

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. II.

OCTOBER 1898.

No. 4.

Doctrinal Theology.

THEOLOGY.

(Concluded.)

ACTS OF GOD.

The acts of God are of two kinds, *internal* acts and *external* acts.

INTERNAL ACTS OF GOD.

The internal acts of God are again of two kinds, *personal* internal acts and *essential* internal acts.

The personal internal acts of God are those acts which terminate within the Godhead and pertain to the divine Person or Persons by whom they are performed as peculiar to such Person or Persons. Thus in Ps. 2, 7 we read: "*The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day HAVE I BEGOTTEN thee.*" Here the act of begetting is predicated of THE LORD, but of the Lord as distinguished from another divine person, whom he addresses by the personal pronoun, *thee*, and names *his Son*, which implies that the Person speaking is the *Father* of the Person spoken to. The act whereby the Father is personally the Father is the act of generation or begetting, an act which is not an act of the Son, nor an act of the Holy Ghost, but a definite act of the first Person in the Trinity. This act is truly an *act*,

Historical Theology.

THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

Historical theology is that practical habitude of the mind which comprises a knowledge and theological discernment of the rise, progress, and preservation of the Christian Church and of its institutions, and an aptitude to utilize such knowledge in the promulgation, application, and defence of divine truth. The theological study of church history is, therefore, the application of the mind to the acquisition of that practical habitude which constitutes historical theology.

Of course, church history may be studied otherwise than theologically, just as the interpretation of Scripture is not necessarily theological exegesis. A lawbook writer may search the Pentateuch to find analogies for certain points of modern legislation, as of the law of marriage and divorce, of other domestic relations, of real estate, of criminal law, etc.; a medical author may draw from the same books in a treatise on leprosy; but neither the lawyer nor the medical man is on that account a theologian, and their interpretation of the texts under investigation may be in their way and measure correct and yet be in no sense or measure theological exegesis. Thus, also, the study of ecclesiastical history may be pursued non-theologically and untheologically, and is often and largely so pursued even by theologians.

Historical theology comprises a knowledge of certain historical quantities in themselves and in their relations to each other, and it comprises more than that. But the study of church history is non-theological not only when it consists merely in the acquisition of that knowledge, without what besides such knowledge enters into the habitude termed

historical theology. Even the knowledge, or what passes for knowledge, of the data of ecclesiastical history may come short of being what it professes to be, theological knowledge, or historical knowledge, or knowledge of any kind. Knowledge is the mental possession of truth, and historical knowledge, the possession of historical truth as such. To hold that the Deluge was merely a local flood, that Christianity was originally a Jewish sect of communists, that St. Peter was the first bishop of Rome, that Marcion's was the first New Testament Canon, that Luther committed suicide, that Calvin signed the Altered Augsburg Confession at Strassburg, that Henry VIII was the foster-father of the Reformation in England, that Pietism was a curative process in the Lutheran church, that Schleiermacher "ranks among the greatest theologians of all ages"—is not historical knowledge, but the maintenance of anti-historical error or falsehood; it lacks the very first essential of all knowledge, *truth*. The so-called historical criticism of the Tübingen school is the very reverse of *historical* criticism, inasmuch as the "historical" principle from which it proceeds and on which it rests, the supposition of a conflict between Petrinism and Paulinism, is not a historical truth, but an unhistorical fiction.

Knowledge being the mental possession of truth, historical study is primarily the acquisition of historical truth, or, more explicitly, the appropriation of true historical concepts and groups of concepts, in themselves and in their historical relations, by the student's mind. This is by no means an easy task. The most important historical realities of which the student of history must endeavor to obtain true concepts are *persons*. A human person is an individual of the genus *homo*, of which the student may obtain a generic concept by direct perception, by observing himself and other individuals of the same genus, and the habitual observation of his own physical, intellectual, and moral nature and that of other men who come under his direct observation is a

