the same house the one became a non-conformist minister because his father was a non-conformist minister; the other became an enemy of religion because his father was a non-conformist minister." (xxi), said Butterfield.

Followed historical methodology of Ranke. Sided with G.M. Trevelyan vs. J.B. Bury in debate on nature of history. Trevelyan: hist. is a kind of literature, i.e. "art added to scholarship"; advocated use of "sympathetic imagination". Bury: history is a science, built around the law of cause + effect as its key. (xxviii)

Theology: - a mediating, reconciling approach, appreciating both evangelical + liberal strengths, trying to eliminate each's weaknesses + rise to a higher synthesis. (xxix)

Acton - Regius Prof. of Mod. Hist. (1895-1902) - introduced German scientific method in history.
Bury " (1902-27) G.M. Trevelyan, (1927-
David Knowles " -55) Catholic
Butterfield " (1955-68).
Owen Chadwick " (1968-

Butterfield "noted that a common feature of much historical writing was its tendency to see things moving in a straight line of progress from somewhere in the past and culminating in whatever the historian favored most about the present." (xxx). [Hegel, Marx], Trevelyan credits Eng. Prots. as front of English political + relig. liberty + toleration. No utopian (xxxi). More dialectic - not a line but a network, is history.

"Historians are unable by academic research to discover the existence of God, the divinity of Christ, or the workings of Providence," says Butterfield, acc. to McIntire. (xxxviii). Such are discovered by faith. But out of what the historian learns from history by the historical method, he may with the deeper insight of faith discern the ways of Providence. (xxxviii). The "Christian interpretation of history" must be primarily focussed on God's work and to the Biblical overview of history from creation to the end-time. (xxxix.)

(1) "The Role of the Individual in History" (p.194) "human beings make history".

Butterfield's basic motifs (1) Human personality in history - the "humanist" school (Cambridge) vs. quantitative, Marxist or behaviorist historians. "History is made by human beings."(1) [Human beings are made by God] But recognized that individuals are often over-whelmed by forces beyond their control. Nevertheless basically free. History cannot be written as tho men had no choice.

(2) Sin - the "universal element of cupidity."

(3) Three levels of history. (A) First level, we may say "Men's actions make history - and men have free will - they are responsible for the history they make.

(B) But second - history, like nature, represents a realm of law - however unpredictable before it happens; it is capable of rational explanation once it has happened..

(C) And there is a third factor operating in life - "one which in a sense includes those two other things - namely the Providence of God, in whom we live and move and have our being." ("God in History" - p. 5).

First level studied biographically; the second through scientific study of regularities and tendencies; the third we approach by faith (xlvi). Bury's scientific approach an example of the "impossibility of history" - too many documents lost; too much undocumented." Perhaps less than 10% of what historians write, says B., can be "historically established" by scientific historiography. (2) [See "God in History", p. 10]

Chron J. Jn

(2)

Herbert Butterfield. Writings on Christianity and History, ed. by C.T. McIntire.

I. "God in History"

Only Two ways of looking at history ("only" two alternative views - in the long run).. "Either you trace everything back in the long run to sheer blind Chance, or you trace everything to God.." (p. 8)

Three levels: as in answer to question, 'Why are you here?' ① Because I wanted to come.
② Because a railroad train carried me here.
③ Because it is the will of God. (p. 5)

J.B. Bury, most famous opponent of theory of scientific law of history - ended up in confusion by as the "arch-prophet of the theory that Chance counted most of all." - p. 9. The whole of history, he asserted, was altered, for example, by the shape of Cleopatra's nose. ("Cleopatra's Nose" (1916) in Selected Essays of J.B. Bury, ed. by Harold Temperley (Camb. Univ. Press, 1930).

But studying history "will not show you God in history if you have not found God in your daily life," says Butterfield. - p. 12. But once we see God at work in our lives, then we have already begun to adopt the Biblical interpretation of history. (p. 13). If you ask how does God reveal himself in ordinary history - this is the particular theme of the OT. The only difference between Jews & other peoples was the way they interpreted their history - "in fact it was their way of interpreting their history that was their chief contribution to the development of civilization" (p. 13). ② "They saw God as being essentially the God of History," and the result was that first & foremost they regarded history as based on the Promise." (p. 13).

② But the Children of Israel sinned, & theirs is the only national history I ever remember reading which proclaimed the sinfulness of the nation - proclaimed its own nation even to be worse than the other pagan nations round about them." (p. 13)

③ But "God's Judgement does not cancel his Promise - if God judged the nation it was only in order to save it - for God is Love & it is always dangerous to think of the power of God without also thinking of his love. (p. 14).

④ Finally - "the greatest of the old Testament Jews came to realize that God's Promise was not one of luxury & worldly success - it was a Promise that the nation should have a mission - a mission that should give meaning to its very disasters - and it was through that mission that it was to have a great role in history, an immortal name amongst men. Its mission was to teach the nations of the world about God - to spread to the rest of mankind the special revelation it had had - the knowledge of God as revealed in history... It was the final mark of their mission that Christ was to come into the world - a Messiah.." (p. 15.

Herbert Butterfield, *Writings in Christianity + History*

VI. "The Establishment of a Christian View of History"

By about 180 AD Irenaeus, *Against the Heretics* (vs Gnostics) - a Christian view of history, i.e. of God acting directly with a plan, in time, begins to appear. God's plan of salvation needs time for its fulfillment - begins with Jews, extending finally to the completion of the chch. - p. 115.
By 221 AD Julius Africanus, working with OT as his basic chronology, develops a chronology of world history (p 116)
Tertullian (early 3rd c) - adopting the Theory of the Four World Empires (Ass.-Bab., Persian, Alex-Seleucid, Rome), and interpreting them as somehow demonic, began to see the continuance of the Roman Empire as the only thing holding back the end of the world. Thus, he says, support Rome in order to stave off the end. (p 117)
Eusebius - end of 3rd c. - first develops realistic historical consciousness. (p.119) History as "The Preparation of the Gospel" (p 129) from the beginning of time, to Eusebius, there unfolds "a grand design of Providence." (p. 122.
Christ comes just when Jews have no king of their own line, when Rome gave universal peace; then Jews are defeated and dispersed for rejecting Christ; then paganism begins to weaken - no oracles, human sacrifices; God builds his chch - the succession of bishops - the grand climax: Constantine, miraculously victorious, the first emp. since Augustus to rule more than 30 yrs. Chch history as a success story - p. 123.

Augustine - (after turning the writing of mere history over to his disciple Orosius) sets himself to discover + explain the fundamentals + universals of history. His book is, "outside the ancient Scriptures," says Butterfield, "the supreme example for study ~~outside the ancient Scriptures~~ if one is interested in the connection between history and belief." (p. 125).
Compared to Eusebius, he has "a very much better idea of the way in which history works" (p.125).
Refuses to accept current view - God gives good kings long reigns, sends the bad ones plagues + death. (p.126
No, says Aug. the good differ from the bad in the way that they take + use misfortune. (p. 126)
He had "a more flexible view of the workings of ~~God~~ Providence than Eusebius," says Butterf.. When Roman Republic fell into social + civil wars, not simply the judgment of God - its empire had expanded beyond its own strength (127)
Concedes usefulness + virtue + service to Rome - but not a magical coincidence with the coming of Xt. (p. 128).
God did not create anything evil, + even the devil is not evil by nature. - (p 129)
His great accomplishment - broke out of Greek cyclic view, fatalistic - but also rejected too simplistic a linear view.

Orosius - more interested in the concrete data. "the first real Christian attempt at universal history", says B. (p. 130)
But in a sense, more like Eusebius than Augustine, "a regression" to the view that God rewards piety with worldly success" p. 131. Even nature improves after Xt - Mt Aetna no longer erupts - only smokes innocuously, now that the age of Xt has come.
And, Middle Ages historians followed Orosius more than Augustine. (p.131 f.)

David W. Bebbington, Patterns in History: A Christian View. (Downers Grove IL: Intervarsity Press 1979).
Ch. 3. "Christian History" pp. 43–67.

Early church usually rejected cyclical view of hist. (e.g. Justin Martyr, Dial. with Trypho, 1/5, trans. A.L. W. Lond. 1930, p. 3 argued that people would not go through second life. Exception, possibly Origen who may have suggested that man dies over + over again. But even O. protests that the work of Jesus will not be repeated indefinitely (p. 52)
Origen also rejected millenarianism - with its suggestion of a limited time & a golden age in history. (52f.)

Basic question: does God intervene in history directly & bless in response to human obedience?
Yes - says Bp. Melito of Sardis, in petition to Marcus Aurelius against persecution in Asia Minor. When Christianity was established in the Empire in time of Augustus - God prospered the Roman Empire. - (p. 53). (See Eusebius 4/26/7f.) "Imperial prosperity was God's reward for use of laity." (53) Then
Yes - said "imperial theology" of time of Constantine, initially Eusebius: ~~the emperor~~ applied Ps. 72 (the ideal king) to Constantine. Followed by 4th c. writers Jerome, Lactantius, Ambrose .. (54)
No - Augustine. Myth at first he agreed. Up to 397 AD: God blesses the empire. But 16 yrs later (415 AD) - in his exp. of Ps. 72 no such inference. From about 390 on, before fall of Rome he began to abandon the "imperial theology".
He points out "that there is no constant correlation between the prosperity of city and divine blessing" on imperial rulers. (Aug. Concerning the City of God against the Pagans. 5/25 trans. H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth, 1972) p. 221. Judgment is not inevitable for any particular sin, + he is merciful even to the undeserving. (p. 55) If every sin were immediately punished, says Aug. (ibid 1/8, p. 14) there would be no need of a last judgment; but if no sin were ever punished, people would cease to believe in providence. (p. 55). Corrects earlier over-simplification of idea of providence.
Yes - said his pupil Orosius. Seven Books of Hist. against the Pagans. became the standard history of the Middle Ages. God blesses the good; punishes the evil. (p. 56)

Augustine's division of history: - (7 seals of Revelation; 7 days of creation)
First 5 Adam to Jesus: 1. Adam to flood; 2. Flood to Abraham; 3. Abraham to David; 4. David to Babylonian exile; 5. Exile to incarnation.
Last 2 in the ages: 6. The church militant. 7. The church at rest. (p. 57)
Its periods of direct intervention:
Muslim Theorist of history (e.g. Ibn Khaldun, Introduction to History, 14th c.) unexpectedly reverts to cyclical, dynastic view. (58)

Joachim of Fiore (12th c. Cistercian abbot): the structure of history, suggested by 7 seals of Rev. — Three-fold pattern: —
① Old Test. - 7 times of conflict - climaxed in brutalization of Antiochus Epiphanes (Maccabees)
② N.T. " " - climaxed in future Gog + Magog.
③ Three ages of the Trinity: ① Father - Adam to Isaiah
② Son - Messianic prophecies of Isaiah and beyond NT period into history, overlapping with —
③ Spirit - begun with Benedict to consummation of the age. (p. 59)

D.W. Bebbington, Patterns of History -

Eusebius - God is always intervening
Augustine - no > periods of intervention

Reformers - linear view of history, leading to decline. End of world is imminent. e.g. Luther. (p 60) generally pessimistic.
Radical wing + millenarians - Revelation as the story of the future vindication of the saints. (p 61)
Reintroduction of idea of progress. Joseph Mede, Christ's Coll. Cat., 1627. Clavis Apocalyptica

Descartes; (followed by Bossuet (q.v.)) Discourse on Universal History (from creation to Charlemagne), the expanding community of faith). Descartes sees "God as working not directly in history through miracle but indirectly through means made." (p 63 f.)
Enlightenment. Historians abandoned the "providential" framework of history; turned to naturalistic historicism. e.g. even church histories omit divine intervention: in 1802, reports Bebbington, "the magazine of the Primitive Methodist denom. discontinued its section recording acts of providence."
Exceptions: Reinhold Niebuhr; Sir Herbert Butterfield. "But western civilization had ceased to be dominated by the Christian view of history long before." (p. 65).

Does God intervene at specific points in history? Eliz. I - medal "God blew; and they were dispersed". (p 66)
Quotes E.H. Harbison, Christianity + History (Princeton, 1964), p. 255/288 - how are we "to see history [as governed by a predestinating Providence, without falling into the sin of playing God and saying 'lo, here - lo there'" (67)

(5) "Historicism"

J.G. Herder, Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind (1784-91), a rambling work, but important for its emphasis on "romantic pluralism", i.e. "each culture has values that cannot be compared with values of other cultures". ∴ opposes "progress school" which deprecates the past
Herder is credited with rehabilitating the Middle Ages - no longer the "Dark Ages" - (p. 104).
Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) - usually represented as exemplar of value-free objectivity. But his famous phrase that history must record "what actually happened" is a mistranslation for "what essentially happened" (eigentlich - today means "actually" but in 19th c. "essentially") (p 107 f. quoting Ranke, Theory + Practice, p xix) - which is typical historicist belief that "intuition enables the historian to divine the essence of the past." (p. 108).
Wilhelm Dilthey (d. 1911) elaborated theory of intuition as not mystical. Must be guided by "hermeneutical laws"; just as Bible must be systematically interpreted (hermeneutics); so also history. The parts must be seen in context (as Schleiermacher); the whole must be seen through recognizing the significance of the parts (p. 110)
R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History. Historical knowledge "is the re-enactment in the historian's mind of the thought whose history he is studying"; writes Collingwood in Autobiography (Lond. 1939, p. 112). (p 110)
∴ "The overriding problem of historicism is its lack of foundations" says Bebbington [cf. liberal hermeneutics]

Gerald Heard, Is God in History? (N.Y.: Harper + Bros., 1950).

~~Dear~~ Alec:

~~We surely appreciated your phone call at the~~ cable.

Joachim of Floris. 3 ~~stages~~ of history: – (12th c. abbot).

1: Primal stage "of the Father" – creative perfection
2: The fall – redeemed by the Son.
3: The age "of the Spirit".

~~This~~ "Many informed people who feel now convinced that God is evident still doubt whether He is historical. This is a grave matter for Xty, which has always claimed, and with right, that it is uniquely the historical religion.. It is good that God should be evident [i.e. a valid inference from evidences of purpose + design in the world], it is far better that He should be historical... (But) as Dr. W.R. Inge has pointed out, "It is hard to love a valid inference." – p. 1.

"Humanism is still the favorite faith of the "educated masses".. – p. 4.

Two revolutions of intellect put theology on the defensive. ① "The victory of heliocentricism over geocentricism" – Galileo; Copernicus. In the field of physics. The telescope.
② Then the battle moved to the field of biology: evolution + the victory of the self-produced man. – p. 5
"Man, only a bag of chemicals".

Natural Science's 3 conclusions: ① It banished God from the story of mankind. The life force is blind, unconscious
② It banished history as a significant study whereby man might be understood.
③ Human progress, therefore, is an accident. – p. 7

→ No modern philosophies of history after Hegel, about 1830. Marx? "proportionately influential as he was proportionately uninformed"! – p. 8.

↘ Lord Acton, Regius Prof. of Hist. at Cambridge attempted a "history of liberty" – history with a meaning, but died leaving only "a..library, ½ a dozen essays." His successor, J. B. Bury, enormously erudite, "in his inaugural lecture told his hearers that history had no meaning." – p. 11. (1903).
Henry Ford – "History is bunk!" – p. 12.

K.S. Latourette, "The Christian ~~Interpretation~~ Understanding of History", Amer. Historical Rev., Jan. 1949.

~~I. The God of history is the same God revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and N.T.~~ God of the Bible,

Creation & Sovereignty of God.

1. "God is the creator of the universe and rules throughout all its vast reaches.. Ultimately and in his own way, so the Christian view maintains, God is sovereign in the affairs of men..." (p. 263)

Free will of Man

2. ~~God~~ created "man in His own image", giving to him "a certain measure of His own free will. Man's freedom is limited. but.. still real. Human history is in large part tragedy, and the tragedy consists in man's abuse of his freedom..." (p. 263). This is a central. As W. Donald Hudson has written: "The whole ~~structure~~ of historical explanation is geared to free agency; its subject matter is what is taken to be →

God's Mercy & God's Judgment.

3. "~~God works in history power in history is seen in manifested in judgment~~ God, who is always working.. in history, meets this perversion of man's will... in two ways, by judgment and by mercy. Through His inexorable laws.. God judges man and whatever man sets up in place of God... ~~God~~ But God wishes man to repent, and as often as men truly repent.. He forgives them and gives them fresh opportunity to grow toward the purpose He has for them.." (p. 264).

4. God's Final Victory. "Ultimately God will triumph. History moves toward a culmination. Whether within or beyond time God's will is to be accomplished.." (p. 264).

Jesus as the Unique Factor in Christian History

5. ~~Uniqueness of the Christian Interpretation of history~~. "Thus far.. The Christian understanding.. of history resembles several non-Christian views: Judaism "largely", Islam "to a certain extent" and "partial parallels" elsewhere. What makes it different then "The distinctively Christian understanding of history," ~~centers upon~~ says Latourette, "centers upon historical occurrences. It has at its heart not a set of ideas, but a person ... Jesus." "~~In Jesus.. God became flesh" (p. 264~~) Latourette points to three historical occurrences as central the incarnation "In Jesus.. God became flesh"; (p. 264); the crucifixion, and the resurrection. (p. 265).

Gerald Heard: —
~~[illegible]~~: economic faith vs social faith; today up the mess & it's all right say the former; the trouble is deeper say the latter: Sin. p. 227.
— Is God in History. N.Y. Harpers Bros, 1950.

Feb. 11.

God's Mighty Works — Ps. 78.
John 14:12 "And greater works than these shall he do..

"The Continuous Manifestation of the Power of God in Church History"

Rhold Niebuhr, Faith in History.
"The dominant note in modern culture is not so much faith in reason as faith in history..." The common factor — "historical optimism". — p. 3.

