

*Dr. Ed. Schenck  
1898*

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1898#

VOL. III.

JANUARY 1899.

No. 1.

## Doctrinal Theology.

### COSMOLOGY.

Cosmology, as a chapter of Christian theology, is the doctrine of Holy Scripture concerning the genesis, nature, and states, of created things. The source whence every doctrinal statement under this head must be derived is the same from which we draw our theological information concerning the unfathomable mysteries of Theology proper, the doctrine of God, of the Trinity in Unity, of the divine attributes and eternal decrees. It is true, the Bible is not a scientific text book of Cosmic Philosophy, of Natural History or Geology or Astronomy, claiming for itself the authority due to the results of scientific research, of human observation and investigation and speculation. Its claims, also in reference to Cosmology, are infinitely higher. The authority of human scientists is never more than human; the authority of the Scriptures, also where it speaks of mundane things, is simply and unrestrictedly divine. Scientists may err, God can not; scientists have often erred, God never. Where the statements of great scientists and those of the Scriptures are at variance, those of the Scriptures must prevail, not although, but because, the Bible is not a scientific text book, because it is more, it is the word of

# Historical Theology.

---

## THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

### II.

That historical theology, to deserve its name, must be historical, and that the study of church history must be the acquisition of historical knowledge, and first of all, of correct notions of historical persons, institutions, and events, has been shown in an earlier article.<sup>1)</sup> But historical theology, in order to deserve its name, must also be theology, and the study of church history is therefore the study of theology with a view of acquiring that practical habitude which constitutes a theologian, inasmuch as theology comprises a knowledge and proper 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 defense of divine truth.

One of the requisites for the pursuance of such study as a study of theology is a theological interest in the subjects about which the theological student as a student of church history must be concerned, and in the purposes which a theologian as a theologian must have in view. It is true, the study of church history is frequently pursued without the proper theological interest and, perhaps, in some instances, without any interest at all, or only because Ecclesiastical History has, by those who have laid out the course of studies for the theological student, been given a place in such curriculum, and, more especially, because at a final examination a certain amount of historical knowledge will be looked for before a testimonial of maturity for the ministerial office can be granted. To this lack of in-

---

1) THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. II, pp. 425 ff.

terest it is largely due that from the minds of many their historical acquisitions have mostly disappeared after a few years of ministerial work, very much as many medical practitioners have but a very superficial knowledge of Anatomy after a few years of professional practice. In short, interest in the subject studied is an indispensable condition of successful study, the enduring acquisition of knowledge stored away, not *in futuram oblivionem*, but for future use.

But here again it must be remembered that even a true and warm interest in the subjects to be dealt with in church history is not necessarily theological interest. A jurist may be very deeply interested in the trial of Jesus and the various trials of Paul from a purely legal point of view. He may scrutinize the Gospels as he would the Annals of Tacitus and the Biographies of Suetonius, to inform himself as to the modes of legal procedure in the Roman Empire, the peculiar relations of local and national law, of ecclesiastical and civil courts and the limits of their jurisdiction, the taking of evidence, the relations of legislative, judicial, and executive power, the evil effects of mixing up politics with the administration of justice, and other points for which the history of those earlier days may afford analogies to the substantive and adjective law of our time and country. As a specimen of historical composition dealing with subjects with which a theologian should be familiar, determined by an interest not theological, we give the following extracts from Ramsay's recent work on St. Paul, the result of a very careful and thorough investigation of the Acts of the Apostles from the author's point of view.

“Several other facts show clearly that, during the following four years, Paul had considerable command of money. Imprisonment and a long lawsuit are expensive. Now, it is clear that Paul during the following four years did not appear before the world as a penniless wanderer, living by the work of his hands. A person in that position will not either at the present day or in the first century be treated with such

marked respect as was certainly paid to Paul, at Caesarea, on the voyage, and in Rome. The governor Felix and his wife, the Princess Drusilla, accorded him an interview and private conversation. King Agrippa and his Queen Bernice also desired to see him. A poor man never receives such attentions or rouses such interest. Moreover, Felix hoped for a bribe from him; and a rich Roman official did not look for a small gift. Paul, therefore, wore the outward appearance of a man of means, like one in a position to bribe a Roman procurator. The minimum in the way of personal attendants that was allowed for a man of respectable position was two slaves; and, as we shall see, Paul was believed to be attended by two slaves to serve him. At Caesarea he was confined in the palace of Herod; but he had to live, to maintain two attendants, and to keep up a respectable appearance. Many comforts, which are almost necessities, would be given by the guards, so long as they were kept in good humor, and it is expensive to keep guards in good humor. In Rome he was able to hire a lodging for himself and to live there, maintaining, of course, the soldier who guarded him.