habit which the student of history should carefully cultivate. For there is no man in all past history who was not essentially man as the student himself. But while this is true, it is also true that among all other men in history there is not one who was identical with, or who did not in thousands of points differ from, the student himself. The very notion of *man* which the student obtains by observing himself is a *historical* concept only inasmuch as it is a notion of his individual self, with which he would deal in an autobiography, while it is not a historical, but a *philosophical* concept, an idea, when it is abstracted from the individual and generalized so as to cover all other men. To confound these two classes of concepts is a blunder which must be most strenuously avoided in the study of history. It is the man *Polycarp*, the man *Athanasius*, the man *Gregory VII*, the man *Spener*, whom we must learn to know in history, and this John Smith cannot achieve by studying the man *John Smith* or his neighbor *John Johnson*; neither can it be done by philosophical construction: though both ways have often been pursued in writing history. And while it is often a matter of some difficulty for John Smith to give a correct account of that individual, as many a man on the witness' stand has anxiously experienced, it is a matter of far greater difficulty for a student of to-day to give a correct account of Athanasius which that student may know to be correct and which others on close examination will find to be correct. The man Athanasius existed but once, and that was long ago. Every act he performed he performed but once, and that in a certain place and at a certain time, and under certain circumstances which were never precisely the same in any other case where he may have performed a similar act at another time. And all this, again, happened long ago. The life of this man was not spent in one place; and there were times when even his contemporaries and those most directly interested in his whereabouts did not know where he was or what he was doing, and he was

sought in vain by friends and enemies; and yet there was not a moment in his life when he was not at a certain place with the exclusion of all other places in the universe. Of course, we will have to rely on testimony for the facts of this man's life. But even in his own day testimony concerning him was painfully conflicting. Investigating committees were sent long distances to gather evidence to prosecute him. Synods acquitted him; synods condemned him; emperors banished him; emperors recalled him. The *orbis terrarum* groaned and went against him. All this certainly would seem conflicting testimony concerning this man Athanasius, the most important human factor in one of the most important periods of ecclesiastical history.

And yet the history of Athanasius has been studied and may still be studied with the most gratifying results. Of course, the student cannot now do what even the contemporaries of Athanasius could not have done. He cannot become an eye witness of Athanasius' life and deeds. But even if he could, he would not thereby secure an advantage superior or even equal to that which he may now enjoy. There was in Athanasius' day one man who was at all times where Athanasius was, by day and by night, at Alexandria, at Nicaea, at Constantinople, at Treves, at Rome, at Sardica, in the desert, in his father's tomb, a man who knew Athanasius most intimately, before whom he had no secret, and who was more earnestly interested than any other man in the great cause of which Athanasius was the illustrious champion. And that man, an eminent theologian and well trained in the learning of his time, wrote down Athanasius' thoughts and his very words, wrote his letters, described noteworthy events of his life, in short, left a record of Athanasius as no one but Athanasius himself could have prepared it. For that man was Athanasius himself. His testimony is unimpeachable. By his writings we are more reliably informed concerning this great theologian than we are concerning Alexander or Constantine

the Great or other great historical persons whose lives and deeds were only described by others. In the writings of great men, of Augustine, and Jerome, and St. Bernard, and Savonarola, and Luther, we have the direct utterances of their minds; they are the most reliable sources of historical information concerning historical *persons*, the persons of their authors. And let us be rightly understood. The chief value of the writings of great historical persons does not lie in what they may have written *concerning* themselves, in what we might term autobiographical remarks, for the information of posterity, but in what they wrote as the *makers* of history, when their words were deeds, exerting a determining influence upon the people of their time. We have no autobiography of Luther. If we had, it would be of great value to the student of the history of that great man. But its historical importance would be far inferior to his great reformatory writings, his ninety-five theses, his tracts *De captivitate Babylonica*, *De libertate Christiana*, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, etc., his polemical treatises, *Wider die himmlischen Propheten*, *Dass diese Worte Christi*, "Das ist mein Leib," *noch fest stehen*, and scores of others, in which we see the Reformer at work, fighting God's battles, teaching God's people, performing the task which was allotted to him, and inaugurating and establishing a new era of the Christian church. By reading the works of the Reformer, the student acquires a historical concept of the man which he would not secure by perusing a hundred biographies.