But what causes historical advance?
1. Social Darwinism — the extension of natural evolution; survival of the fittest.
2. Idealists — the natural, gradual growth of "mutuality", or "social tension", or moral sense.
Both see it as an extension of forces operative in nature — p. 5.
3. The Enlightenment — attributes it to a "negation of natural impulses through the growth of mind". Rationalism.
All this collapsed with 1914.. (p. 6 ff.) The 19th c., the "century of hope" (F.S. Marvin, The Century of Hope

~~There is an indispensable warning~~

Anyone bold enough to attempt ~~an essay~~ a lecture on "The Continuous Manifestation of the Power of God in Church History" would do well first to take warning from the title of a chapter in Reinhold Niebuhr's book Faith and History (N.Y., Scribners, 1949). The chapter is ~~and~~ called "False Absolutes in Christian Interpretations of History", and warns that history may be more ambiguous ~~than~~ than theologians or secular philosophers ~~may think~~ or even systematic ~~and nominally Christian~~ historians, like the nominally Christian Arnold Toynbee may like to believe.

~~What Niebuhr reminds us of usefully~~

The point Niebuhr ~~usefully~~ makes is a useful one: namely, that it is one thing to generalize and state with all due Biblical and theological certainty that God is indeed continually manifesting his mighty power in history; but it is another thing to ~~[illegible]~~ single out specific events and movements in history ~~as~~ and call them "~~the manifestations of the power of God~~ His mighty works". ~~[illegible]~~ Revivals, for example, are commonly accepted as manifestations of His power; But not the rise of communism, which some Xns would like to blame on the devil. Why? ~~not~~. Is not God always and everywhere at work in history. It is easy for Xns. ~~[illegible]~~ He was at work through Moses leading his people to freedom, ~~[illegible] Pharaoh~~ But in the Bible, which often shocks us out of too simple interpretations of history, God was also at work in Pharaoh, whose heart he hardened; and that is harder for Xns. to explain.

R.H. Niebuhr, Faith + History (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949).

The "Biblical concept of a divine sovereignty over individual and collective human destiny has a unique quality" – p. 102.

The beginning of revelation was the [implanted] recognition that God chose Israel, Israel did not choose God. – p. 104.

The other side – "history is filled with man's proud and pretentious efforts to defy the divine sovereignty, to establish himself as god by his power or virtue, his wisdom or insight." – p 104

"History..is a unity because all historical destinies are under the dominion of a single divine sovereignty" first explicit exposition, Amos 9:7 "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel.." . – p. 107.

But this unity cannot be apprehended by rational explanation. Failures: Hegel "absurdly finds its climax in the Europe of his day". Comte. Toynbee – ~~three~~ four failures. ① Civilizations are not as discrete + different as he supposes. ② Combines classical cycles with a Christian twist, i.e. civilizations are not "destroyed" by some superior foe. Actually they they perish at their own hands; and the instrument of their destruction is the idol by which they make some ephemeral technique, structure or instrument of history into a false absolute. ③ He adds the modern idea of progress – "the rise + fall of civilizations", Niebuhr manages Niebuhr, "represents the turn of the wheels of a chariot and drives the chariot forward." (p. 109). History, says Nieb., is more complex.

H. Dooyeweerd's Philosophy — L. Kalsbeek, Contours of a Christian Philosophy. (Toronto: Wedge, 1975).

A favorite theme: enkapsis, "the relation of structures or interlacement between entities of a diff. nature" (p. 192).

Dooyeweerd's philosophy of history: The historical process is subject to divine norms which require positivation. How can we know what these norms are? When we seek them, must do so with humility (p. 145 f.) The "meaning-nuclei" always indicate a "how", never a concrete "something". (p. 103).

The historian's task, to track down the irreducible "meaning-kernel", or "formative power" of history. Not every event in human life is significant. In 1815, a fight in a city slum, and a fight on a Belgian meadow. Only one made history - Waterloo. Men only form history; they do not create it. The results of man's "formative power" in history can be good or bad, depending on whether the "former", the shaper of history follows normative, historical principles (p. 98). "All power, says D., is in essence vocational power, which implies a task for the person in power.. The very worst abuse of power in our sinful world cannot make power itself sinful." (H. Dooy. "The Criteria of Progressive and Reactionary Tendencies in History". Verslag van de plechtige van het honderdvijftigjarig bestaan der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. (Amsterdam, 1958). p. 71.) (cited p. 99)

"If we cannot view historical actions neutrally, neither can we elevate an event or development of the past into a norm, as has unfortunately been done so often," says L.K. e.g. "God has led our fathers to the East Indies," and "what God has joined together let no man put asunder". (p. 99.

Historicism — "grows out of the absolutization of the historical process." Historicism claims that the birth + growth of the church can be entirely explained from history. The Christian, rather, sees the Church arising in the course of history. To historicism, history rises + falls, changes + alters changes continually — cf. Oswald Spengler, Decline of the West. But historicism has "moments of truth", but history remains only one element of total reality; it is not the root reality. Its "moments of truth" [can] become the most dangerous weapons of the spirit of deception. Just like the tempting words of the serpent to Eve in paradise: you will be like God knowing good and evil, historicism contains half truths. (H.D. Vernieuwing en bezinning. ~~Amsterdam~~ Zutphen, 1963. p. 41). (p. 112 f.)

I. God in History — a. The cyclical view. b. The progressive view. c. The historicist views. d The Marxist View. e. Is there a Christian view?

II. God in Church History

~~of church history that entirely too much of church history reads as if it were happening in spite of God the rather than because of Him.~~ I remember an incident in New Haven. Standing in front of a bulletin board at Yale I heard the ~~dist~~ professor of homiletics say to Roland Bainton, the tremendously erudite professor of church history, preeminent authority in American on the Reformation, "Roley, how can you know so much church history and still ~~remain~~ be a Christian". Of course, he was partly joking, but there was a serious side to what ~~He so~~ he said. It is all too ~~true~~ that ~~too~~ much of church history reads as if it were happening in spite of God rather than because of Him.

Nevertheless, despite all its difficulties, and the dangers of over-simplification and hidden presuppositions, and with full acknowledgment of complete fallibility and proneness to error, if the historian is a Christian, there is no possible way for him to avoid ~~the~~ recognition of the ~~inescapable~~ evidences of the mighty hand of God in history. ~~To quote Sir Herbert Butterfield again,~~ "The alternative is to surrender to the absurd, to the irrational. To quote Sir Herbert Butterfield again in that same essay ~~Either you~~ "let us make sure of one thing - in the long run there are only two alternative views about life or about history... Either you trace everything back.. to sheer blind Chance, or you trace everything ~~back~~ to God." (Ibid., p. 8).

J.B. Bury -

Butterfield is himself an illustration of the last part of his own dictum. A Regius ~~Proffess~~ Professor at Cambridge is no ordinary ~~teacher~~ don. He is a professor by appointment of the King of England, ~~The title which is~~ a ~~the high recommendation~~ fact which is no small measure of a man's ~~standing~~ prestige in his field. And Butterfield, a Christian, traces everything to God. But In 1903 the Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge was J.B. Bury, an enormously learned man, who succeeded Lord Acton ~~(famous for the words, "Power corrupts, and absolute power~~ to that position. Lord Acton, a liberal 19th c. ~~devout~~ Catholic, had labored all his life to show that history has a meaning. He is famous for the aphorism "Power corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely". But J.B. Bury came to the chair in an age when the old certainties of faith were crumbling before the harsh questions and doubts of the new god, Science. In his very first lecture he told his hearers that history has no meaning. Later, he amplified his ~~xx~~ disbelief. He said it ~~It~~ was not God that changed ~~the~~ history ~~of Rome~~ at a turning point in the story of Rome not ~~many decades~~ long before the birth of Christ, it was the shape of Cleopatra's nose! ("~~Cleo of Bury~~ "Cleopatra's Nose" (1916), in Selected Essays of J. B. Bury, ed. by Harold Temperley, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1930). ~~But history without meaning~~ It was pure chance.

But the tide seems to be ~~is~~ turning against those who, in the name of science, ~~in failing to find a purpose of history itself, or of Marxism~~ can see no meaning in history beyond history itself. ~~Not long after J.B. Bury gave up hope~~ The last three Regius ~~Proff~~ Professors of Modern History at Cambridge have all been active, confessing Christians: David Knowles, a Catholic monk (-1955); Butterfield, a Methodist lay-preacher (1955-68), and Owen Chadwick (1968-) the present incumbent who is, among other things, an Anglican and a church historian.

~~But Niebuhr's warning is still~~

But Niebuhr's warning is still appropriate: beware of false absolutes. It is one thing to generalize and state ~~with~~ as an avowedly Christian historian, with all due theological certainty that God is indeed continually manifesting his mighty power in history. After all we have Biblical witness to that much, and a Biblical command as well, in Psalm 78.

"Tell them about the mighty works God did .. so that each generation might set its hope afresh on God, and not forget His glorious works..." ~~But~~

But It is quite another ~~thing~~ to move ~~out of the~~ beyond Biblical history into the puzzling ups and downs of the human struggle – from the fall of Jerusalem ~~to Hiroshima, and the~~ conversion of the ~~Roman empire~~ to Christ ~~and from the fall of Rome to~~ to the fall of Saxon, and from the conversion of the Roman Empire to ~~the Billy Graham crusades – and to~~ say ~~this was a work of God, but this was not~~. the conversion to Marxism of the Russian Empire — and to say this was a manifestation of the power of God, but this was not. Revivals, for example, are commonly accepted as manifestations of His power. But not communism. That, say a good many Christians, is the work of the devil. Perhaps so, ~~which of course is too simple~~ but as an interpretation of history, ~~it~~ it is too simple; and as a theological philosophy of history is heretically dualistic. Is not God always and everywhere at work. He was of course at work through Moses leading his people to freedom. But the Bible says he was also at work in Moses' enemy, Pharaoh. God hardened Pharaoh's heart. And that is ~~a difficult matter for Christians to explain~~ not only a difficult matter for Christians to explain; it is impossible, outside of Biblical history where it is given as revealed truth, for ~~the~~ even the Christian historian to determine. ~~History is not simple.~~ ~~It~~ Is it then possible that Hitler was an act of God – the hardening of his heart, the massacre of the Jews? It has actually been ~~so~~ so interpreted — as punishment of the Jews for the crucifixion of Christ. ~~But who can so detect~~ but the Christian recoils from such a terrible conclusion. It is the absolutization of a half truth, and ~~worse~~ far more dangerous than an outright lie — But Beware of false absolutes.

~~The Christian Interpretation of History.~~

~~How then~~ can we ever discern the hand of God in history? ~~b~~

The Christian Interpretation of History

How then can we ever discern the hand of God in history? This is very much like the question Kenneth Scott Latourette, professor of missions and Oriental history dared to ask in his inaugural address as president of the American Historical Association — and the professional historians, ~~gathered~~ mostly secular, gathered for that prestigious event were visibly uncomfortable. For in 1949 the reigning philosophy of history ~~were either scientific historicism (like J. B. Bury~~), or ~~the evolutionary historical optimism of~~ cyclical ~~— either pessimistic cyclical like Nietz~~, as David Bebbington classifies them in his Patterns of History: A Christian View (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter Varsity Press, 1979) were in four main groups.

1. The cyclical, as in classical Greek and Buddhist thought, but revived by Nietzsche on a pessimistic model, and by Toynbee in a more optimistic key.
2. The progressive, which accepted the Christian's more linear theory of history, but ~~with~~ naive optimistic replaced God as history, with evolution or ~~the~~ human reason as the source of inevitable progress.
3. The historicist, ~~which with Bury~~ beginning with the Herder, limited all meaning in history to that which is found in history itself, ~~rejecting basic presuppositions of history~~ as in the past, and therefore rejecting

THE CONTINUOUS MANIFESTATIONS OF THE POWER OF GOD IN CHURCH HISTORY

Anyone bold enough to attempt a lecture on "The Continuous Manifestations of God in Church History" would do well first to take warning from the title of a chapter in Reinhold Niebuhr's book Faith and History (N.Y.: Scribners, 1949). He calls the chapter, "False Absolutes in Christian Interpretations of History." ~~There is the nub of the problem when Christians are The problem of false absolutes surfaces immediately when~~ Once Christians begin to pick and choose out of the ever-changing rhythms of man's history and point to this or that significant event, and say with finality, "There is the hand of God at work".

~~Once we leave the~~ Unlike ~~the writers of the both the Old and New Testament~~ Old & N.T. scholars, church historians, alas, ~~have~~ cannot claim the authority of an inspired Bible ~~the inspiration of the Holy Spirit~~ to direct them with divine certainty to God's mighty acts among the nations. ~~as distinct from man's ... In this respect the task of the church historian Christian historian is beset with more difficulties than that of the Bible scholar.~~ He has no "Thus saith the Lord" to guide him through the tumbled history of the world after the close of the NT, no ~~for his standard~~, no ~~sacred canon of Scripture to~~ inspired and canonical interpretation of modern history to ~~rely on, after the close of the New Testament to turn to~~ for support.

Suppose ~~he writes~~ we write, as many do, "In 1884 God brought ~~a Christian doctor~~ Dr. Horace Allen to Korea, and ~~the door of~~ opened the door of the Hermit Kingdom to the gospel." I can accept that statement by faith, but as an historian, all I can document is this: ~~fact~~ "In 1884 a Christian doctor, Horace Allen, became dissatisfied with ~~mission~~ his work in China, and came to Korea as the first resident Protestant missionary." Only as a Christian historian can I allow my presuppositions about God's sovereign role in human history to dictate my interpretation of that history. Only as a Christian can I say, "God brought Allen to Korea; God opened the door for the Gospel." ~~And~~ Once my presuppositions are challenged (~~and~~ as they often are), and my Christian interpretation of history questioned, I am left with the ~~im~~ age-old, impossible challenge of proving God apart from faith. ~~No way~~.

It was one of the wisest, and most respected historians of our time, the Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University, who wrote, "[Studying history] will not show you God in history if you have not found God in your daily life" ("God in History", Church of England Youth Council Newsletter (July, 1952); publ. in C.T. McIntire, ed. Herbert Butterfield: Writings on Christianity and History, N.Y.: Oxford Univ Press, 1979, p. 12). That was Sir Herbert Butterfield, writing for Christian young people in England on the subject "God in History". And if you suppose that finding God in church history, as opposed to secular history, makes it easier to find Him mightily and continuously at work, ~~let me say, as one who has read a lot~~

Commentaries. These diaries of the humanist-diplomat-pope cover his whole life, 1405-1463, and in their racy, anecdotal style contain an immense amount of unique information on the behind-the-scenes ecclesiastical politics not only of the Catholic church but of all Europe just before the Reformation. It includes a chapter on "How I Became Pope".

As secretary of the Council of Basel, Aeneas Sylvius had been a conciliarist, limiting the power of the pope. Perhaps his intimate view of the inner workings of the politics of that Council led him to distrust too much democracy. At any rate, when the Council deposed Pope Eugenius IV, and elected as his successor a layman, Duke of Savoy, as Pope Felix V, Aeneas Sylvius became the new pope's secretary, and inevitably began to turn more papal and less conciliar. The process was completed when he himself was elected pope in 1485 and opposed all the conciliar views he had once defended. His papal bull, Execrabilis, of 1460 condemned as treason and heresy any appeal from a papal decree to the authority of a Council.

Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457). Whereas the importance of Aeneas Sylvius in church history is more due to his work and influence than to his writing, Valla made history by his writing of it. But like his contemporary, he was not principally a church historian. He was a linguist and literary critic, who wrote only one work of standard history, The History of Ferdinand I of Aragon.

That was not the book that gives him his place of fame as a church historian. His chief claim to special mention is rather a shorter monograph, Tract on the Donation of Constantine (De Constantini donatione declamatio) published in 1440, in which he exposed as outright forgery a famous edict attributed to the Emperor Constantine turning over temporal power to the Pope.

This, together with other critical essays such as one in which he convincingly casts doubt upon the apostolic origin of the Apostles' Creed, has earned him the title of "founder of critical scholarship and historical criticism" (Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 7, p. 768 f.). The so-called "Donation" claimed to be a charter of the Emperor Constantine granting to Pope Sylvester and his successors the overlordship of "the city of Rome and all the provinces, districts and cities of Italy or of the Western regions", in effect, the whole Western Roman Empire. It was effectively used by medieval popes as a major support of the temporal claims of the papacy over against kings and emperors. The full text of the "Donation" can be found in English in E. F. Henderson, Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages, 1892, pp. 319-329.

Valla's monograph exposing the fraud "had the effect of an intellectual earthquake", writes Thompson (Hist. of Historical Writing, vol. 1, p. 493). It was based on the investigations of others, notably Nicholas of Cusa, but it was his own simple, clear analysis of the Latin of the text that devastatingly exposed for all to see that it could never have been the 4th century document it claimed to be, but was undoubtedly written no earlier than about the time of Charlemagne in the 8th century. This was the beginning of scholarly textual and historical analysis of the documents of

HISTORIANS OF THE REFORMATION AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

The Protestant Reformation opens a whole new period in the writing of church history. In one sense the church histories of that period build upon the humanist historiography of the Renaissance and even far outstrip it both in the volume of historical books produced and in zealous search for and recovery of original historical sources. But in another, more negative sense, the Reformation historians and their Counter-Reformation antagonists turn away from the promising beginnings of historical impartiality and critical analysis that is found in the humanist Renaissance, and revert instead to the polemic manipulation of history and the self-serving credulity of the Middle Ages. James W. Thompson, in his History of Historical Writing is sharp in his criticism: (1, p. 526)

> "There are some period of history which have to be not re-written but unwritten, and perhaps of no period is this so true as of the Reformation. From its inception ignorance, traditional interpretation and prejudice conspired to obscure and to mutilate the facts. There is an enormous volume of contemporary historical writing which must be discounted or discarded."

In times of controversy, like the Reformation, contemporary sources are not always the best sources, therefore, unless very critically examined and used.

Nevertheless, controversy also sharpens and stimulates the writing of church history. In their search for weapons of defense or attack, historians on both sides of the conflict dug deep for historical ammunition and in so doing made their "most important contribution to historical scholarship: the recovery and publication of early documents on church history". (Barnes, p. 122). They also began to analyze church developments from a deeper perspective. As Thompson admits, despite his sharp criticism quoted above:

> "The firm establishment of Protestantism brought into prominence a branch of historiography...: church history, but of a nature radically different from the medieval historia ecclesiastica. Modern ecclesiastical history, treating of the inner life of the Church, its doctrine and administration, is the child of the Lutheran Reformation, created by the demands of the controversy raging between the Roman Church and the Protestants, the central question of which was the exclusive possession of 'the pure faith' by one church or the other.." (p. 513 f.)

We will look first at some of the less commendable [illegible] histories of the times, and then single out the best church historians on either side.

Polemic Church History in the Reformation

Reformation church history began rather poorly not so much as an effort to discover and report the true history of the church but rather as an attempt to prove from history that Protestantism was the true church and Catholicism a false counterfeit, or vice versa, depending on whether the historian belonged to the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. Its basic philosophy of history was a return to the view of Orosius that history is an epic struggle between God and the Devil, with this difference, that whereas Orosius, following and over-simplifying Augustine, pictured the City of God in terms of the Christian church, and the City of the Devil in terms of paganism, now with Protestants battling Catholics the struggle was between Christians. "Two new 'Cities of Satan'..replaced the pagan 'City' of.. Orosius--'the Devil's Nest at Rome' and the followers of 'the crazy Monk of Wittenberg', respectively," writes H. E. Barnes (p. 121).

Robert Barnes (1495-1540). The first guns of the battle of the church historians were fired by the Protestants. One of Luther's earliest supporters, the knight Ulrich von Hutten, in 1517 discovered Valla's expose of the fraudulent Donation of Constantine and happily sent it to Luther to use against the Pope. This may have stimulated Luther to consider the mounting of an historical attack against Rome. He found an English Lutheran refugee in Germany, Robert BARNES, and directed him to write The Lives of the Popes of Rome. It was not good history, but it was an effective attack, purporting to trace all the disasters of the Middle Ages to the wickedness of the popes and their greedy seizure of temporal power from natural national rulers.

The Magedeburg Centuries. By far the best and most influential Protestant historical polemic was a work called the Magdeburg Centuries, so-called because each of its 13 volumes was devoted to the history of a complete century from the time of Christ up to the 13th century. Compiled between 1553 and 1575, it was begun by MATTHIAS FLACIUS (or Vlacich) ILLYRICUS (1520-1575), a convert of Luther and often a theological opponent of Melanchthon but always a strong Lutheran partisan. He was assisted in the monumental undertaking by a whole corps of prominent scholars, six in all, who scoured all Europe for historical documents and evidence to strengthen their attack.

As with all the partisan histories of the Reformation, it is easy to criticize the Centuries. Its bias is obvious and extreme. Everything discreditable to Rome is included, and in a few cases even manufactured such as the report of a female pope, Pope Joan. The popes are all Anti-Christs. Miracles favorable to Catholicism are discounted as false, while those supporting the Protestant argument are uncritically accepted.

But even the most contemptuous of modern critics of the Centuries must grudgingly admit their immense contribution to the

CHURCH HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE RENAISSANCE

It is not surprising that the Renaissance, with its humanist interest in the classical past produced important developments in the writing of history. Nor should it be surprising to find that it produced few church historians. Its interest in history was not religious but secular. The Italian Renaissance, therefore, saw the emergence of the lay historian, quite different from in his local, political interests and his realistic, more critical methods from the priestly mediaeval historians who had preceded him. One of the most important contributions of the Renaissance historians was their search for the texts and documents of the past which, for the first time, they began to examine critically and without credulity.

The most familiar name in the transition from mediaeval to renaissance historical writing is that of Francesco PETRARCH (1304-74), who was not a church historian but rather "the true father of both Italian Humanism and of Humanist historical writing". (H. E. Barnes, Hist. of Historical Writing, p. 102). Petrarch's Lives (Liber de viris illustribus) was a history of Rome written as a series of short biographies of its great heroes. It dramatized the golden age of Rome as a sharp contrast to the unheroic Christian "Dark Ages" which followed, and thereby gave sharp impetus to the Renaissance's secularizing idealization of the pagan past. But it also inspired church writers to glorify their own past with lives of Christian heroes more believable than some of the miracle-filled, medaeval Lives of the Saints.

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (1405-1464). One who wrote such a Lives of Famous Men was the most famous, but not the best church historian of his times. He was famous not because he was a historian but because he was a Pope (Pius II), and Popes who write creditable histories are rare. He was not a very religious Pope, but a good one, "perhaps the best man of letters and the best speaker who ever wore the tiara". (Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 8, p. 181) He was a brilliant and immensely likeable man with a great diversity of talents--poet, novelist, essayist, diplomat, geographer, diarist and historian. Perhaps the most valuable part of ~~their~~ histories he wrote is his description of his own part in that history and how he viewed the events of his own time.

His historical works include:

Commentaries on the Council of Basel. Aeneas Sylvius himself was secretary of the Council which was the high point in the controversy between the conciliarists and the papacy, reaffirming the declaration of the Council of Constance (1414) that the authority of church councils was superior to that of the Pope. This work describes the deposition of Pope Eugenius IV.

History of Bohemia. The unity of Christendom in the time of Aeneas Sylvius was threatened not only by the controversy between conciliarists and papal supremacists, but also by the rise of pre-reformation reform movements like those of Wyclif and John Huss. His History of Bohemia is an important contemporary Catholic account of the Hussite wars following the martyrdom of Huss at the Council of Constance.

Commentaries. Perhaps most valuable of all, historically, are

Evidence from Roman Authors Regarding Early Christianity.

Suetonius, Vita Claudii 25, written about A.D. 120, refers to about A.D. 49. Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. For constant rioting instigated by Chrestus he (Claudius) expelled the Jews from Rome. (Ref. Acts 18:2).

Tacitus, Annals XV, 44, written about A.D. 115, refers to A.D. 64. So, to dispel the report (namely, that the fire of Rome in A.D. 64 was due to his orders) Nero substituted as the guilty persons, and inflicted unheard-of punishments on, those who, detested for their abominable crimes, were vulgarly called Chrestians (Chrestianos). The source of the name was Christus, who in the principate of Tiberius had been put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilate (auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat.) Checked for a moment, the pernicious superstition broke out again, not only throughout Judaea, the original home of that pest, but also through Rome, to which from all quarters everything outrageous and shameful (atrocia et pudenda) finds its way and becomes the vogue.

So those who confessed (that they were Christians) were first hurried to trial, and then, upon their information, a great multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of incendiarism as from hatred of the human race. And their death was aggravated by mockeries, insomuch that, wrapped in the hides of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs, or fastened to crosses to be set on fire, that when darkness fell they might be burnt to illuminate the night. Nero had offered his own gardens for the spectacle, and exhibited a circus show, mingling with the crowd himself dressed as a charioteer, or riding in a chariot. Whence it came about that, though the victims were guilty and deserved the most exemplary punishment, a sense of pity was aroused by the feeling that they were sacrificed not on the altar of public interest, but to satisfy the cruelty of one man.

Pliny the Younger, Epist. X, 96, written from Bithynia in A.D. 112. Gaius Plinius to the Emperor Trajan greeting.

It is a rule, Sir, which I inviolably observe, to refer myself to you in all my doubts; for who is more capable of guiding my uncertainty or informing my ignorance? Having never been present at any trials of the Christians, I am unacquainted with the method and limits to be observed either in examining or punishing them. Whether any difference is to be made on account of age, or no distinction allowed between the youngest and the adults; whether repentance admits to a pardon, or if a man has been once a Christian it avails him nothing to recant; whether the mere profession of Christianity, albeit without crimes, or only the crimes associated therewith are punishable - in all these points I am greatly doubtful.

In the meanwhile, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were Christians; if they confessed it I repeated the question twice again, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered I ordered them to be executed. For whatever the nature of their creed might be, I could at least feel no doubt that contumacy and inflexible obstinacy deserved chastisement. There were others also possessed with the same infatuation, but being citizens of Rome, I directed them to be carried thither.

These accusations spread, as is usually the case, from the mere fact of the matter being investigated and several forms of the mischief came to light. A placard was put up, without any signature, accusing a large number of persons by name. Those who denied they were, or had ever been, Christians, who repeated after me an invocation to the Gods and offered adoration, with wine and frankincense,to your image, which I had ordered to be brought for that purpose, together with those of the Gods, and who finally cursed Christ - none of which acts, it is said, those who are really Christians can be forced into performing - these I thought it proper to discharge. Others who were named by that informer at first confessed themselves Christians, and then denied it; true, they had been of that persuasion but they had quitted it, some three years, others many years, and a few as much as twenty years ago. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the Gods, and cursed Christ (Christo maledixerunt).

They affirmed, however, the whole of their guilt, or their error, was that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god (Christo quasi deo), and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food - but food of an ordinary and innocent kind. Even this practice, however, they had abandoned after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your orders, I had forbidden political associations. I judged it so much the more necessary to extract the real truth, with the assistance of torture, from two female slaves, who were styled deaconesses: but I could discover nothing more than depraved and excessive superstition.

I therefore adjourned the proceedings, and betook myself at once to your counsel. For the matter seemed to me well worth referring to you - especially considering the numbers endangered. Persons of all ranks and ages, and of both sexes are, and will be, involved in the prosecution. For this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread through the villages and rural districts; it seems possible, however, to check and cure it. 'Tis certain at least that the temples, which had been almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred festivals, after a long intermission, are again revived; while there is a general demand for sacrificial animals, which for some time past have met with but few purchasers. From hence it is easy to imagine what multitudes may be reclaimed from this error, if a door be left open to repentance.

Pliny the Younger, Epist. X, 97.

Trajan to Pliny greeting.

The method you have pursued, my dear Pliny, in sifting the cases of those denounced to you as Christians is extremely proper. It is not possible to lay down any general rule which can be applied as the fixed standard in all cases of this nature. No search should be made for these people; when they are denounced and found guilty they must be punished; with the restriction, however, that when the party denies himself to be a Christian, and shall give proof that he is not, that is, by adoring our Gods, he shall be pardoned on the ground of repentance, even though he may have formerly incurred suspicion. Informations without the accuser's name subscribed must not be admitted in evidence against anyone, as it is introducing a very dangerous precedent, and by no means agreeable to the spirit of the age.

For further information the following may be consulted:

Johannes B. Aufhauser, Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, no. 126), Bonn, 1913.

C.R. Haines, Heathen Contact with Christianity during its First Century and a Half, Cambridge, 1923.

Kurt Linck, De antiquissimis veterum quae ad Iesum Nazarenum spectant testimoniis (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, vol. XIV), Giessen, 1913.

Erwin Preuschen, Analecta: kurzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons, 2te Aufl., I. Teil, Staat und Christentum bis auf Konstantin (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, VIII.I) Tübingen, 1909.

CHANGING PERSPECTIVES IN CHURCH HISTORY

(A paper for a theological consultation in Seoul, Korea, February 10, 1970)

James M. Phillips
Tokyo Union Theological Seminary
Tokyo, Japan

The historian E. H. Carr once wrote that "History is an unending dialogue between the present and the past." Sometimes the best way to gain one's perspective in the midst of present problems is to renew a dialogue with a past debate. It may be helpful for those of us in the field of church history to try to understand something of our task today by recalling the works of two historians of Christian doctrine, written almost a century ago, which enter into dialogue with present-day conditions. These are John Henry Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (1845) and Adolph Harnack's History of Dogma (1886-90). These two works, although they were not written in direct confrontation with each other, nevertheless present a "debate" about the nature of Christianity which has far-reaching implications for us today. This paper will seek to renew that debate and to examine some of its implications, especially in regard to our situation in East Asia.

I. The Newman-Harnack "Debate"

John Henry Newman is not generally considered a church historian, but his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine has had a profound influence not only on the writing of church history, but also on the course of that history itself. Although he was not the first to do so, he posed a problem about church history which his and subsequent generations have had to face squarely, even though they may have taken strong exception to Newman's solution to the problem. The Essay itself is offered as a defense of the doctrinal developments of the Roman Catholic Church, for Newman wrote it after he had become disillusioned with Anglicanism and just before he became a Roman Catholic. Even so, the Church of Rome from that day to this has never been quite sure whether this was the right way to defend the faith or not, and during most of Newman's life regarded his work as a highly questionable production.

Newman wrote the Essay to answer a question that deeply troubled him. He recognized that the primitive Christian Church, as described in the New Testament and in the writings of the Early Church Fathers, did not have the same appearance nor teach the same doctrines as did the 19th-century Church of England, or the Roman Catholic Church, or any other church for that matter. How was one to explain the difference? As an Anglican, Newman had believed that the substance of the Early Fathers' writings had been preserved in the Church of England, and that the Church of Rome had made many later innovations to the faith and practice of the church. But after the hostile reception that many Anglicans gave the Oxford Group's Tracts, Newman came to have another view, which he elaborated by intensive research and writing

from 1841-5 in a small house in Littlemore, near Oxford. During this time he developed the view that Christian doctrine, just as life itself, must inevitably go through a process of development, if indeed it is to live and grow in this world. We shall not go into the precise process of development which Newman described in a rather labored fashion, for that process soon became rather quaint itself. [1] What we must not lose sight of is Newman's basic thesis about the development of doctrine, which he described in his beautiful and unforgettable prose in this way:

"It is indeed sometimes said that the stream is clearest near the spring. Whatever use may fairly be made of this image, it does not apply to the history of a philosophy or belief, which on the contrary is more equable, and purer, and stronger when its bed has become deep, and broad, and full. It necessarily rises out of an existing state of things, and for a time savours of the soil. Its vital element needs disengaging from what is foreign and temporary, and is employed in efforts after freedom which become more vigorous and hopeful as its years increase. Its beginnings are no measure of its capabilities, nor of its scope. At first no one knows what it is, or what it is worth. It remains perhaps for a time quiescent; it tries, as it were, its limbs, and proves the ground under it, and feels its way. From time to time it makes essays which fail, and are in consequence abandoned. It seems in suspense which way to go; it wavers, and at length strikes out in one definite direction. In time it enters upon strange territory; points of controversy alter their bearing; parties rise and fall around it; dangers and hopes appear in new relations; and old principles reappear under new forms. It changes with them in order to remain the same. In a higher world it is otherwise, but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often." [2]

There are many reasons why we might pursue Newman's viewpoint further, but let us instead contrast it with that of Adolf Harnack. His view, summarized in his influential book What is Christianity? was that the original teaching of Jesus about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man had been adulterated and almost lost as a result of its contacts with Hellenism, from the time of Paul onward. As one commentator put it in a vivid metaphor, Harnack felt that the original followers of Jesus who rejoiced in the sunlight and fresh air of his clear Gospel message were soon led into the dark caverns of Hellenistic speculation. There they wandered for eighteen hundred years, catching only an occasional glimpse of sunlight in the writings of Augustine and Luther, until in the 19th century under the leadership of Liberal German Protestant scholars like Harnack they were to be led back into the bright rays of the original Gospel once again.

Hence for Harnack, the history of Christian doctrines or dogmas takes on an entirely different significance than it had for Newman. "The claim of the Church," wrote Harnack, "that the dogmas are simply the exposition of the Christian revelation, because deduced from the Holy Scriptures, is not confirmed by historical investigation. On the contrary, it becomes clear that dogmatic Christianity (the dogmas) in its conception and in its construction was the work of the Hellenic spirit upon the Gospel soil." [3]

Then the task of the historian of dogma, far from that of defending the church's doctrinal developments as was the case with Newman, was to attack them, in order to free the church to hear the original Gospel. This is the way he puts it: "The history of dogma, in that it sets forth the process of the origin and development of the dogma, offers the very best means and methods of freeing the Church from dogmatic Christianity, and of hastening the inevitable process of emancipation, which began with Augustine." [4]

Although the precise ways that Newman and Harnack elaborated their discussions of the topic are of great interest, the dominant contrast that emerged in this "debate" between their presuppositions and methodologies is clear enough. The major difference is this. Newman assumes that doctrines must develop and change in order to remain the same, and that such has in fact been the case in the development of Christian doctrines. Harnack, on the other hand, holds that doctrinal development is a result of the Hellenization process, and must therefore be cut away, in order that the original Gospel may be heard and kept in all its simplicity and purity.