But we revert once more to Athanasius. The student of the history of that great champion of orthodoxy against the Arian heresy has comparatively smooth sailing as he pursues his course through the writings of Athanasius, because they exhibit the same man from the beginning to the close of his public career. There is perhaps no second theologian of the first order in history who has remained so much like himself in all the various periods of an equally

eventful life. On the other hand, not a few of the prominent men in the history of the church, as they stand exhibited in their own writings, while they have maintained their personal character, have shifted their positions and associations in a manner and measure to alter their historical significance and, so to say, impose upon the student the task of studying them anew and distinguishing them from themselves, of acquiring vastly different concepts of the same individuals. Thus we have an earlier and a later Tertullian, the same individual, but the later being, though not another, certainly a different Tertullian. We have, likewise, an earlier and a later Melancthon, an earlier and a later Flacius, an earlier, an intermediate, and a later Calvin, an earlier and a later Cranmer, the former, in each case, differing widely from the latter in some respects, while in other respects the individual remained the same and asserted itself in its peculiar constitution. Here the student is made to confront a maze of difficulties. It is of the utmost importance that the identity of the earlier and the later Melancthon should never be lost out of view; and it is of equal importance that the changes which this man is known to have undergone should be distinctly noticed and correctly estimated, in order that at every stage of his life the true historical Melancthon may be in relief before the student's eye. In other cases, the erroneous assumption of certain changes in historical individuals have led to gross misstatements. Thus an earlier and a later Luther with regard to the doctrine of free will and grace and of predestination, and in point of his attitude toward the Swiss, has been falsely construed from spurious evidence or in the face of evidence to the contrary, and in our day an earlier and a later *Walther* and an old and new *Missouri* have been insinuated into certain contributions toward the literature of contemporary history.

It should be remembered, however, that while all the writings of great men are valuable as sources of historical information, not *all* their writings are of *equal* value.

St. Augustine was a prolific writer; but as his chief historical significance lay in his championship against Pelagianism, his polemical treatises against the Pelagians and Semipelagians rank first in importance to the student of history, highly as we should prize his books against the Manichaeans and the Donatists, his Confessions and his dogmatical and exegetical works. Chemnitz, the *alter Martinus*, exhibits himself most plastically in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*. The last great exponent of orthodox Lutheranism before the age of Rationalism, V. E. Loescher, is indispensable to the student of the history of Pietism for what he has laid down in his *Timotheus Verinus* and other writings directed against the *malum pietisticum*. In some cases it is necessary to compare the various editions of important works as they issued from the hands of their authors, as of Melanchthon's *Loci* and Calvin's *Institutes*, and quotations from such works, to be of real historical value, must be accompanied with references to the editions from which they are taken; otherwise they may be highly misleading. For a similar reason the study of Augustine's *Retractationes* is imperatively necessary in order to do justice to the man as a theologian.

But while emphasizing what has been said, that not all the writings of historical persons are of equal value to the student of history, it should, on the other hand, be said that *nothing* which a great man has written is without value in historical research. Luther's letters, those to his wife not excepted, furnish a surprising amount of information to the student of the history of the Reformation. The present writer has discovered in mere scraps of manuscript, some of them half charred from exposure to fire, and from letters to which no manner of historical significance was attached by the writers and the first recipients, valuable historical material probably to be found nowhere else in the world.

Finally the student should note that he has enjoyed the full benefit of these sources of information only when

he has scrutinized the *ipsissima verba* of their authors as far as this is possible. In this respect, autographs of undoubted genuineness rank first. Next in order are carefully prepared apographs and critical editions based upon a comparison of all the available copies of general reliability. No translation should be used where the original is accessible, since even the best translation is not the text, but an interpretation of the text and only as reliable as the translator is for ability, veracity, and carefulness. Luther has been made to say things by the translators of his Latin works, e. g. of his book *De Servo Arbitrio*, which he never said in the originals. Again, extracts will answer the purpose in many cases; in others, however, they will not, unless they be very extensive, comprising enough of the context to place the words in point beyond reasonable doubt. Clement of Alexandria, Augustine, Luther, Chemnitz, have been quoted in their own words in evidence of what, in the light of the context, those words do not say and cannot say. Besides, the quotations found in historical treatises are not always correct extracts from the authorities quoted; words are sometimes omitted, sometimes changed. The student who is bent upon original research should, therefore, look upon the references to books, sections, and pages, by which quotations from works presumably accessible to the reader are generally accompanied, as invitations to verify the correctness of the quotation and to inspect the context, before basing any assertion of his own upon a quotation. This is a precaution which German theologians and others have too often neglected, and hence citations and references which have time and again been nailed and branded as false testimony are ever anew and from generation to generation paraded in evidence of false historical statements also passed along the line and carried from one edition of encyclopaedias to the other. In many instances, as especially in Roman catholic historiography, the citations have evidently been made in bad faith when first made and

are being carried forward in the same spirit of conscious falsehood. In this way it was possible to draw monstrous caricatures of Luther professedly "taken from Luther's own works." But Rome had operated with false quotations long before Luther lived; the greatest literary swindle of all ages, *Pseudo-Isidore*, consisted largely of false citations and served as a legal basis of Rome's tyranny until it was exposed as an immense fraud by Lutheran historiographers.

A special department of ecclesiastical history for which the sources hitherto described must yield the greater part of the material is the *history of doctrine*, for the simple reason that the men whose writings have come down to us were chiefly the teachers of the church. In most of what these men wrote they were occupied with Christian doctrine, and that in a way which renders their works of peculiar value to the student of history. In their extensive commentaries, in their sermons, in their catechetical lectures, in their dogmatical treatises, Origen and Clement and Basil and Gregory and Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome and Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine and St. Bernard and Luther and hundreds of others not only wrote *about* or *concerning* doctrine, but wrote doctrine and set forth doctrine itself, and the student, as he reads these words, finds them in the very act of *teaching*, learns not only *what* they taught, but also *how* they taught, their doctrine *in rebus et in phrasibus*. Their apologetical and polemical writings, also, are largely doctrinal, exhibiting the truths assailed by Jews and gentiles and heretics and fanatics, bringing out the various points of doctrine all the more sharply and precisely because of the errors with which they had to contend, proving their thetical statements and meeting the antitheses with copious texts from the Scriptures of both Testaments. Here, then, we have the real primary sources of the history of doctrine. At the same time, the writings of the earlier Fathers contain most of what we can learn concerning the heresies of their times.

Most of what we know of Gnosticism and Monarchianism and Arianism and Pelagianism is taken from the works of Irenaeus and Tertullian and Hippolyte and Augustine and a few others. But as we intend to take up the history of dogma in a separate article, we break away from this subject at present and, having hitherto dealt with one class of historical persons as the subjects of research in ecclesiastical history, direct our attention to another class, which must not be overlooked.

Not all the great men whose names are inseparably associated with the history of Christianity were literary men, and such women as Blandina and Felicitas, Paula and Monica, have left no memoirs of their lives composed by themselves. And yet Constantine and Theodosius the Great, and many like them, who in their own day and ever since depended upon others for the records of their name and fame, demand the attention of the student of history. They, too, were individuals, each with his own personality and character. Theodosius was not Constantine any more than Constantine was Theodosius or than either of them was Athanasius. The historical Constantine cannot now be construed by generalizing the concept of Washington or the student John Smith, nor by direct observation, but must be conceived as exhibited in the testimony of those who lived with him and saw and heard what he did and spoke, or in narratives and descriptions directly or indirectly based upon such testimony. In this case the student enjoys the singular advantage of having, in Eusebius, the most learned man of his day and the father of ecclesiastical history, at the same time the first biographer of Constantine. And yet he is at a great and irremediable disadvantage compared with the student of Athanasius and Luther. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius and his Life of Constantine are in by far their greater parts no more original sources of information than the books of Gibbon and Milman. Eusebius was not engaged in or present at