What is here said of doctrine applies with equal force to almost everything else connected with the Christian Church. The organizational life of the church may also be examined with regard to its development or degeneration, and the same may be said of the liturgy or the piety or the ethics of the churches. Issues regarding the development of Christian ethics will always be associated with Ernst Troeltsch's monumental The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, and it is significant that despite their differences, Harnack and Troeltsch shared essentially the same concept of the task of the historian. Troeltsch put it this way, in words which Harnack quoted in a funeral address for Troeltsch in 1923: "To conceive of construction and reconstruction means to overcome history by history and thus to furnish a platform for new creativity." [5]

II. The Aftermath of the Newman-Harnack "Debate"

It is interesting to contrast the attitudes of Newman and Harnack in regard to the Vatican Council of 1869-70, which promulgated the doctrine of papal infallibility. Both men were highly critical of the council's decisions, but their evaluations of its significance were quite different. Sustained by his view of doctrinal development, Newman could write in words that were prophetic of the Second Vatican Council: "Let us have a little faith in her [the Church] I say. Pius is not the last of the popes. The fourth Council modified the third, the fifth the fourth... The late definition does not as much need to be undone, as to be completed... Let us be patient, let us have faith, and a new Pope, and a reassembled Council may trim the boat." [6]

But for Harnack, what the Vatican Council had done was to alter for the worse the very basis for doctrinal development in that church: "The Roman Catholic Church leaves the possibility of the formulating of new dogmas open, but in the Tridentine Council and still more in the Vatican has in fact on political grounds rounded out its dogma as a legal system which above all demands obedience and only secondarily conscious faith; the Roman Catholic Church has consequently abandoned the original motive of dogmatic Christianity and has placed a wholly new motive in its stead, retaining the mere semblance of the old..." [7]

As things have turned out, Newman proved to be the better prophet. Even though the details of his theory of development now appear very dated, the Second Vatican Council -- which some called "Cardinal Newman's Council" while it was being held -- gave a kind of approval to the view that development of doctrine does take place. The Constitution on Divine Revelation puts the matter in this rather guarded way : "The tradition which comes from the apostles develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit... For, as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward toward the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her." [8]

And what of Harnack's views? They too lived on among his disciples and many followers in the Liberal Protestant school, and even among his erstwhile critics. Even a figure like Karl Barth who has vehemently criticized this school will recognize his debt to it. [9] For despite their many differences, Barth at least shared with Harnack the view that the proper understanding of Jesus Christ is not to be found through historical development. This has profound consequences for Barth's view of history. The British church historian John Kent has put it this way: "Karl Barth, for example, often wrote as though after the death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ human history had no meaning at all." [10] Actually, Barth did not disparage history, for he once gave Philippe Maury this advice: "Remember that to be a good historian you must be a good theologian, just as no good theologian can be indifferent to history." [11] Kent's criticism is quite wide of the mark, for it applies more aptly to "Barthians," for whom Barth has disclaimed all responsibility. [12] Karl Löwith of Heidelberg, for instance, wrote a book on the theological implications of the philosophy of history, which starts in modern times and works its way back to the final chapter on the Biblical view of history. [13] It may in part have been the influence of this book which led to the suggestion made at the Northeast Asia Theological Consultation in Seoul in 1966 that church history might be taught backwards, starting at the present and finishing with the Biblical period. [14]

Quite apart from the method of presenting church history, however, what is striking is Löwith's extreme pessimism about the significance of history for the development or explication of meaning. "Historical processes as such," he wrote, "do not bear the least evidence of a comprehensive and ultimate meaning. History as such has no outcome. There never has been and never will be an immanent solution to the problem of history, for man's historical experience is one of steady failure. Christianity, too, as a world-religion, is a complete failure." [15] Now if such expressions are meant to serve as antidotes to the extreme optimism about inevitable historical progress that Harnack and his colleagues expressed in their writings about the Social Gospel, well and good. [16] But if this indicates a more fundamental deprecation of the study of history itself as holding any meaning for the development of the truths of the Gospel as they come into contact with different eras, nations and cultures, then it cannot be accepted.

One may find traces of the aftermath of the Newman-Harnack "debate" throughout the theological literature of the last forty years. The discussions about the distinction between Heilsgeschichte and Weltgeschichte sometimes have led to the inference that the former was an island of "holy history" in the midst of a troubled and troubling ocean of "world history," with which it has no essential contact. Kenneth Scott Latourette was quite right in declaring that such a distinction if used in more than an analytical sense "is in contradiction to the central core of the Gospel." For Latourette stated his belief that "God has been active in all history, and in ways not inconsistent with 'salvation history,' properly understood." [17]

The debate is also echoed in the discussions about the distinctions between Historie and Geschichte as representing different levels for interpreting history, as well as in the "demythologizing" efforts of Rudolf Bultmann and his school, and in the "new quest of the historical Jesus" among the post-Bultmannians. [18] A discussion of these various developments would take us far beyond the scope of this paper. Yet in the background lies the lingering issue between Newman and Harnack: Does history leave any room for the development of the Gospel and its life of faith in the Christian Church? The way one answers this question determines one's attitude toward the contents and the meaning of both church history and world history.

III. Implications of the Newman-Harnack "Debate" for East Asia.

Let us attempt to draw out some of the implications of the Newman-Harnack "debate" about historical development for the situations we face in East Asia. For there are signs all around us that the essence of the problem with which these two scholars were wrestling in the field of history of doctrine is closely related to a number of contemporary developments in this part of the world.

That the question about "development" could be raised anew at this time indicates something of the change that has come across the study of history itself in recent years. Historians are now rightly suspicious of any effort to identify "development" with a theory of inevitable progress. Indeed, the very school of historiography to which Harnack belonged, which pinned its hopes on an inevitable progress that was to develop in history, saw the collapse of their hopes in the ashes of two world wars. Alan Richardson's History Sacred and Profane is as persuasive an epitaph as any for the rationalist views that history must necessarily bring with it increasing happiness and prosperity. [19]

One important thing that should be noted is that there is a different consciousness of history that may be seen among many students today. Student bookstores in Japan have in the last two years stocked more books on historical subjects than in almost any period since the end of World War II. This is in sharp contrast to American college bookstores, by the way, where a recent survey revealed that students liked books on race, revolution, and Buddhism, but showed almost no interest whatever in history. [20] But beyond the actual subject matter of history, what is striking about some of the leftist students in Japan, for instance, is their desire to make history the scene of new developments, understood of course in revolutionary terms. Faced with an academic system that seems to them unchanged and unchanging, more concerned about mass-producing students through a diploma mill of stereotyped education, these students rebels have sought to inject elements of radical change into what appears to them to be a closed system. Scolded by their elders for lacking specific program goals or alternatives to the present systems, these students keep on increasing the number of their demands, and when these are met, keep on asking for more. If they are pressed to specify the goals that will truly satisfy them, they are apt to say that they will be satisfied with nothing else than "permanent revolution." But that phrase on their lips does not necessarily mean the same thing for them as it did for Marx and Lenin. It is as if the one thing that the radical students do not want to happen is to have their future fixed, and therefore closed off to other possible options for further development. It hardly needs to be said, however, that such an outlook can easily slip over into total anarchy, and thus contain the seeds for the destruction of oneself and others. This danger should alert us to the urgent need for coming to grips with the problem of what an open future can mean for the student generation today.

Furthermore, a new consciousness of history and its possibilities is emerging in connection with national development programs in Asia. Some of the aspects here are to be explored from a Christian perspective at the Asian Ecumenical Conference for Development, co-sponsored by EACC and SODEPAX, to meet in Tokyo in July 1970. Despite the use of the same word, it would be a mistake to make a ready identification of the word "development" as used in the Newman-Harnack debate with the subject of national development. It is more in the area of common views about the possibilities of history that the resemblance lies. In fact, the precise definition of national development is a very elusive matter. For instance, the economist Neil H. Jacoby has

recently written: "For our purposes development may simply be defined as a complex socio-politico-economic process whereby the people of a country progress from a static traditional mode of life toward a modern dynamic society." [21] Note how this definition, based primarily on economic presuppositions, severely prejudices the matter by trying to define a people's "progress" from the "static" and "traditional" to the "modern" and "dynamic."

Americans in particular have had a weakness for concentrating so heavily on economic factors in development that they have slighted other areas. They have used concepts popularized by W. W. Rostow such as "take-off point" and "drive to maturity" as if they marked the necessary stages of a new determinism. [22] American foreign policy and aid programs have often been linked to such deterministic concepts. The preliminary studies that have been conducted for the EACC-SODEPAX Conference, for which Dr. In Ha Lee is the Executive Secretary, have already indicated how dangerous it is to rely solely or even primarily on the economic factors of national development. Indeed the renowned Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal's massive studies entitled Asian Drama have indicated that the social, cultural, and religious factors in a nation's life may be fundamental in creating that people's sense of identity that makes development in the economic and political sense possible.

The significance of this for Christians can hardly be overestimated. It means that Christian theologians, for instance, need to have a clearer theological understanding of what "development" means. Dr. Won Yong Kang of the Korea Christian Academy has often been quoted (perhaps apocryphally) as saying that whereas the churches in North America and Europe are being called upon to develop a "theology of reconciliation," and the churches of Latin America are being confronted with a "theology of revolution," what the churches of Asia must work at is a "theology of development." Indeed, because of the different conditions which churches in different parts of Asia are facing, it might be said that there is need for a number of theologies of development. For societies in the early stage of economic growth, the emphasis must largely be on nation-building, while societies which have already experienced large-scale industrial development must focus on the overall purposes for which their societies exist, and their capacities for both good and evil.

Seen in the terms of the Newman-Harnack "debate," the question for historical theology comes down to this: Can history be the arena for meaningful changes that will enhance the dignity of peoples before God, and not damage or destroy them? Jürgen Moltmann has put the matter this way: "In the light of the prospects for the whole creation that are promised in the raising of Christ, theology will have to attain to its own, new way of reflecting on the history of men and things." [23] Indeed, if historical theology is to be true to its responsibility in our day and age, it must embrace within its concerns not only the past and the present, but the future as well. Church history must learn to speak not only the language of recollection, but also of hope.

Sometimes it is said that our task as church historians is to develop an "Asian church history." Too much emphasis has been placed on the growth of Western nations and churches, it is pointed out, and it is imperative to pay attention to the unique contributions that have come out of the Christian churches of Asia. [24] These are necessary and praiseworthy objectives. At the same time, it is also important for scholars in Asia to reflect on the entire course of history, viewing it from the perspectives of Christian faith in the eyes of their own people. [25] Such an historical theology will let us have some perspectives on the present difficulties through which we are passing, and also may give us a glimpse of the hopes we cherish for the future.

As John Henry Newman provided the point of departure for this paper, we may allow him to have the last word as well. In his Apologia pro Vita Sua, he recalls how in 1839 he embarked on a renewed study of church history during a period when there seemed to be difficulties on all sides, in the Anglican Church and English society, as well as in his personal life. It was this return to research in the church's past that brought forth his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. During the course of this work, he recalls how in reading over the records of a particular series of events in the distant past, he was suddenly struck with the realization that he was here faced with frighteningly accurate parallels to the tumultuous situation through which he was passing: "There was an awful similitude, more awful, because so silent and unimpassioned, between the dead records of the past and the feverish chronicle of the present." [26] Let us hope that there can continue to be such study of church history, that will reveal the "awful similitude(s)... between the dead records of the past and the feverish chronicle of the present," that will also enlighten our way to the future, with confidence and hope.

FOOTNOTES:

1. See Owen Chadwick, From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1957).

2. John Henry Newman, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (N.Y.: Doubleday Image Books, 1960), p. 63.

3. Adolf Harnack, Outlines of the History of Dogma (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), p. 5. Italics are Harnack's.

4. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

5. Quoted by Wilhelm Pauck, Harnack and Troeltsch: Two Historical Theologians (N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1968), p. 124.

6. Quoted in Hans Küng, The Council, Reform and Reunion (London: Sheed & Ward, 1962), p. 162.

7. Harnack, Outlines, pp. 3-4.

8. Quoted in Walter M. Abbott, ed., The Documents of Vatican II (N.Y.: Guild Press, 1966), p. 116.

9. Karl Barth, From Rousseau to Ritschl (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 390.

10. J. Daniélou, A. H. Couratin, and John Kent, The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Vol. 2: Historical Theology (London: Penguin Books, 1969), p. 244.

11. Quoted by Philippe Maury in his essay in History's Lessons for Tomorrow's Mission (Geneva: WSCF, 1960), pp. 6-7.

12. In Barth's Foreword to Otto Weber, Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics (London: Lutterworth, 1953), p. 9.

13. Karl Löwith, Meaning in History (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1949).

14. See the Report of the Consultation, Theological Education and Ministry (Tainan: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1967).

15. Löwith, op. cit., p. 191.

16. See, for instance, Adolf Harnack and Wilhelm Heermann, Essays on the Social Gospel (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), especially Chapter XI on "The Realm Mind of Jesus."

17. Kenneth Scott Latourette, Christianity Through the Ages (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1965), p. xi.

18. See, for instance, James M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1963), also the series on New Directions in Theology Today, in which Vol. I: Introduction is by William Hordern, and Vol. II: History and Hermeneutics, is by Carl E. Braaten (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966).

19. Alan Richardson, History Sacred and Profane (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), especially "Appended Note III: The Philosophy of History."

20. Article in Japan Times, February 4, 1970.

21. Neil H. Jacoby, The Progress of Peoples (Santa Barbara, Cal.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1969), p. 5.

22. W. W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1960), pp. 4 - 16.

23. Jürgen Moltmann, Theology of Hope (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 35.

24. A very welcome publication in this area is Gerald H. Anderson, ed., Studies in Philippine Church History (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press) 1969).

25. There are important articles in this connection from Korea and Japan in The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology (Number 2), September 1969.

26. John Henry Newman, Apologia Pro Vita Sua (N.Y. : Doubleday Image Books, 1956), p. 218.

50 YEARS OF
DOCUMENTARY DISCOVERIES
ON CHURCH HISTORY

1887

The Church Quarterly Review (London), Vol. XXV,
No. xlix (Oct., 1887) pp. 182-

Art. X.—FIFTY YEARS OF DOCUMENTARY DISCOVERIES ON CHURCH HISTORY.

Urkundenfunde zur Geschichte des christlichen Alterthums. Von Dr. Gotthard Victor Lechler, ord. Professor der Theologie, Geh. Kirchenrath in Leipzig. (Leipzig, 1886.)

The celebration of the Queen's Jubilee has given occasion for the publication of many reviews of the progress the nation has made during the last fifty years. It seems, then, not an unsuitable time to take a review of what the last fifty years have gained for us of materials for the knowledge of Church history; for in respect of the coming to light of new documents, the years of our Queen's reign will well bear com-

parison with any previous period of equal length. So many important 'finds' have been made, that we cannot help asking ourselves whether we have come to the end of them. Is there any chance that any of the works now set down as lost may yet be recovered? What a light it would throw on the history of our Gospels if there should be disinterred from the library of some Eastern monastery that *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord* by Papias, about which so much ingenuity of conjecture has been expended! What if a copy should have escaped destruction of Porphyry's learned assault on the Christian faith, a work so hateful to believers that they seem not to have had even patience to read the answers to it—at least these answers, though some of them were written by distinguished men, have failed to reach us—and yet a work which, if we now had it, would probably give us a fuller picture of the Christianity of the third century than is presented in the writings of many an orthodox divine? What if some New Testament MS. should come to light earlier than any we have got, the earliest of which only dates from the fourth century?

It seems unreasonable to hope for much of new discovery, now that the treasures of the civilized parts of the world have been so well explored. The records of the earliest Christian centuries, to which we should now attach the most value, did not excite the same interest in the minds of the scribes of the Middle Ages, who preferred to transcribe many documents which we could bear to lose with little grief. Our hopes of finding really old books or papers still surviving become faint when we read many a true story of the destruction of ancient libraries through the waste of ignorant possessors, who either allowed valuable papers to rot uncared for, or even applied them to base uses. According to Tischendorf's story, he was barely in time to save the Sinaitic MS. of the New Testament from being used in lighting fires. The regions whose literary treasures have been least explored are also those where waste and destruction are likely to have had greatest range of exercise. Every year the chance of finding old documents undestroyed must be becoming less; and if we should find a heap of such, the chances are that the greater part would be things for which we should not much care. Lord Bacon complained that time was like a river, which bore on its surface things light and worthless, while the weighty matter sank to the bottom. Yet if we must not be too sanguine in our hopes, the knowledge of what the last fifty years have gained for us may teach us not to despair. For at the time when Queen Victoria ascended the throne it might have

been argued, as we have argued now, that there was little reason to anticipate much addition to the then existing sources of knowledge.

There will no doubt be many readers of this Review for whom nothing that we have to tell will have any novelty; but there is a pleasure in being reminded of what we know, as well as in being told what we do not know. We called to mind at the beginning of this article how many narratives of the secular events of the reign have been lately published, and have been read with interest by persons themselves well able to remember most of the things related. The tract by Dr. Lechler, which is the subject of this article, is intended to give an account of the documents throwing light on early Church history which have been recovered within the last fifty years; and though naturally he wrote last year without thought of our Jubilee, it so happens that he begins with the first year of our Sovereign's reign. Although we can ourselves well remember the surprise and pleasure with which we heard of most of the discoveries of which he tells, we read his tract with so much interest that we think our readers will be glad to receive an account of this very opportune publication. A review article in modern times is commonly an independent dissertation, for which the title of the book reviewed only furnishes a motto. Ours must be one of the modest reviews of the old school, which aimed at no more than giving a faithful account of the contents of the work reported on; for we write in an Alpine village, at a distance from books, and have learned by sad experience the danger of putting too much confidence in our memory.

Dr. Lechler begins by stating the limitations necessary in order to bring what he has to tell within reasonable compass. Thus he restricts himself to discoveries throwing light on the history of the first six centuries, although he gives specimens of interesting things which might be related if he were to carry the history lower down. He confines himself also to speaking of documents. Thus he refrains, for example, from saying anything about the explorations made in the Roman catacombs, about the discovery of ancient buildings, and about inscriptions. This last subject is in itself extensive enough to furnish materials for an article. Those who have read Bishop Lightfoot's recent volumes will know how important a part inscriptions play both in determining the date of Polycarp's martyrdom and in enabling us to identify the Asiarch who presided over the games at which he suffered. Many still disputed questions in chronology might be settled

by the very possible recovery of an inscription enabling us to determine the date when office was held by a proconsul whom we know of in connexion with the events in question. We need not speak of other services rendered by inscriptions, the importance of paying attention to them being fully felt by all modern writers on Church history. We have now only to speak of documents, of which Lechler treats in chronological order, arranging them, however, according to the order when the discoveries were made, not according to the dates when the discoveries were published. Accordingly he gives the first place to Dressel's discovery of the conclusion of the Clementine Homilies, which appears to have taken place in 1837, the first year of Queen Victoria's reign, though not actually published till 1852.

I. In the speculations of the Tübingen School concerning the early history of the Christian Church a prominent place is occupied by a work which was given circulation in Rome at the end of the second century, or not long after. In the form in which it then appeared it was written in the name of the Roman Clement, and professed to give an account of St. Peter's preaching to the Gentiles and of his controversies with Simon Magus. That form of the work which is known as the Clementine Homilies was published by Cotelier in his *Apostolic Fathers* in 1672; but the MS. on which Cotelier's edition was based was defective, for although it stated that the complete work contained twenty homilies, it broke off in the middle of the nineteenth, and it was more than a century and a half before the gap could be filled up. In 1837, as we have said, Dressel, a Saxon scholar who was engaged in literary research at Rome, found in the Vatican Library an unmutilated MS. containing also a better text of the Homilies, a MS. to which no attention had previously been paid, probably because the heretical work which it contained had excited little interest.

But, however unorthodox may have been the doctrine of this work, its undoubted antiquity gives it importance in the eyes of historical students. One question which it raised was whether the writer manifests acquaintance with our Gospels. In the discourses ascribed to St. Peter sayings of our Lord are quoted, in substance agreeing with the report of our Gospels, but ordinarily differing somewhat in form. Are we to suppose that the writer drew his information from Gospels other than those we know, and which have now perished, or is it enough to say that some distortion of quotation was a literary necessity?—for too close a copying of our Gospels would

betray at once that we had to deal with one completely dependent on the written record, and not, as was pretended, an apostle speaking from independent knowledge and at a time before any Gospels were written. With the controversy as regards the Synoptic Gospels we have here no concern, nor indeed is there much need to speak of it; for, as St. John's Gospel is allowed by all to be the latest of the four, it will hardly be disputed that, if the Clementine writer was acquainted with that, it is likely that he knew also the other three. Now there are in the first eighteen of the Clementine Homilies several coincidences with St. John's Gospel, the most obvious explanation of which was that the homilist had borrowed from St. John. But this the critics of the Tübingen School obstinately refused to admit. Hilgenfeld, in 1850, urged the extreme improbability that the Clementine writer would make use of a book with which he was doctrinally at utter variance, his work being so deeply marked by Jewish Ebionitism as to be outside the limits of orthodoxy, whereas no New Testament book more completely throws down the barrier between Jew and Gentile than does the fourth Gospel. Hilgenfeld's positive conclusion was that there is no instance of the use of St. John's Gospel in the Homilies. The same conclusion was maintained by Zeller, in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* for 1853, who declared that the attempts were vain which had been made to establish an acquaintance with St. John on the part of the Clementine writer. It was exactly then that Dressel's complete edition of the Clementine Homilies appeared, and in the newly recovered 20th Homily there was found a distinct reference to the healing of the man born blind (John ix.) and to the disciples' question, 'Whether did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?'

The result has been that the Clementine use of St. John may be said now to be completely acknowledged. Volkmar owned the decisiveness of the new proof in 1854. So did Strauss in his *New Life of Jesus* in 1864. Hilgenfeld showed some reluctance at first, but in his Introduction to the New Testament in 1875 makes full acknowledgment. In fact, those critics who regard as pure invention the things related by St. John and not mentioned by the other Evangelists, feel it to be a less evil to acknowledge the Clementine use of St. John than to assert that a story peculiar to the fourth Evangelist had been confirmed by an independent tradition. Lagarde counts fifteen passages of St. John made use of in the Clementines, none of which it is worth any one's while to dispute, now that the Clementine writer's acquaintance with the Gospel has been

established in one clear case. But the value of the victory on this point has been greatly enhanced by the efforts that were made to avoid yielding it. For Hilgenfeld's proof that the author of the Homilies was in point of doctrine at the opposite pole from St. John entitles us to say that the fourth Gospel must have been a long time in established credit and authority when the Clementine forger wrote, else he would not have made such frequent use of a book with which he could have had no sympathy.

Another interesting result obtained from Dressel's discovery is that we are now assured how the story ended. It appears that the original story of the preaching of Peter and of his conflict with Simon Magus described all as taking place in Eastern cities. The story of a conflict at Rome between Peter and Simon Magus is seen to be a later addition, probably first imagined when the *Preaching of Peter* was adapted to Roman use, and afterwards amplified by legend.

II. The next 'find' which we have to relate takes us to a different period of Church history, viz. the end of the fourth century. A parchment MS. in the Paris Library, written in uncial characters, contains, among other matter, the Acts of the Council of Aquileia in 381. A German scholar, Krust, took notice that on the broad margin of some of the leaves there was writing in a cursive hand. And being himself obliged to leave Paris, he directed to the MS. the attention of another German scholar, Professor Waitz, who edited this marginal matter in 1840. It was found to contain controversial notes by an Arian bishop, Maximin, criticizing the statements in the Acts of the Aquileian Council. We are on firmer ground in writing the history of any heresy, the more we are able to balance the accounts of it given by orthodox writers by documents written from the heretical point of view. But what has especial interest for us in the fragment of which we are treating is that it gives us new materials for the life of Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths, who exercised immense influence over that nation, who translated the Scriptures for their use, and who for that purpose had to create the Gothic written character. It was known that he was an Arian, and that under his teaching Arianism became the creed of the Goths; but our previous authorities for his life, being separated from him by some interval of time, and emanating from persons apparently with no sufficient means of knowledge, left us uncertain on several points. The new information, though not as full as might be desired, may be regarded as peculiarly trustworthy,

for it rests on a relation made by Auxentius, Bishop of Durostorum, who tells us that he had been from early childhood the ward and pupil of Ulfilas. Having so many things to speak of, we cannot enter into details as to the facts now put in a clearer light, but refer our readers to the little volume about Ulfilas published not long since by Mr. C. A. A. Scott.

III. In the two instances just considered we had not to tell of any importation of new MSS., but only of gains made by a closer examination of the contents of old libraries. Great libraries have not always had learned and intelligent librarians ; and even a learned and intelligent librarian cannot be expected to have leisure and inclination to examine carefully all the books under his charge. Thus it has been quite possible for libraries to contain treasures unknown to their possessors. A curious instance how even a book which is known to be in a library can remain concealed from its custodians is presented by the late Mr. Bradshaw's discovery of a volume in the Cambridge University Library, which had for a long time been supposed to have been lost, but which was actually standing all the time in its proper place on the shelf, only disguised by having been bound with a wrong title. The scholars of a century or two ago had to make laborious travels in order to explore the contents of isolated libraries. The scholars of the present day have their labours immensely lightened not only by greater facilities of travel, but by the work which is actively going on of publishing catalogues of the MS. possessions of different libraries. Thus they know beforehand where what they are in search of is likely to be found ; and as each MS. is brought under the scrutiny of scholars with special knowledge and interest in the subject, peculiarities are discovered which would easily escape the notice of an ordinary cataloguer. We may cite for example Mr. Bensly's discovery that the copy of the Fourth Book of Esdras in the Communal Library at Amiens contained a considerable passage absent from all previously known Latin MSS.

The discovery which we have next to mention was indeed of a volume brought from the East in recent times, but which had yet run a risk of passing into the class of 'unsuspected treasures' of an old library. In the year 1842 a collection of Greek MSS. was brought from the monasteries of Mount Athos to Paris, gathered by a Greek scholar, Mynoides Mynas, who had been commissioned for the purpose by Villemain, then Minister of Public Instruction. Among these MSS. was one which at first attracted no attention. It was not older than the fourteenth century, it bore no author's

name, and it had the uninviting title, 'A Refutation of all Heresies.' But after a few years an official of the Paris Library, Emmanuel Miller, had his attention drawn to the book, in which he imagined that he had discovered a work of Origen. The Clarendon Press at Oxford undertook the publication of the work, which appeared in 1851 under the title *Origenis Philosophumena sive Omnium Hæresium Refutatio.* That the work was as old as the time of Origen all scholars were soon agreed, but equally so that Origen was not the author; for he appears to claim to be a bishop, and certainly to have taken an active part in controversies at Rome. Who the author was became for some time a subject of hot dispute; but a general agreement has now been arrived at that he was Hippolytus, who has commonly been described as Bishop of Portus, and who was at any rate one of the chief representatives of the learning of the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century. Besides the controversy concerning its authorship to which the discovery of this treatise gave rise, there were two other points on which active literary discussion arose.

Two Roman pontiffs, contemporary with the author, Zephyrinus and Callistus, had till then enjoyed an unblemished reputation, and had been honoured with the title of Saint. The memory of the latter has been specially preserved in connexion with his work on the Roman Catacombs. If we were to believe this writer, we must regard these two Popes as men not only of indifferent moral character, but as heretical in doctrine. Zephyrinus is treated with comparative leniency, his errors being attributed to his rustic ignorance, and no worse moral fault being laid to his charge than excessive love of money. But with Callistus the writer had come into personal controversy. The subject in dispute was the union of the two Natures in the Person of our Lord. Hippolytus charged Callistus with countenancing the error of those who removed all distinction between the Father and the Son. Callistus retorted by accusing Hippolytus of having two Gods. There were disputes also as to Church discipline, which seem to indicate that Hippolytus and Callistus were at the heads of rival congregations—the latter, who adopted a laxer discipline, receiving into his communion persons excommunicated by the former. In the treatise of which we speak a scandalous account is given of the life of Callistus, who is described as originally a slave, as a fraudulent bankrupt, as having attempted suicide, as having gained the honour of confessorship on false pretences—the offence for which he was really

punished being not the profession of Christianity but brawling in a Jewish synagogue—and as having imposed on the simplicity of Zephyrinus so as to obtain promotion from him, though he had been treated with marked distrust by the previous bishop, Victor. It is evident what use could be made in the Roman controversy of this third-century evidence that popes were then regarded as neither impeccable nor infallible. The late Bishop Wordsworth published a work in which all the statements of the newly discovered volume were accepted as true, and the obvious inferences were drawn from them. Cardinal Newman was so scandalized that he positively refused to believe that so libellous a story could have been penned by Hippolytus, whom the Church has always honoured as a saint and a martyr. The proof, however, that the *Refutation of all Heresies* is really the work of Hippolytus is too strong to be resisted; and Von Döllinger, then the most learned divine in the Roman Church, made the ingenious defence, which he supported by strong arguments, that whatever sins or errors Hippolytus charged on Callistus he charged none on the Bishop of Rome, for that he did not acknowledge Callistus as such, but claimed to be Bishop of Rome himself. But as Church history does not show the slightest trace of a schism in the popedom at this period, if we accept Von Döllinger's theory we are led to the conclusion that the whole Christian world must at the beginning of the third century have been singularly indifferent who was Bishop of Rome, and that the see could be claimed by rival candidates, one of them the member of the Roman Church whose writings were best known outside of Italy, and yet that no one should appear to be aware of the dispute.

Enough has been said to illustrate the importance and interest of one class of the controversies to which the discovery of this treatise gave rise. To speak now of another, a marked feature of the treatise was that it poured a flood of new light on the Gnostic speculations of the second century. Several Gnostic heresies were among those which the author undertook to refute, and in doing so he gave large quotations from several Gnostic works previously unknown. What value was to be attached to these extracts became the subject of a new class of controversies. For example, the picture of the heresy of Basilides presented in this work of Hippolytus is quite different from that presented in the account of Irenæus; which of them are we to esteem more worthy of credit? But deeper interest attached to another question: almost all these extracts, including those ascribed to the oldest heretics, such as Basilides

and Valentinus, agree in making large use of the fourth Gospel. If we accept the extracts as genuine, the date of that Gospel is established as antecedent to the rise of any of these heresies. In order to escape this conclusion, it was contended that Hippolytus must, either through mistake or through carelessness in writing, have ascribed to the early founders of heretical sects works really written by their followers not long before his time. This would not be the place to discuss that question. We merely wish to give our readers an idea of the importance of the discovery of this little treatise and of the controversies which arose out of it.

IV. The discoveries hitherto described were of isolated MSS. We come now to a larger subject, viz. the collection of Syrian MSS. brought from the Nitrian Desert to the British Museum. As the Nile, coming down from Upper to Middle Egypt, approaches the point of the Delta, the mountain chains which hitherto had closely bounded its course retire to a greater distance, and that on the west side breaks off into isolated heights separated by flat barren tracts, a land of salt and sulphur. The name 'Nitrian Desert'—known to the early Christians as the desert of Scete—is given in a general way to the whole district, though strictly it has a narrower signification. As early as the second century this inhospitable region became the abode of Christian anchorites who sought to withdraw from the society of men. In the fourth century, when the monastic life became fashionable, scores of monasteries were established in this district, of which only four now remain. In one of these, somewhere about the eighth century, a company of Syrian Jacobite monks settled, with the consent of the Coptic Patriarch, with whose doctrine, as Monophysites, they were in unison. In the year A.D. 932 the then Abbot Moses brought back from a journey to Mesopotamia 250 valuable Syriac MSS., partly purchased, partly presented to him. From the second century to the seventh, Syriac-speaking Christians had exhibited considerable literary activity, and had translated into their own language many valuable Greek theological works, including a few now preserved in no other form. But in the course of time the successors of these monks lost the knowledge of the Syriac language, and these treasures became useless to them. In the year 1707 Pope Clement XI., who had been urged by the Maronites settled at Rome to attempt to gain some of the Syriac MSS., which they were able to tell him could be found in Nitrian monasteries, sent Elias Assemani, and eight years later his cousin Joseph Simon Assemani, to the East with this object

in view. The result was the gain of over 150 Syriac MSS. for the Vatican Library, the most important of the contents of which were made known to the world through various publications of the Assemani family, in particular their *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Not more, however, than about forty of the MSS. brought back by the Assemani came from the Nitrian monasteries of which we have made mention ; and the lion's share of that collection finally fell to the lot of the English nation. A small portion was obtained by Archdeacon Tattam, who travelled in Egypt in search of Coptic MSS. in 1839. This led to negotiations for the purchase of the entire library, which was gained in successive instalments, the last in 1851. The late Canon Cureton speedily devoted himself to the study and publication of these Syriac MSS., and his work has been ably carried on by his successor in this department of the British Museum, Professor Wright.[1] Lechler considers Cureton's publications in the chronological order of the authors edited.

(1) First is to be mentioned a discovery of by no means the same importance now as when it was first announced, at which time it excited great interest and raised no little controversy. The genuineness of the letters ascribed to Ignatius had for a couple of centuries been fiercely contested ; though the sagacity of Ussher had put out of court the larger collection long current in Latin, and had reduced the question to that of the genuineness of the seven letters recognized by Eusebius. Cureton now found in Syriac three of these seven letters, and these in a shorter form than the corresponding Greek epistles, and he regarded these Syriac letters as representing the original Ignatius out of which the Greek form had been developed. This middle view was neither acceptable to those who had defended, nor to the majority of those who had impugned, the genuineness of the Greek epistles ; but it found favour with some very eminent scholars. The fact that the Ignatian letters had been tampered with by a forger in the fourth century is certainly not logically a reason for thinking it likely that a previous forger had been at work on them in the second ; but undoubtedly the admitted fact that these letters had been the subject of one forgery made men more inclined to believe that there had been another. However, as investigation proceeded the credit of the Syriac letters

[1] A full and interesting account of the successive acquisitions thus made by the British Museum will be found in Dr. Wright's Preface to the third part of the *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year* 1838, London, 1872. See also an article by Dr. Cureton in the *Quarterly Review*, No. cliii.

declined, and scholars, such as Lipsius in Germany and Lightfoot in England, who had been once disposed to accept their form as the original, now abandon their defence, and the Syriac letters have lost nearly all their importance in being recognized to be only extracts made from a version of the seven letters.

We shall not delay on (2) an Apology bearing the name of Melito of Sardes, who died about 180. Even if genuine, it does not add much to our knowledge of the times when it was written; but it is highly questionable whether the ascription is not erroneous, for Eusebius appears to have known only one Apology by Melito, and he quotes an extract from it which is not found in the Syriac Apology.

Somewhat more interest attaches to (3) a work of which there had been some previous knowledge—a dialogue ascribed to Bardesanes of Edessa, bearing the title of *The Laws of the Countries*, for the dialogue was known to Eusebius and to Epiphanius under the title *Concerning Fate*, and it has also been made use of in the Clementine Recognitions. Of the teaching of Bardesanes we have scarcely any direct knowledge, but according to trustworthy authorities it was tainted with some form of Gnostic heresy. Even the work now recovered is found to have been penned, not by Bardesanes himself, but by a pupil of his. The subject is one not calculated to exhibit any discordance between the writer's views and those of the Church. His object is to refute the doctrine of astrological fate; that is to say, the doctrine that men's character and conduct are determined by the constellations under which they are born. His method of refutation is to show the power of man's freewill to resist all stellar influences. He displays his geographical knowledge by giving a detailed account of the laws and customs of different countries, and then tells how the Jews, in spite of stars or climates, keep the Sabbath day and circumcise their children, whether they are in Edom or Arabia, Greece or Persia, north or south. So likewise the new race of us Christians, wherever we are, hold our Sunday meetings, keep our weekly fasts, and observe none of the evil customs of the country in which we live. Of these a detailed list is given, of which we only note that he states that those who live among the Jews do not use circumcision. The antiquity of the tract is evidenced by the phrase, 'new race,' applied to the Christians, and what is told about their weekly observances is interesting.