the battle of the Milvian Bridge, and what he knew of that battle he knew on the testimony of others. Even where the Emperor himself was the informant of his biographer, the words of Eusebius are not those of Constantine, and what we learn from those words *we* do not learn from him, but from another, not from an original, but from a secondary source. And while even the merely human testimony of an eye witness does not afford absolute security, the reliability of a record decreases with every step from its original source, the mind of the subject or agent or actual observer of the historical reality recorded. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the student that, wherever original sources are not accessible, he should, in his efforts to acquire true historical concepts, endeavor to get as near as possible to the first sources, always remembering that no number of derivative sources can be more reliable than their common origin, and that historical evidence must not be counted but weighed. Eusebius speaks as an eye witness of the persecution in the Thebaid and of the Nicene synod. He gives us in the original words the original testimony of the church at Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp, and the original report of the persecution in Gaul under Marcus Aurelius as set forth in the encyclical of the churches in Lugdunum and Vienna to the "brethren in Asia and Phrygia," one of the most instructive sources of the history of those early persecutions of Christianity. But while the original citations in which the work abounds are its most valuable feature, the entire History of Eusebius is of inestimable value, since the author, also where he is not or does not give us an original authority, is in most cases near the fountain heads of information. He possessed an excellent historical library and made good use of it, and the student who makes good use of Eusebius is extremely well served and will find little to correct in his notions of the first great period of ecclesiastical history. No subsequent period has had its Eusebius. His continuators, Socrates,

Theodoret, Sozomenes, Evagrius, bring the history down to the close of the sixth century. The later centuries have their Gregory of Tours, Lambert of Hersfeld and the long line of mediaeval annalists and chroniclers and biographers, all of whom, though of unequal value, invite the attention of the student who would get at or near the original sources of history. Thus the history of the Saxon emperors after Otto I is taken from the Chronicles of Thietmar of Merseburg, and the better part of what may be known of the reign of Henry IV may be found in the Annals of Lambert of Hersfeld and Bruno's Saxon War, though both these sources must be used and followed with a considerable measure of allowance. And this leads us to another series of remarks and recommendations in reference to our subject.

A second category of historical realities of which the student of history must endeavor to acquire true concepts is that of historical *events*. A historical event may be a very simple or a highly complicated affair, and the events recorded in historical composition are generally of the latter kind. Some events, by their very nature, leave a record of what transpired in such event, the publication of an edict, the adoption of a creed, the issuance of a bull, the signing of a treaty, the establishment of a rule or enactment of a law, and a complaint or remonstrance or appeal by letter, are events which leave such edict, creed, bull, treaty, rule, law, or letter in evidence of what event, often embodying such details as the agent, the time and place, the occasion and purpose, and other circumstances, of such event. Of a similar nature are the adopted minutes or official records of the transactions of assemblies, the reports of commissioners, the decrees of tribunals, etc. Evidence of this kind is called documentary evidence, and the documents connected with an event or series of events constitute the most reliable original sources for historical research, which the student should never neglect to investigate, if they are within his reach. They should, as a rule, be given

the precedence when the choice is between them and the testimony of individual witnesses, and in a conflict of documentary evidence, those documents which formed a part of the event itself in the nexus of cause and effect should prevail over those which were intended as an official record of the event. It is remarkable to what extent a brief document may serve as a key to a historical problem. Thus the conduct of Luther at his first appearance before the Diet of Worms has been severely criticised from that day to this, and it may seem strange that the Reformer, who had to all appearance been fully aware of what he was about and determined on his course, should then and there ask a respite for deliberation. But a few words of the imperial summons and letter of safe-conduct on which Luther had come to Worms fully account for his refusal to act without mature deliberation after the surprise he had experienced on that 17th of April.