(4) If the last work described is by one branded as a heretic, the next to be mentioned is by one of unimpeachable

orthodoxy—the great Athanasius. It has been long known that it was the custom of the Bishops of Alexandria to issue circular letters announcing the day on which each coming Easter was to be celebrated. The earliest of whom this is told is Dionysius, fragments of such letters being preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 20–22). After the Council of Nicæa had laid down the rule that Easter was to be celebrated on the Sunday following the full moon of the vernal equinox, the announcement of the day was made by the Bishop of Alexandria, where astronomical science was most cultivated. It was known that Athanasius had written Festal letters of this kind. Some fragments of them had been preserved, and some spurious Festal letters in the name of Athanasius had been forged. Montfaucon, the Benedictine editor of his works, had expressed a hope of the recovery of something more trustworthy: 'fortassis adhuc latent in Oriente, ubi bene multa extant.'

This hope has been fulfilled by Cureton's publication of an old Syriac translation of these Festal letters, not indeed complete, but still very interesting. Besides its doctrinal teaching it enables us to rectify some small errors in the chronology of the life of Athanasius; his accession to the see is found to have been not in 326, as on the authority of Theodoret had been previously supposed, but not until June 8, 328; and the date of the Council of Sardica has to be altered from 347 to 343.

(5) We come close to the limits we had fixed ourselves in the last of Cureton's publications described by Lechler, the third part of the *Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus*, a Monophysite bishop who lived in the reign of Justinian, and had been employed by him in the conversion of the heathen still numerous in Constantinople and Asia Minor. In this work he had been highly successful, having, as he tells us, baptized 30,000 persons, and built 96 churches. In his later life, during which, like other Monophysites, he had to suffer persecution, he gave his Syrian fellow-countrymen the first Church history in their own language and it was brought down to their own 'troubled times.' An interesting piece of contemporary history which he gives is that of the foundation of the Christian Church in Nubia. Assemani had printed in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* the statement of Bar-Hebræus, a Syrian writer of the thirteenth century, that Nubia had been converted by Monophysites in the time of Justinian; but he had refused to give credence to a story which seemed to him to have been got up in the interests of heretics. It is, however, quite con-

firmed by the newly recovered authority, which tells a curious story of this planting of Christianity in Nubia in the year 550. It appears that Julianus, an Alexandrian Monophysite, had been inspired with zeal for the conversion of the tribes outside the limits of the Roman empire, and had written to the Empress Theodora, a patroness of the Monophysites, requesting her co-operation. When the emperor was informed of the plan he was eager to join in it, only the missionaries must be of the orthodox faith of the Council of Chalcedon. Accordingly he sent an ambassador with presents to the Nubian king, and also letters to the governor of the Thebaid. But Theodora promptly took her measures, and let the governor know that his head should pay the penalty if Julianus did not arrive before those sent with the emperor's authority. The governor dared not disregard the warning; so he gave the emperor's ambassadors a courteous reception, but told them of the dangers of the desert journey they had to make, and of the necessity of finding the cattle necessary for the journey, and, what was more important and more difficult, really trustworthy guides. While these were being sought Julianus had pushed on, and when after much delay the emperor's ambassadors arrived at their destination they found the king not only converted to Christianity, but pledged to the Monophysite creed.

(6) It does not fall within the plan of this article to speak of the discovery of MSS. of the New Testament text; but any mention of Cureton's publications would be incomplete without saying something as to his publication of fragments of a Syriac translation of the Gospels which plays an important part in modern textual criticism. Tregelles had remarked that the Peshito, or Syriac vulgate text, instead of conforming to the text attested by the oldest Greek authorities, was in tolerably close accordance with that which became current in the fourth century. He ventured then to assert that there must have been an older form of Syriac text, of which the current Peshito is only a later recension. It seemed like the verification of the calculations of Adams and Le Verrier by the discovery of the planet Neptune when Cureton in 1864 published fragments, found among the Nitrian MSS., of a Syriac version of the Gospels, the text of which has strong affinities with that of the older Western MSS. This is so exactly what had been anticipated, that the version with which we have thus been made acquainted is quoted by Westcott and Hort as *Syriaca vetus*, the Peshito being referred to as *Syriaca vulgata*; and in this view they have the adherence

of the majority of New Testament critics. But Syriac scholars find it hard to get over the complete absence of other traces of what is held to be the old Syriac, Mr. Gwilliam, for example, who is preparing for publication an edition of the Peshito Gospels founded on MSS. one of which is as old as the fifth century, not being able to find in the oldest MSS. any indication that their text was substantially different from that now current. It is not unreasonable to hope that some as yet unstudied Syriac documents may become known which will put the solution of this question beyond all controversy. At present the most hopeful source of illustration is a comparison with the text of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, to be mentioned presently, which has been found to exhibit a relationship with the Curetonian text. That Tatian, who resided for some time in the West, should use a Western text is quite natural; but with regard to the relations between his work and the Syriac Gospels there are questions not yet fully determined, into which, therefore, we cannot enter.

V. Next in order comes to be mentioned Tischendorf's success in obtaining the great Sinaitic MS. in 1859. We need not repeat the interesting history which he himself has given of his discovery, since it is given in a tract of his, entitled, *When were our Gospels written?* which has been published by the Religious Tract Society for a shilling, and has obtained a wide circulation. We have declined to enter on the history of the discovery of New Testament MSS., but this one contains besides, as an appendix to the canonical books, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. It had been known from the testimony of Eusebius that, besides our canonical books, some other writings had, in early times, been admitted into the public reading of some churches. This had been confirmed by the fact that the Alexandrian MS. had been found to contain the two Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome; and was now further illustrated by the finding of these two early works in a MS. to all appearance intended for church use. The discovery that this new find contained a complete text of the Epistle of Barnabas was the first thing to excite Tischendorf's interest, and the very night when he became acquainted with the MS. he copied out the whole of the epistle. The Greek copies known previously, all derived from a common source, had wanted the first four chapters, for which we had been dependent on a by no means trustworthy Latin version. In one point, however, on which its accuracy had been impugned it turns out to have been quite right. At the end of the fourth chapter Barnabas

says: 'Let us take heed lest we be found, as it is written, many called but few chosen.' Many found it hard to believe that so early a document as the Epistle of Barnabas undoubtedly is, should cite St. Matthew's Gospel as Scripture, and Credner in 1832 suggested that the 'Sicut scriptum est' of the Latin must be a gloss of the translator. It turns out, however, that the Latin translator faithfully represents the ὡς γέγραπται of the Greek. In another passage, however, the Greek has enabled us to correct a faulty reading of the Latin, the words 'sicut dicit filius Dei' being now seen to be a transcriber's error for 'sicut decet filios Dei,' and the result being that a supposed saying of our Lord disappears.

VI. Mention has just been made that the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament contained the two Greek Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome; and until lately no other copy of these letters was known. Besides sundry small lacunæ in the MS., one whole leaf was lost in the First Epistle, and about the latter half of the Second Epistle. Hopes that had been raised of discovering an independent authority for the text were more than once disappointed. Wetstein in 1752 published two Syriac Clementine Epistles, but they proved to be a different work from the Greek Epistles, and are evidently by a later author. Tischendorf thought to recover the desired authority in a palimpsest heard of as preserved at Ferrara; but he found on examination that it contained merely a legendary relation of the martyrdom of Clement, and was of no value.

Strange to say, after hope had been almost given up, we have come into possession, not of one, but of two, new authorities for the text of these Epistles, which were discovered, we may say, almost simultaneously. The first was found by Bryennius, a learned Greek divine, Metropolitan then of Serrae, now of Nicomedia. It illustrates what we have already said about the possibility of treasures of an old library escaping notice, that the library in which Bryennius found the volume containing these Clementine Epistles, that of the Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople, had already been visited and carefully examined between 1845 and 1853 by more than one Western scholar, none of whom were so fortunate as to anticipate Bryennius's discovery. About a year after Bryennius (in 1875) had published an edition of the Constantinopolitan MS., most creditable to his learning and accuracy, the second authority unexpectedly came to light. At the sale in Paris, early in 1876, of the MSS. of the deceased Orientalist, Julius Mohl, the Cambridge University Library

became possessed of a Syriac MS. which was supposed to be only a copy of the Philoxenian version of the New Testament. But on examination it was found to contain also these two Clementine Letters ; but not, as in the Alexandrian MS., as an appendix to the canonical books, but taking their place with the Catholic Epistles and before the Pauline Letters. The pericope divisions also show that the transcriber completely treated these epistles as canonical Scripture. The two new sources have been made use of by Bishop Lightfoot in the appendix, which he published in 1877, to the edition of the Epistles of Clement which he had brought out eight years before. The newly discovered matter has thus been made so generally known to English readers that we abstain from enlarging on many points on which it would be interesting to dwell, and content ourselves with mentioning that the so-called Second Epistle, which had previously been known to be of different authorship from the First Epistle, now turns out not to be an epistle at all, but a homily intended for church reading.

VII. The year after the publication of Bryennius's *Clement* a book was published in Venice which in great measure reveals to us a work of the second century which had long disappeared, and had been the subject of much controversy. We learn from Eusebius and from Epiphanius that Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, composed a harmony of the Gospels, which he called *Diatessaron* ; but neither of these authorities appears to have had personal acquaintance with the work. We have reason to believe that it was extensively used in Syria, and was in fact the form in which the Gospel history was commonly read in the churches where Syriac was spoken. Theodoret tells that he found in his own diocese two hundred of these books in church use, which he took away and replaced by the Four Gospels. He states that the *Diatessaron* did not contain our Lord's genealogies, and he regarded the omission as made with heretical intent. This was about all that was known of the *Diatessaron* on really ancient testimony. There were those to whom it seemed incredible that so early a writer as Tatian should have known our Four Gospels, and attributed to them such pre-eminent authority as to endeavour to weave them into a harmony. 'The word "Diatessaron" must not be supposed to imply *four* sources, or, if it does, the fourth must not be supposed to be St. John's Gospel, but some other Gospel now lost.' Nor were they convinced though Dionysius Bar-Salibi, a Syriac writer of the twelfth century, made known to the West by Assemani, states

that Ephrem Syrus had in the fourth century written a commentary on the *Diatessaron*, and that this harmony had commenced with 'In the beginning was the Word.' Bishop Lightfoot, in the *Contemporary Review* for 1877, exposed the weakness of the pretexts on which the obvious inferences from the word 'Diatessaron' had been evaded. But at the time he wrote, though he was not then aware of it, a new witness had made his appearance. It is in the Armenian language that this testimony has been preserved. Early in the fourth century the Gospel was preached in Armenia by Gregory the Illuminator. In the following century Armenian had become a written language; the Bible was translated into it from the Syriac; and soon after, active work went on in the translation of Syriac and Greek works, over six hundred having been translated before the year 450. In this way have been preserved some writings which otherwise would have been lost; and it may be mentioned in passing that an Armenian translation of the 'Chronicle' of Eusebius, the Greek of which is lost, gives us help in determining whether and how far St. Jerome, in his Latin translation, departed from his original.

The West owes its knowledge of these Armenian writings to a colony of learned Armenians who in 1715 came to Venice under the leading of Mechithar, whose name the society still bears. Mechithar, desirous to introduce Western learning and culture among his countrymen, had been anxious for union with Rome; but he met with so much opposition in the East that at length he came with his scholars to Venice, as we have said. There the Senate gave him the then uninhabited island of St. Lazzaro, where, with the help of rich Armenians in Constantinople, he built a monastery, provided with a printing press and a library, which now contains the richest collection of Armenian manuscripts to be found anywhere. His successors followed in his footsteps, and through their press theological literature has made many acquisitions. In 1836 issued from their press four volumes of an Armenian translation of the exegetical writings of Ephrem Syrus, and among them his Commentary on the *Diatessaron*; but so few in the West are acquainted with the Armenian language that this remained practically unknown until a Latin translation of the Commentary, which had been made in 1841 by Aucher, one of the most diligent and most learned of the Mechitarists, was revised, and at length in 1876 published by a German scholar, Moesinger. There can be no doubt that the Commentary thus made known is that which Bar-Salibi

has described, and that its author was Ephrem Syrus. It is clearly a Commentary on a Gospel Harmony, and it seems unreasonable to question that that Harmony was what was known as the *Diatessaron*, the authorship of which is ascribed to Tatian. It is beyond doubt that this Harmony was based exclusively on our Four Gospels, that according to St. John being largely made use of. Apparently it did not contain the genealogies; but we find nothing to countenance Theodoret's suspicion that there had been any heretical motive for the omission. Questions have been raised as to the original language of the 'Diatessaron,' and as to its relations with the Curetonian Syriac Gospels already mentioned, which it would be out of place here to discuss.

VIII. Here may briefly be noticed a find of which Lechler makes no mention, but which deserves to be recorded. The attacks on Christianity made by Porphyry and others were so offensive to Christian readers that, as we have said, not only have the works themselves perished, but even the refutations of them have seldom been preserved. One large fragment of a work containing heathen objections and replies to them has recently been recovered. The author's name is given in the title as Macarius Magnes; internal evidence fixes the date of composition about A.D. 400, and there was a Macarius bishop at that time, to whom the work has reasonably been ascribed. It had, indeed, a very narrow escape of being lost. It was cited in the Iconoclastic controversy in the eighth century, and Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople at the time, who had never heard of the work before, procured a copy with great difficulty. His account will be found in *Spicilegium Solesmense*, i. 305. After that, scarcely any notice seems to have been taken of the work until near the end of the sixteenth century, when the Jesuit Turrianus found a copy of it in St. Mark's Library at Venice, and used some passages in controversy. Then the book disappeared, and it is quite lately that what may very possibly be the same copy was discovered at Athens, through the exertions of the French School in that city. It was published in Paris in 1876. It contains, as we have stated, a collection of heathen objections and replies to them. It is a question whether the objections have been simply taken from a heathen book or whether they are stated by the writer in his own words. In any case it may be presumed that they represent assaults on Christianity then current. The objector is evidently intimately acquainted with the New Testament; and this gives especial interest to the work as showing what were

the points which were then felt as presenting most difficulty to the unconverted. The answerer frequently escapes the attack by methods of allegorical interpretation in which a modern reader is not disposed to follow him.

IX. Syriac literature offers us another gain which has not yet been fully utilized, in a translation of the Church History of Eusebius. The oldest Greek MSS. of that work are not older than the tenth century; the Syriac translation is not later than the fifth, and must have been made within a hundred years of the time when the work was written. It need not, therefore, be said what valuable help this translation offers to an editor of the Greek text. Among the MSS. described by Cureton is one containing the first five books of this translation, written in the year 933. But in St. Petersburg there is a MS. containing other portions of the same version, and dated A.D. 462. There is, besides, in the Mechitarist Library an Armenian version of this Syriac translation. Professor Wright is known to be at work on the Syriac version, and Merx on the Armenian; but we have still to wait for the complete result of their labours. Meanwhile it has been possible to remove suspicions whether certain passages found in the current text of Eusebius might not be later additions, by showing that they were read by the Syriac translator about the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, it has been possible to make some isolated corrections of the Greek text. Thus, for example, in the list which Eusebius gives of the works of Melito of Sardes is one called 'the Key.' Pitra, in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, published a Latin work, which he fully accepted as being a translation of the *Clavis* of Melito. Though the claim was acknowledged by some, it has been abundantly shown that the work edited by Pitra is really a mediæval production, in which works were made use of centuries later than Melito. What was the subject of Melito's work remained uncertain. But it is an important fact that this title, 'the Key,' is absent from the Syriac version, whether the translator accidentally omitted it or did not find it in his text.

X. Under this head Lechler gives a full description of the early work known as the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a copy of which was found by Bryennius in the same volume which contained the Epistles of Clement already noticed by us. This new find has excited so much interest, and has given birth to so copious a literature, that it would not be possible to treat of it adequately in the space that remains to us. Nor are we under any temptation so to lengthen this

article, since the Didaché has so recently been the subject of investigation in this Review.

XI. Since Lechler wrote, a new source has been opened, from which we may expect valuable accessions to our knowledge. Volney tells us in his travels that in 1778

'the Arabs found in a subterranean place near the site of the ancient Memphis fifty volumes written in a language which they understood not. They were inclosed in a case of sycamore wood, and were highly perfumed. The Arabs offered them for sale to a French merchant, but he refused to purchase them all. He fortunately, however, bought one, while the Arabs consumed the rest, cutting them up, and using them for tobacco, for which they served as an admirable substitute on account of their pleasant odour.'[1]

What we have lost in this way it is impossible to tell, but the MS. which survived proved to be as old as the second or third century, containing a list of the workmen employed on the canals connecting the Lake Moeris with the Nile. Since then many Greek papyri have been from time to time recovered. A large collection was purchased in 1877 by the German consul at Alexandria, and sent to Berlin; but the greatest treasure of all was gained about four years ago by the Austrian Archduke Renier, who, when travelling in Egypt, purchased a vast quantity of papyri in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Persian, Arabic, Coptic, as well as in the old Egyptian character. This mass of documents has been deposited in the Imperial Library at Vienna, and is undergoing examination by thoroughly competent scholars. Until they have had time to complete their scrutiny, and to publish its results, it would be premature to attempt to count our gains. Probably a large part of the recovered documents will turn out to be of no importance, and classical literature is likely to profit more than theological. But Church history may be largely benefited by the recovery of even quite secular documents. Among these Fayûm MSS., for example, is a collection of edicts and other State documents which will help to put on a firm basis our chronology of early imperial times, even if it should throw no other light on ecclesiastical history. One little fragment from the Fayûm collection has already made some little stir. It is a third-century copy of that part of the Gospel story which relates our Lord's prediction of Peter's denial—St. Matt. xxvi. 30–34, Mark xiv. 26–30. But the verbal differences from our present Gospels are so great

[1] Professor G. T. Stokes, in an article on the Fayûm Manuscripts, *Expositor*, May 1885.

that Bickell, a Roman Catholic professor at Innspruck, holds that it was not taken from them, but preserves a fragment of an earlier Gospel. In this view he has found some distinguished scholars to agree with him; but Dr. Hort has given what seem to us quite satisfactory reasons for thinking that it is no more than a free quotation from the Gospels we have. Among the Coptic papyri are an original history of the Diocletian persecution as conducted in Egypt, and a Monophysite account of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon. The Greek papyri are said to contain portions of St. Cyril's works, and others which we will not delay to enumerate.