There is another and very comprehensive class of events, however, which do not naturally leave documentary evidence for future inspection and examination. The proclamation of religious liberty by Constantine and Licinius in their edict of 313 was an important event, and the text of the edict is extant to-day, stating what it was that the emperors promulgated. But the great battle of Oct. 28, 312, which opened the way to that edict, was not fought with the pen but with the sword, and left no records but those written in blood, which the rains of a season washed away, and which neither the heathen Zosimus nor the Christian Eusebius had ever seen when they wrote their detailed accounts of those eventful days. And thus it is with thousands upon thousands of events recorded in history. They were recorded by friends or enemies, or by friends and enemies, of the persons or causes connected with such events, or by such as had little or no special interest in the affairs themselves of which they wrote, but simply chronicled because they were put to it, or to earn money or fame or both by literary work, much

as a contributor to an encyclopaedia may follow his allotments and write an article on Milton to-day and another on Mohammed to-morrow. And the student of history? Whom is he to follow, Zosimus, or Eusebius, or the Encyclopaedia? He will do well to consult them all and keep his eyes open and his wits about him until he is through with them. In doing this he will find some points in which they all agree, others in which they differ. Where he finds them all agreed, the presumption is strong that he may accept what he has found. Where he finds them disagreed, he will not draw straws or toss a penny to show that he is an "impartial historian;" nor will he, to be heroically impartial, give the precedent to Zosimus because he is a heathen; nor will he, to exhibit his loyalty, side with Eusebius because he was a bishop; nor will he follow the Encyclopaedia because that saves him the trouble of further investigation. But what *will* he do? He will first investigate the nature of the disagreement. If he finds a circumstance mentioned in Zosimus of which Eusebius says nothing, or if he finds the former explicit in detail where the latter has but a general term, he will see no contradiction, but understand that the one is probably supplementing the other. This kind of disagreement is so far from being a cause of embarrassment, that it is rather a great advantage, accruing from the multiplicity of sources which may be made to contribute to the student's stock of information. It is by taking Eusebius, Zosimus, Lactantius, Eutropius, the Panegyrics, and a few others, and leading them into the same channel, that we obtain the material for the history of the events which culminated in the downfall of heathen rule in the Empire.

But what if real contradictions occur between two authorities, the one stating what is incompatible with a statement of the other, or the one denying what the other affirms? In that case a number of previous questions must be decided before the point at issue can be settled. The student will first ask which of the conflicting authority was

more probably able to learn and willing to say the truth. As between Eusebius, the contemporary and familiar friend of Constantine, and Zosimus, the bitter enemy of Christianity and separated by many years from the events of 312, the decision should be in favor of Eusebius. Although this author may not have been free from partiality *for* his emperor, this defect is at least counterbalanced by the known partiality of Zosimus *against* the emperor, which leaves the greater proximity of Eusebius to the most authentic sources of information to turn the scales in the bishop's favor. In other cases what we may call circumstantial evidence may be called in to decide a question of credibility. Thus when Zosimus says that Constantine's mother was not his father's lawful wife, this statement cannot stand in the face of the fact that Diocletian insisted on Constantine's divorce from Helena when he was to become the son-in-law of Maximian by marriage with the latter's step-daughter, Theodora. Finally, the student may also be confronted with cases of conflicting evidence so nicely balanced that he will leave it an open question where the truth may lie. But these cases should be rare, and in most instances the preponderance of evidence is so decided that there is no room for hesitation or doubt, and very frequently the evidence is even cumulative. The really distressing cases are those where, in the absence of documentary evidence, there is but one witness to an event, and he of doubtful reliability. But here again there is no serious cause of alarm; for among these cases we do not find the hinging points of history. Important events are generally well attested, and the testimony is not very hard to find after it has been discovered and registered and made generally accessible. And, once more, to acquire true concepts of historical events of superior importance, let the student get near the events by getting at the nearest records, documentary evidence, if possible, and a few chroniclers who knew what to say and said what they knew.

A third general category of historical realities which should be here considered is that of ecclesiastical *institutions*, as the ministerial office, public worship and its occasions and occupations, preaching, the administration of the sacraments, holydays, schools, church polity, monasticism, etc. The institutions have also had their history, and this history has had its recorders. But while persons and events have largely been exhibited *ex professo*, the persons writing of themselves or others and the events leaving their records or finding their recorders, institutions have mostly been dealt with incidentally, in connection with other subjects. The information concerning these matters is, as a consequence, far more dispersed, more difficult to find, more restricted in compass, and, in some points and respects, very sparingly furnished. We may find scraps of information where we should least expect them, as on the institution of deaconesses and details of Christian worship in the letters of Plinius Secundus, on the celebration of Epiphany in Ammianus Marcellinus. Original research on topics of this class requires more time, more books, more previous knowledge of history, and more willingness to be satisfied with small returns for much labor. This is the reason why the student, when it comes to dealing with these chapters, is less inclined and, perhaps, less able, to see for himself, to search the first sources, but will content himself with going over the more recent productions of specialists in historical research. And here he is at a great disadvantage; for most of these productions are sadly unreliable. To say that many authors seem not to have found what they did not want to find is putting their case mildly; for in some instances they have done what is worse, stating what they had not found, and could not have found with their eyes open, the very reverse being expressly stated in the sources to which they refer. Even Christian Archaeology, with a limited and highly reliable apparatus of original sources, has been handled in a manner which admits of no

excuse. Treating chiefly of Christian institutions, most of the archaeological works or chapters are deplorably misleading, many of them bristling with false statements, distorting everything they touch, and all this with an air of certainty which may keep the student from following up the strings of references and finding that the evidence referred to does not say what is claimed, or from surveying the field himself to find abundant evidence to the contrary. The student should, therefore, be very careful in occupying and maintaining a position relative to Christian institutions where he has not seen for himself, and what has been said of citations above should be remembered here. And once more we say, Get at or as near as you can to the first sources.

Reiterating this recommendation we are aware of two objections which may be in the reader's mind. The first is, that this advice would seem to restrict the study of history either to very few students or to very small territories in the vast domain of History. Our answer is, that while the study of history to any great extent is not everybody's business, the task must not be overestimated. No man is expected or able to master the whole of History, or even of Ecclesiastical History, in all its details, and that by searching the first sources, and all of them, to their full compass. In this the study of History does not stand alone. What would Chemistry be without experiment? Even a course of elementary study would be looked upon as a crippled affair without ample experiment. Yet no chemist of high standing in his science has ever made or seen all the experiments which have led to the results of chemical research. And as in Law and in Medicine a high degree of proficiency is only reached by restriction of extent and increase of intensity, so in History a complete mastering of all the details accessible by original research is only possible within restricted limits. But as the Lawyer, also where he is not a specialist, should, and very well may, make himself familiar with a few lead-

ing cases, as the early case of *Mitchell vs. Reynolds* and the more recent case of *Diamond Match Co. vs. Roeber* with regard to Contracts in Restraint of Trade, so the theologian should, and may well be, familiar with one or two first sources for all the chief chapters of Church History. The *New Testament*, *Eusebius* and his *Continuators*, the *Apolo- gies* of Justin, *Irenaeus Against the Heresies*, Cyprian on the *Unity of the Church*, Athanasius on the *Nicene Synod*, Augustine's *Confessions*, the chief *Acta* of the first four Ecumenical Synods, the *Regula Pastoralis* of Gregory I, the *Ten Books* of Gregory of Tours, the History of the Lombards by Paulus Diaconus, Einhard's *Life of Charles*, the *Annals* of Lambert of Hersfeld, Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, Abaelard's *Epitome*, a few *Sermons* of St. Bernard and Tauler, the *Sentences* of Petrus Lombardus, Erasmus' *Moriae Encomium*, and the *Koran*, would make a very serviceable library covering fifteen centuries of Church History; a library which would serve to lay a broad and solid foundation of historical concepts in the student's mind and to rear quite a respectable beginning of a super-structure; a library obtainable at moderate cost, and the first perusal of which could be easily accomplished in the course of a year. Future additions would readily suggest themselves.