We have said enough to show how very large has been the discovery of ancient documents in the course of the present reign; and that there is good reason to hope that we have not yet come to the end of such discoveries. Two remarks occur to us in conclusion. One is that while the new discoveries have shown the groundlessness of some suspicions that had been expressed as to the antiquity of some of our sacred books, nothing has turned up tending the other way. The second remark is how much our knowledge has gained though the missionary exertions of the Church which, even before the destruction of Jerusalem, the Apostolic seer beheld embracing men of all 'nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues.' From this wide diffusion of Christianity it has resulted that what has been lost in one place has been preserved in another; and we have seen how from these different tongues, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, united testimony is borne to the history of the progress of that kingdom in which all nations are one.

SHORT NOTICES.

Social Aspects of Christianity. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D. D.C.L., Canon of Westminster and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. (London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1887.)

Canon Westcott gives us a series of very able sermons preached in Westminster Abbey. The place for which they were prepared has had, as he tells us, much to do with the choice of his subject. Indeed he is so desirous that this should be remembered that he extracts from a former volume a passage of much beauty in which he describes the effect of 'the Abbey' and its vast congregations upon one called to minister there. We can well conceive it when the heart of the

Kenneth Scott Latourette was both an avowed Christian and one of America's leading historians of this century. In this article William A. Speck examines how Latourette understood his vocation as a Christian historian. Professor Speck teaches at the University of South Alabama.

By WILLIAM A. SPECK

Kenneth Scott Latourette's Vocation as Christian Historian

THE CHRISTIAN HISTORIAN who tries to reconcile faith and history undertakes an imposing task. Two questions define his task. At the level of conventional historical study and writing, how can he function in accord with both religious faith and secular scholarship? At the level of general interpretation, how can he place in Christian perspective the past as reconstructed by historiography? In this century, professional historians such as Sir Herbert Butterfield, Christopher Dawson, Gerhard Ritter, Henri Marrou, and Oscar Halecki brought, in varying degrees, Christian assumptions to their work. Kenneth Scott Latourette (1884-1968) was probably the most notable American example. A distinguished historian of Asia and the church, he conducted his studies as a scientific investigator and as a professing Christian. His church historiography in particular represents an attempt to reconcile scholarly and religious commitments. This essay examines and evaluates that attempt.

The basic nature of Latourette's two commitments can be quickly stated.[1]

[1] Latourette discussed his private and professional convictions in the following: his autobiography, *Beyond the Ranges* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967); "My Guided Life," in *Frontiers of the Christian World Mission Since 1938: Essays in Honor of Kenneth Scott Latourette*, ed. by Wilbur Christian Harr (New York: Harper, 1962), pp. 281-93; "A History Teacher's Confession of Faith," *The Ohio History Teacher's Journal*, No. 19 (1920), pp. 177-82; *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (7 vols. New York: Harper, 1937-45), I, "Introduction"; "The Christian Understanding of History," *American Historical Review*, 54 (1949), 259-76; an untitled statement in *What I Believe*, sel. and arr. by Sir James Marchant (London: Odhams Press, 1953), pp. 49-56; *What Can I Believe About Christian Missions* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement, 1931); "The Real Issue in Foreign Missions," *Christian Century*, April, 1931, pp. 506-8; "Every Christian a Missionary," *Criterion*, May 1955, p. 3; *Challenge and Conformity: Studies in the Interaction of Christianity and the World of Today* (New York: Harper, 1955), ch. 1.

As a man of scholarship, he was dedicated to history for its own sake. In his appreciation of man's historical nature, he was "secular" to the degree that any serious scholar has to be who wishes to study the past in an acceptable manner. At Yale he was trained in the school of "scientific" history, whose assumptions he accepted with few reservations. To write the best history possible, he carried out an extensive and critical investigation into the sources. And he endeavored to present the facts and inferences based upon them. As a man of faith, he belonged to the evangelical Protestant tradition that stressed conversion of individuals, personal piety, evangelism, and humanitarianism. He accepted literally the articles of faith enunciated in the Apostles and Nicene Creeds. Belief in the Gospel, personal rebirth, and missionary enthusiasm were the three essential phenomena of an authentic and vital Christianity. He was a historical and theological optimist, reflecting the high expectations of the age in which he attained maturity and a personal inclination to underscore the redemptive features of Christianity. Devout and puritanical, he sought God's will for his life. As a result of his faith, he practiced and promoted evangelism in a variety of roles, from ordained Baptist minister and Bible study leader to mission board member and university professor. From his two closely related careers and commitments, he drew the resources that shaped his historiography and historical thought.

He conceived of his overall professional task both as a historian and as a Christian. His historical purpose was highly pragmatic. In examining the history of China and Christian missions, he was conscious of filling gaps left by historians.[2] Much of his scholarly distinction lies in his early leadership as a Sinologist and missiologist. He also dealt with his subjects in a pragmatic fashion. History was not for him an exercise in literary expression, the reconstruction of different worlds in the past, or a detailed narrative dramatizing men and events. He wrote mainly for the sake of the present.[3] In his introductions to China and his surveys of Christianity, approximately half the space was given to historical background, the other half to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He wished to promote among a wide readership an elementary understanding of contemporary China and Christianity. *The Chinese: Their History and Culture*[4] and *A*

[2] Four early articles are pertinent: "The History of the Far East, a Neglected Field," *The History Teacher's Magazine*, June, 1916, pp. 183-85; "American Scholarship and Chinese History," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 38 (1918), 97-106; "The Missionary Factor in Recent History," *The Ohio History Teacher's Journal*, No. 15 (1919), pp. 102-9. "The Study of the History of Missions," *International Review of Missions*, January, 1925, pp. 108-15.

[3] See "Teacher's Confession."

[4] K. S. Latourette, *The Chinese: Their History and Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1964) 4th ed. Originally published by Macmillan in two volumes in 1934.

History of Christianity[5], for example, were intended for students and the general reader. Although his multi-volume *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* and *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*[6] were more obviously monuments of scholarship, they were meant to be helpful not only to specialists, but also to those engaged in the work of the Church. In this instance, his pragmatic approach served a Christian purpose.

Latourette also defined his general role in religious terms. He believed that his scholarly work constituted a specifically Christian vocation. His studies of China and Christianity were inspired by a sense of "Christian obligation"[7] and "missionary purpose."[8] He felt called to help in the opening up of Chinese and missions history as new fields of research and teaching, the more so because of his brief experience in China as a missionary teacher.[9] At the same time, missionary zeal encouraged his selection of topics. "My writing," he declared in his autobiography, "was an outgrowth of the global outreach of the Christian faith."[10]

Latourette's conception of vocation also had roots in theological optimism. His work rested upon the belief that *Weltgeschichte* was *Heilsgeschichte*: the effort of God to save man "has centred and been climaxed in 'salvation history,'" but He "has been active in all history, and in ways not inconsistent with 'salvation history,' properly understood."[11] For example, God had to some extent sought and influenced men through the agency of non-Christian religions.[12] Moreover, what appeared to be ordinary events to the secular mind, capable of historical explanation, actually had theological meaning. For Latourette, in other words, historical study was at one and the same time the examination of a mundane order and a providential order. The latter was discernible: the pattern of progress and failure, spiritual and temporal, provided evidence for the historian as historian "which suggests a strong probability for the truth of the Christian understanding [of history]."[13]

5 K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper, 1953).

6 Subtitled *A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (5 vols; New York: Harper, 1958-62).

7 "Guided Life," p. 291.

8 *Beyond the Ranges*, p. 61.

9 "Guided Life," pp. 290-91.

10 *Beyond the Ranges*, p. 109.

11 K. S. Latourette, *Christianity Through the Ages* (New York: Harper Chapelbooks, 1962), p. xi.

12 "An Appreciation of Non-Christian Faiths," *The World Tomorrow*, January, 1928, p. 25.

13 "Christian Understanding," p. 271.

Though Latourette believed God to be active in all history, he thought that activity most easily discoverable in the story of Christianity and its expansion. Consequently he discussed the theological meaning of events in his church studies, but not in his East Asian studies. In the former, where his religious commitment was fully engaged, he revealed himself as a Christian historian. Part of his purpose was to show how the historic role of the Church tended to confirm a Christian view of the course of events.

The working out of Latourette's pragmatic and religious purpose was closely tied to a revisionist interpretation of modern Christianity. He understood but strongly disagreed with the frequent labelling of the period since the French Revolution as "post-Christian." Because, as he saw it, Christianity was a young and growing force in the world, the period should be designated "pre-Christian."[14] Starting with *Expansion*, his histories of the faith served to demonstrate the following thesis:

> Christianity, beginning in what seemed a very unpromising fashion, has gone forward by a series of pulsations of advance, retreat, and advance. Each advance has carried the Christian tide farther than its predecessor and each major recession has been shorter and less marked than the one before it. . . . In the mid-twentieth century, if mankind is viewed as a whole, Christianity is more a force in the human scene than it or any other religion has ever been.[15]

The life of Jesus Christ "is the most influential ever lived on this planet and its effect continues to mount. Here is the most thought-provoking fact of human history."[16]

For Latourette this thesis possessed both historical and theological significance. Accordingly, he maintained that his study raised two sets of questions. The first confronted the historian. Why had Christianity spread? By what processes had it spread? What had been its human and cultural consequences? Why did it continue to advance and yet suffer setbacks? Why had the life of Jesus been the "most influential ever lived on this planet?" The history of Christianity also posed and shed light on questions for the theologian. Did history have a meaning? If so, what was it?[17] Did God act uniquely in Jesus, sending him into the world in order to save it?[18] Would God achieve all his

14 See "The Present: Post-Christian or Pre-Christian," *Religion in Life*, 33 (1964), 170-79.

15 *Revolutionary Age*, V, 534. Cf. *The Unquenchable Light* (New York: Harper, 1941), pp. xv-xviii, 171. *Expansion* VII, 493-94. *A History of Christianity*, p. 1471. Latourette held to this thesis until the end. See "Christian Missions and the Changing World," *Review and Expositor*, 62 (1965), 163-74. "The Christian World Mission," *Baptist Watchman-Examiner*, December 26, 1968, pp. 806-7.

16 *A History of Christianity*, p. 34.

17 *Expansion* VII, 483.

18 *A History of Christianity*, p. 60.

purposes within history?[19] As a Christian historian, Latourette sought to answer both sets of questions.

To carry out his task, he used a methodology derived from historical science and Christian belief. First and foremost, his working principles and procedures were shaped by the imperative to write reliable history. Without a solid basis of historical knowledge, there could be no adequate comprehension of Christianity, no accurate description of either the temporal or the providential order, no intelligent Christian interpretation of the past. He aimed to investigate the "mechanical and human factors" operating in culture and influencing the flow of events. Those factors he listed as the "geographical, climatic, economic, political, social, aesthetic, and intellectual."[20] He looked for causes "in preceding events in human nature and in the physical environment."[21] In accordance with his training, he also strove for objectivity within the limitations of his value system. He cited as ideal working principles "carefulness of statement," "catholicity of mind," "judgment and balance," and "an absolute fearlessness in facing facts."[22] He set out to discover what actually happened in the past.[23]

Latourette's methodology was secular and scientific only in a restricted sense. His secularity and objectivity were limited by personal bias, by an expansionist view of Christianity, and by the decision to speak occasionally as a believer, in order, for example, to call attention to facts incapable of purely historical explanation.[24] During the writing of *Expansion*, he abandoned his initial intention of avoiding any attempt to prove a thesis and any discussion of the "cosmic significance" of events.[25] He argued later that in the study of Christianity complete objectivity, meaning a strict neutrality and exclusive reliance upon empirical data, would not be desirable even if it were attainable. He said that "truth is not attained by reason alone. The insight that is born of faith can bring illumination."[26] Only a Christian commitment "opens the mind towards the true understanding of history."[27] The proper examination of Christianity required an empirical study in combination with the perspective of faith.

In Latourette's methodology, Christian beliefs became principles of selec-

19 *Revolutionary Age*, I, 5.

20 *Expansion*, I, xvii.

21 *Ibid.*

22 "Teacher's Confession," p. 182.

23 See *A History of Christian Missions in China* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. vii; *Expansion*, I, xvi.

24 *Expansion*, I, xvii-xviii.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. xvi, xxii.

26 *A History of Christianity*, p. xxi.

27 *Ibid.*

tion, organization, and interpretation. He thought it desirable that the history of any subject, no matter how limited in time or geography, should be written, insofar as possible, from a global point of view. Over and above scholarly considerations, the universal implications of his faith compelled him to adopt such an approach.[28] The need to place events in the setting of universal history was particularly urgent in the study of Christianity.

> Since Christians have claimed that Christ is essential to a comprehension of the meaning of history, since the outlook of Christianity is universal in its scope, and since from the outset the ideal has been set before the followers of Jesus of winning all men to his discipleship, the historian must ask how far that understanding and that dream have been realized. His canvas therefore must be all mankind from the beginning to the present.[29]

The obligation acknowledged in that passage harmonized with his objective of demonstrating the increasing world role of the faith.

Latourette's understanding of Christianity as man's response to the Gospel also broadened the sweep of his historiography. In order "to trace the entire course of the stream which issued from our Lord and of its contributions to mankind,"[30] the traditional study of Western Christianity had to be transcended. More was required than an examination of the internal affairs of the institutional church and of theological trends. The emphasis had to fall upon practice rather than theory, upon religion rather than doctrine. Above all, attention had to be focused upon man's spiritual life. The criteria he used to measure the progress of Christianity were thus intended also to illuminate the human response to the Gospel. His criteria were geographical extent, the number and strength of new movements attributable to Jesus, and the effect of Jesus upon men and cultures.[31]

Latourette also brought to his work interpretive principles derived from faith. Some were implicitly Christian. He thought that religion found its most profound explanation at the level of internal spiritual factors; more ambitiously, he theorized that the nature of culture was determined, in the last analysis, by religion and individual morality. The first idea appears in his explanation of the successful expansion of Christianity; the second, in his study of the Church in the "revolutionary age." To explain fully the unique vitality and influence of the faith as well as the larger meaning of its historical achievements, he used an

28 *Beyond the Ranges*, p. 109.

29 *A History of Christianity*, pp. xvi-xvii.

30 "The Peace of Church History in the Training of Missionaries," in *The Life of the Church*, The Madras Series, IV (New York & London: International Missionary Council, 1939), p. 256.

31 LeRoy Moore, Jr. describes Latourette's emphasis upon the human response to the Gospel as the "pietist" approach to church history. See his "*Beyond the Ranges*: The Autobiography of Kenneth Scott Latourette, a Review Article," *Hartford Quarterly*, 8 (1968), 91-92.

explicitly Christian principle of interpretation. Stated simply, it was the belief "that the Christian Gospel is God's supreme act on man's behalf and that the history of Christianity is the history of what God has done for man through Christ and of man's response."[32]

In practice, how did Latourette's methodology affect his church historiography? The content of his writings is predominantly empirical. To answer the historical questions raised by his study, he assembled the necessary documentary evidence, giving the "mechanical and human factors" their proper due. *Expansion* therefore, chiefly narrates the discoverable facts of the spread of the faith. It emphasizes the processes by which Christianity advanced. Other studies follow a similar pattern. *A History of Christianity* surveys the leading events in the life of the Church since the first century. *Revolutionary Age* records the activities of modern Christianity. These works present a wealth of detail; they are virtual catalogs of names, missions, congregations, societies, revivals, and the like. Latourette's selection of material was influenced by other professional aims. Wishing to be impartial and sympathetic, he paid close attention to all major branches of Christianity. An ecumenical point of view encouraged his comprehensive coverage. His emphasis was, in addition, dictated by the pragmatic intent of dealing at length with the history of modern Christianity. Again, a professional motive coincided with a personal one: the examination of missions since the nineteenth century had to give considerable space to Latourette's own theological tradition.

His plan to study and to measure the global influence of Jesus also shaped the content and organization of his work. As a result of that plan, his writings underscored the territorial and numerical gains of Christianity, its interaction with Western and non-Western cultures, the achievements of its major branches, and its ebbs and flows over the centuries. His periodization of church history and thus the overall organization of his writings were based upon his identification of the stages of Christian advance and recession. Using his three criteria of geographical extent, inner vitality as seen in the creation of new movements, and cultural and human impact, he divided the history of Christianity into the following periods of advance and recession: the period from the time of Christ to 500 was one of initial advance; from 500 to 950 the first and greatest recession; from 950 to 1350 the second major age of advance; from 1350 to 1500 the second major recession; from 1500 to 1750 the third age of advance; from 1750 to 1815 the third major recession; from 1815 to 1914 the fourth age of advance, "the great century"; and the latest age since 1914, one of advance and recession, "advance through storm."[33] The volumes of *Expansion* roughly

32 *A History of Christianity*, p. xxi.

33 Latourette's periodization was first worked out in *The Unquenchable Light*, pp. xvi-xvii.

correspond to that scheme of periodization the principal sections in *A History of Christianity* correspond exactly to it. The same scheme, harmonizing with his thesis, justified his concentration on the past four centuries of Christianity above all, the last century and a half. It presupposed that the faith was a growing force, becoming progressively more global and influential in the modern period. More than a quarter of the pages in *A History of Christianity* discuss events since 1815, three volumes in *Expansion* cover the "great century" and one the years from 1914 to 1945, and the entire five volumes of *Revolutionary Age* examine the last century and a half.