The second objection we would here anticipate is this: What room does your recommendation of books like those above enumerated leave for the works of modern historians like Neander and Kurtz and Schaff and Fisher and a legion of others? We answer, A good deal. We have already touched upon the use we have for such works when, having asked whom the student should follow, Zosimus, or Eusebius, or the Encyclopaedia, we answered, "He will do well to consult *them all*." The days of Polyhistor are over and past. We must have books of reference. We must have text-books. The lawyer knows that his real authorities are the *Reports* and the *Constitutions* and *Statutes*. Yet he has ample

use for the *Digests*, for Blackstone and Kent, for Pollock on Contracts, Bishop on Marriage and Divorce, Tiedeman on the Limitations of Police Power, even for Stewart and other authors of the "Pony Library," in short, for the *Text Books*, which keep him informed on the past and present state of Subjective and Adjective Law without putting him to the trouble of handling and revolving the hundreds and thousands of volumes containing the authorities proper, most of which are only found in the large libraries of Bar-Associations and the great Law-Schools, but not one of which can ever be really supplanted by any text-book or all the text-books combined. In a similar way, the student of history will gratefully avail himself of the labors of Neander and Ranke, of Koestlin's *Life of Luther*, Preger's *Flacius*, Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire*, Jacobs' *Lutheran Movement in England*, etc., and gather from them stores of valuable information. He may make Neander as far as he goes his Blackstone, and Ranke's *Age of the Reformation* his Tiedeman, and Koestlin his Pollock. As each law text-book is what its author made it, and no more, and its merit lies in the correctness and completeness with which the author has stated, and the manner in which he has arranged and grouped together, what the Reports and Statutes contain, so each work of a modern historian is what its author has made it, and no more, and its merit consists in the correctness and completeness with which he has stated, and the manner in which he has arranged, what the first sources contain. Elegance of style is in both instances an inducement to use the book, but does not enhance the emolument of its use, while references to the sources are an inducement to verify the correctness of the book and facilitate the recourse to the authorities proper where it may be in demand. They are, in the latter sense, a part of the information embodied in the book which is sometimes more valuable than the statements in the text.

We have not exhausted our subject. The study of Church History means more than the acquisition of correct historical concepts, and we have not even said all that should have been said on this restricted view of the topic. But we must try the reader's patience no longer. Perhaps he may be willing to continue the disquisition, and if so, we shall be pleased to hear of him.

A. G.

THE CASE OF DR. KRELL.

We have been asked whether the claim that the Lutheran church had never inflicted religious persecution can be sustained in the face of certain facts connected with Cryptocalvinism in Saxony, and, especially, in view of the imprisonment and execution of Dr. Krell, the last leader of this movement, who was beheaded at Dresden on Oct. 9, 1601. While the subject is not of such importance that we would deem it proper to give it a thorough discussion in all its points and aspects in the *QUARTERLY*, we readily devote enough space to the matter to substantiate the statement that Krell can *not* with historical truth be held up as an instance of religious persecution by the Lutheran church or a Lutheran government.

Nicolaus Krell had been the Chancellor of the elector of Saxony, Christian I, and had used his influence for a second attempt at introducing Calvinism into the Saxon church, after the endeavors of Peucer and his associates had failed and the Lutheran church had reasserted itself in the adoption of the Formula of Concord. This second cryptocalvinistic movement was, like the first, in itself of deep political significance inasmuch as the peace of Lutheran territories in Germany was secured by the Augsburg treaty of 1555, which recognized the rightful existence of the Lutheran, not of the Zwinglian or Calvinistic church.