As the organization of Latourette's writings supported his thesis so did his factual emphasis. He thought the historical record demonstrated the increasing strength of the Church. The proof was this: Christianity had spread farther, had won more adherents, and had become more deeply rooted among more peoples than any other religion. In the last century and a half its inner vitality had been displayed in the flourishing of congregations and orders, mission societies, the younger churches outside Europe, eucharistic congresses, YMCAs, theological creativity, and the Ecumenical Movement, to mention some of the movements issuing from the faith. Its modern influence upon humanity had been widened and deepened by Western expansion, the missionary enterprise, the greater number of churches and believers, and by the power of its beliefs and ideals to inspire not only its own adherents but those of other faiths. In the category of "results of Christian influence," broadly define, Latourette placed anti-slavery movements, the League of Nations and the United Nations, democracy, socialism, the Red Cross, numerous schools and hospitals, the reduction of languages to writing, the personalities of men such as Sun Yat Sen and Gandhi, and, above all, the changed lives of millions.

The influence of Christian belief upon Latourette's historiography extended from its scope, organization, and emphasis to questions of interpretation. In *Expansion* and *Revolutionary Age*, he used in historical explanation his convictions about the nature of religion and culture. He explained the successful expansion of Christianity as a Christian historian. In his view two of the most extraordinary periods of Christian advance were the first three centuries A.D., which witnessed the initial spread and triumph of the faith, and the nineteenth century, the "great century" of missionary success. As a diligent historian, he detailed the peculiar features of both periods that helped to account for the expansion of Christianity. In the case of the early Christian centuries, he pointed to the conditions in the Roman Empire favorable to the spread of a new religion, noting the Empire's unity, its relative tolerance of religious differences, and the widespread search for spiritual certainties. Christianity was specifically benefited by the presence of religious and moral ideas that anticipated its own. Above all, the endorsement of Constantine was crucial.[34] With similar care he cited the

[34] *Expansion* I, 6-44, 163

circumstances in the nineteenth century that facilitated the missionary enterprise. Among them were the wealth made available by the Industrial Revolution, new means of transportation and communication, the atmosphere of optimism and self confidence, and especially the overseas expansion of Europeans and the resultant breakdown of some non European cultures.[35]

Although Latourette took into account the historical background of these two periods of Christian advance, he thought that

> the last analysis the spread of a faith depends not only upon external circumstances, but upon inward vitality something in the nature of the religion or sect that commands such enthusiastic devotion that it impels its adherents to propagate it No matter how favorable the environment where this inward dynamic is wanting the expansion does not [36]

It was a "plain matter of history," he wrote, that the "vitality of . . Christianity when traced back to its source has its origin primarily in the impulse that came from Jesus."[37] The "impulse from Jesus" he defined as the belief in his life character, teachings, deeds, death, and resurrection" and the experience of moral and spiritual rebirth through him.[38] The "impulse from Jesus" was the underlying cause of the characteristics that made the early Church attractive to the Roman world, from its superior organization to its moral and spiritual witness.[39] By the same token, it was responsible for the vitality, displayed particularly in evangelical Protestantism, that carried forward the religious and humanitarian work of nineteenth-century missions.[40]

As a causal factor, the "impulse from Jesus" was sufficiently elastic to serve both a historical and a supernatural explanation of Christian vigor and expansion. Though Latourette's emphasis upon that factor was perhaps compatible with secular scholarship, it accorded the inner life an unusual degree of primacy and autonomy. In effect, it gave his treatment Christian overtones.

Those overtones were even more pronounced in his interpretation of the "revolutionary age," the period since the Enlightenment. More sweeping and conjectural than his explanation of Christian expansion, that interpretation not only highlighted religious factors, but also viewed events in moralistic terms. In *Expansion* he had underscored the role of personal religious experience to account for the successes of the faith; in *Revolutionary Age* he suggested that the cultural influence of Christianity and the moral conduct of individuals were central to understanding modern history. His general interpretation of events since the eighteenth century grew out of the attempt to clarify a "seeming

[35] *Ibid*., IV, 18 20
[36] *Ibid*., II, 14
[37] *Ibid*., I, 168 69
[38] *Ibid*., p. 60; 167 68
[39] *Ibid*., pp. 164 67
[40] *Ibid*., IV, 45 46

paradox of the period, that is, the extraordinary vitality and unprecedented expansion and influence of Christianity on the one side and on the other the rise of threats to the Church as grave as it had known. His understanding of the revolutionary age provided the setting for a detailed examination of world Christianity intended to show its staying power and continued vigor despite threats and setbacks, indeed its ability to find in adversity opportunities for new advances and achievements.

Latourette's interpretation of the revolutionary age and the "seeming paradox" of the age converged at two important points.[41] First, the forces that defined the period also identified the threats to the faith. Second, the menacing features of the past few centuries to a greater or lesser degree had their source in Christianity and Western Christendom. The aspects of the revolution that he singled out included industrialization, urbanization, science, scholarship, democracy, nationalism, socialism, communism, and secular intellectual traditions. Although many of these phenomena had conferred benefits upon mankind, they also challenged the faith in the forms, for example, of social injustice, the atomization of society, alternate views of man and life, the study of comparative religion and biblical criticism, the secular state, materialism, militant atheism, and religious scepticism and unbelief. Together they threatened Christianity by contributing to the formation of a secular civilization. The revolutionary age became increasingly secular and self-confident. Spurred by expanding knowledge and technologies, modern culture adopted as its chief aim the creation of the "good life" here and now through economic modernization. At the same time, it rendered obsolete traditional social functions of religion and dulled awareness of the supernatural. In many ways, it was either indifferent or hostile to religion. The forces shaping the revolutionary centuries exploded in wars and revolutions directly damaging the faith. In general, the threats and explosions of the age intensified after the eighteenth century and became worldwide in the twentieth.

Although Latourette proposed a causal relationship between them, he did not think that the revolutionary age and the threats to religion were simply the by-products of Christianity and Western Christendom. They were "caricatures or perversions of the Gospel," representing "man's misuse of what came through Jesus."[42] Individuals exercising their freedom of choice were blameable for social injustice, secularism, wars, and communism. Christians and non-Christians alike shared responsibility for creating dangers to the faith; through mixed purposes, both had misused "God's good gifts."[43] Yet, Latourette indicated that the worst distortions of Christianity, the most serious challenges to the

[41] Latourette's interpretation is found primarily in *Revolutionary Age*, I, ch. 5; IV, ch. 1.

[42] *Ibid.*, I, 27, 121.

[43] *Ibid.*, V, 533.

Church, came from unbelievers, like Marx and Engels, who deliberately attacked religion.[44]

The menace to Christianity was only one side of the revolutionary age. The other, and more significant side, was the unprecedented advance of the faith. Taken together the themes of challenge and advance resulted in a general interpretation of modern history. It found in the cultural influence of Christianity the main shaping factor of the modern world, the source of both good and evil, depending upon man's right or wrong use of "what came through Jesus." The double movement of the right use of "God's good gifts" versus their wrong use explained for Latourette the apparent paradox of the Church in the revolutionary age. Because of man's contradictory behavior, good fruits and perversions of the Gospel existed side by side. Even so, Latourette's optimistic thesis remained essentially intact. With perhaps evangelical Protestantism uppermost in mind, he held that in spite of the setbacks and continuing threats to the many movements issuing from Christianity

> [He] enabled millions of individuals to live triumphantly in the midst of revolution and inspired and empowered by him [Jesus] to devise and use means to offset the destruction and to make the revolutions contribute to the welfare of great segments of mankind and, indeed, of all the human race.[45]

Latourette's discussion of Christian expansion and the revolutionary age illustrate how he combined secular and religious assumptions in historical analysis. His explanations incorporate an emphasis upon spiritual and moral factors and, in the case of his treatment of the revolutionary age, even some unmistakable judgments of faith. They mark the movement in his work from implicit to explicit Christian interpretation. In the main body of his studies, he remained the secular historian in most of his discourse, rarely speaking as a believer. Consistent with his sense of professionalism, he generally reserved statements of faith for prefaces, introductory chapters, and especially chapters of summation, thus the last chapters in *Expansion*, *A History of Christianity*, and *Revolutionary Age*. He also expanded upon those statements in auxiliary works of interpretation written from an outspoken Christian point of view.[46] In concluding chapters and apologetic writings, he answered as a man of faith the historical and theological questions raised by his study. In those places, he attempted to show how religious truth must supplement historical analysis and how the course

44 *Ibid.*, 530-31.

45 *Ibid.*, I, 121.

46 See *Anno Domini: Jesus, History and God* (New York: Harper, 1940) and *The Inextinguishable Light*, which complemented *Expansion*. *Christianity Through the Ages* summarized his life's work from a Christian point of view. His observations on the meaning of history are developed most fully in *What I Believe* and particulary "Christian Understanding."

of events tended to confirm Christian belief. There he also completed his task by reaffirming a Christian understanding of history.

At the conclusion of his church histories, Latourette made it clear that historical explanation, even if it stressed religious and moral factors, could not fully account for the successful expansion of Christianity, the paradox of the modern Church, and the fact that the life of Jesus had been the most influential ever lived and that its effect continued to mount. These phenomena had to be seen from a Christian perspective. The advances of the faith and the worldwide influence of Jesus could be explained by the same biblical assertion, "God was in [illegible] Christ," judging and reconciling men to Himself.[47] At the finish of [illegible] Latourette spelled out his [illegible] explanation of the [illegible] of Christianity that he had hinted at earlier in accordance with the [illegible] of Jesus: the wheat and the weeds must grow together in the same field, so that the "chronic ills and evils of mankind" and "the forces issuing from the [illegible] of God in Christ" were both increasing at the same time.[48] Human error and [illegible] were "to be expected from the measure of free will God has given to man in His desire to beget sons and not to create robots."[49]

While Latourette completed historical explanation as a Christian, he also dealt with the theological riddles about history's meaning, the uniqueness of Jesus' mission, and the success of God's purposes in time. Not appealing to faith alone, he proposed that historical research seemed to support orthodox solutions to those riddles. At the end of *Revolutionary Age* the question, "What if anything is the meaning of the story we have endeavoured to narrate and in this chapter to summarize?" is answered by the words, "May we say at once that much seems strangely to fit into what Christians have believed about the universe, mankind, God, and the fashion in which God works?"[50] Largely on the basis of evidence gathered in defense of his thesis, he declared more confidently that "the course of history has confirmed" St. Paul's insight when he "saw in the cross both the power of God and the wisdom of God."[51] In the penultimate chapter of *Expansion*, he wrote: "'In him was life and the life was the light of men.' In the first century that had been an assertion of faith. By the twentieth century experience had made it demonstrated fact."[52]

Latourette's efforts to reconcile faith and history culminated in a Christian interpretation of history. Although he characterized his understanding as an unadorned biblical view, based upon faith, he thought it was substantiated to a

47 *Expansion*, VII, 504; *Anno Domini*, p. 9.

48 *Revolutionary Age*, V, 534.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 5[illegible].

50 *Revolutionary Age*, V, 531.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 532.

52 *Expansion*, VII, 482.

considerable degree by the record of human experience. An examination of the New Testament upheld, he believed, the historicity of the central articles of faith, such as those asserting the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection of Jesus.[53] He did not, however, develop this argument. The burden of his case for the verification of Christianity rested not upon the historical Jesus but upon the evidence of his transforming influence over the centuries. In any event, his [illegible] close to forming a natural theology, with history taking the place of [illegible].

Thus Latourette's overview of events consisted of biblical affirmations [illegible] to historiography. It declared that man, created in God's image, [illegible] to disobey the law of love. Judgment manifested itself in the [illegible] and social tragedies that resulted from his disregard of that law, [illegible] in war. But in Latourette's theology, as in his [illegible], God's pursuit of man, not the tragic nature of history, was the major [illegible].

> [illegible] God's [illegible] for man. God is judge, but He judges that He may save [illegible] and transform. [illegible] God's grace, the love which man does not deserve and cannot earn, [illegible] man's free will and endeavors to reach man through the incarnation, the cross, and the Holy Spirit.[54]

On the basis of observable evidence, Latourette asserted that God's redemptive purpose made progress with the passing of time. The reality of salvation was apparent in individual lives and in the activities of the Church. Moreover, "from the Churches there have come, never more than in the past century and a half, impulses and movements 'for the healing of the nations.' These I believe to be the work of God the Holy Spirit."[55] Thus, according to this view, the beneficial results of Christianity that Latourette often cited were actually divinely inspired. Although the redemption traceable to Christ "is increasingly potent,"[56] the Kingdom of God could not be brought to completion within history. As the nature of the revolutionary age indicated, both good and evil exist until the consummation of time.

> Beyond history . . . God is to gather all things in one in Christ, which are in heaven and which are on earth. God has always been sovereign, and in the cross and resurrection He signally triumphed, but beyond history His sovereignty is to be seen as complete.[57]

In that passage Latourette revealed his hope that God's love would eventually

53 See *A History of Christianity*, pp. 34-35, 58, 60; *Beyond the Ranges*, pp. 73-74.

54 "Christian Understanding," p. 265.

55 *What I Believe*, p. 55.

56 *Ibid.*, p. 54.

57 "Christian Understanding," p. 266.

embrace all men."[58] Though perhaps at odds with his orthodox background, his universalism was a fitting extension of his optimistic thought.

In the preceding pages we have seen how Latourette tried to reconcile his two careers and commitments. His task was obviously facilitated by the nature of ecclesiastical studies. He was a serious practioner of straight academic history. Yet within the framework of secular scholarship, he defined his overall purpose in a religious fashion, he allowed private beliefs to influence his methodology, and at important points in explanation he emphasized spiritual and moral factors. Stepping outside that framework, he introduced explicit Christian interpretation. On the whole, the function of religious presuppositions in his work was to guide, serve, and supplement, but not to supplant, the empirical study of the past. In this manner, he achieved a partial synthesis of theology and conventional history.

How well did Latourette reconcile faith and history? Let us briefly consider both sides of the question. On the negative side, religious beliefs were sometimes destructive of the "good" history to which he aspired. In certain instances, they interfered with proper objectivity, balance, and analysis. He was too partial to the Church when he ignored the spiritual and cultural arrogance underlying the missionary enterprise and when he played down the damage missions did to foreign societies. Rather uncritically, he selected and interpreted data in a way designed to underscore the vitality and influence of Christianity. Furthermore, despite his effort at fair coverage, he still highlighted the achievements of Protestant missions. In trying to show the human response to the Gospel, the quality of Christian spiritual life, he pursued an elusive goal. Lacking necessary biographical information, he fell back upon the less than satisfactory method of counting converts, listing new religious organizations, and speculating on the cultural impact of the faith. In his explication of the threats to modern Christianity, he subordinated analysis to moral judgments. Was secularization primarily the result of wrong-headed personal decisions or was it primarily the consequence of the Western cultural heritage and of a more complex society in formation? In any case, although he may rightly have insisted upon individual responsibility, his primary obligation as historian was to show the conditioned nature of human actions.

Finally, the optimistic terms of Latourette's identification of universal church history with salvation history calls into question both his historical perception and his theological understanding. Could the dividing line between good and evil be as sharply drawn as it was in his history and theology? Was a Christian interpretation of history best confirmed by an expansionist view of the faith? Was the history of the Church really such a success story? Could missionary gains and greater church unity compensate for the secularization of culture,

[58] Cf. *WLL: I Believe*, p. 56, *Christianity Through the Ages*, p. 22

the losses caused by communism, and the social malaise of modern industrial society? In a word, Latourette constructed an inadquate interpretive framework. Understandably, it has found no fervent followers.

These and other flaws should not obscure the creative role of Christian experience and assumptions in Latourette's work. His scholarly dedication and achievement can be attributed in some measure to a religious conception of the historian's task. Personal sympathies and convictions help to explain his pioneering research and publications. Moreover, his theological position encouraged a [illegible] methodology that challenged parochialism in church studies and encouraged a revisionist interpretation that questioned a one-sided pessimism. Finally, as a result of his contribution, no serious survey of modern Christianity can now overlook churches outside Europe and North America. And no balanced study of the nineteenth century can ignore evidence of Christianity's [illegible]. Guided by faith, he also supplemented an empirical, external view of [illegible] history with a religious inside view. In so doing, he raised a legitimate question. Was a naturalistic conception of religion satisfactory? In this connection he made a distinctive contribution by reminding a secular and scientifically minded age of a spiritual interpretation of life. Whatever its shortcomings, the apologetic side of his work may still possess merit for many believers. After all, he upheld orthodoxy and related it to historical study. In short, he continued the tradition of the Christian historian.

What can be said, then, about the attempt to reconcile faith and history? On balance, Latourette demonstrates that in the hands of an accomplished scholar, a Christian point of view need not, any more than an alternate point of view, undermine a serious investigation of the past. At worst, the assumptions of the believer occasionally distort historical reality. At best, they inspire the search for truth and even have heuristic value, supplementing conventional principles of selection and explanation. In any event, they help to broaden the range of interpretation. Latourette also illustrates that the Christian historian, as a conscientious professional, need not adopt a position of moral and theological neutrality. Not only in ecclesiastical studies, but also in cultural, philosophical, and general history, he has opportunities for expressing personal values and insights. And nothing prevents him from acting as a Christian spokesman in writings set apart from technical studies, notably social criticism and theology of history. As we have seen in Latourette's case, the problem of reinterpreting history in the light of Christian revelation is not easily resolved. That remains the Christian historian's most vexing single assignment.