“An appeal to the supreme court could not be made by everybody that chose. Such an appeal had to be permitted and sent forward by the provincial governor; and only a serious case would be entertained. But the case of a very poor man is never esteemed as serious; and there is little doubt that the citizen’s right of appeal to the Emperor was hedged in by fees and pledges. There is always one law for the rich man and another for the poor; at least, to this extent, that many claims can be successfully pushed by a rich man in which a poor man would have no chance of success. In appealing to the Emperor, Paul was choosing undoubtedly an expensive line of trial. All this had certainly been estimated before the decisive step was taken. Paul had weighed the cost; he had reckoned the gain which would accrue to the Church if the supreme court pronounced

in his favor; and his past experience gave him every reason to hope for a favorable issue before a purely Roman tribunal, where Jewish influence would have little or no power. The importance of the case, as described in the preceding section, makes the appeal more intelligible.

“Where, then, was the money procured? Was it from new contributions collected in the Churches? That seems most improbable, both from their general poverty, from Paul’s personal character, and from the silence of Luke on the point. Luke himself was probably a man dependent on his profession for his livelihood. His name is not that of a man of high position. There seems no alternative except that Paul’s hereditary property was used in those four years. As to the exact facts, we must remain in ignorance. If Paul hitherto voluntarily abstained from using his fortune, he now found himself justified by the importance of the case in acting differently. If, on the other hand, he had for the time been disowned by the family, then either a reconciliation had been brought about during his danger (perhaps originating in the bold kindness of his young nephew), or through death property had come to him as legal heir (whose rights could not be interfered with by any will). But, whatever be the precise facts, we must regard Paul as a man of some wealth during these years.

“He appeared to Felix and to Festus, then, as a Roman of Jewish origin of high rank and great learning, engaged in a rather foolish controversy against the whole united power of his nation (which showed his high standing, as well as his want of good judgment). That is the spirit of Festus’s words, ‘Paul! Paul! you are a great philosopher, but you have no common sense.’”<sup>1)</sup>

And again: “It is doubtful why Paul’s trial was so long delayed. Perhaps his opponents, despairing of obtaining his condemnation, preferred to put off the trial as long

---

1) Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 310 ff.

as possible; and there were then, as there are now, many devices in law for causing delay. Perhaps the case was being inquired into by the Imperial Office: the trial had to take place before the Emperor or one of his representatives (probably one of the two Prefects of the Praetorian Guard). The whole question of free teaching of an oriental religion by a Roman citizen must have been opened up by the case; and it is quite possible that Paul's previous proceedings were inquired into.

“The trial seems to have occurred toward the end of A. D. 61. Its earliest stages were over before Paul wrote to the Philippians, for he says, I 12, ‘the things *which happened* unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Good News; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ in the whole *Praetorium*, and to all the rest; and that most of the Brethren in the Lord, being confident in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear.’ This passage has been generally misconceived and connected with the period of imprisonment; and here again we are indebted to Mommsen for the proper interpretation. The *Praetorium* is the whole body of persons connected with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court, doubtless in this case the Prefect or both Prefects of the Praetorian Guard, representing the Emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice, together with the assessors and high officers of the court. The expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the trial is partly finished, and the issue as yet is so favorable that the Brethren are emboldened by the success of Paul's courageous and free-spoken defence and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court; but he himself, being entirely occupied with the trial, is for the moment prevented from preaching as he had been doing when he wrote to the Colossians and the Asian Churches generally.”<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) Ibid. pp. 356 f.

And once more: "At his second trial the veil that hides his fate is raised for the moment. On that occasion the circumstances were very different from his first trial. His confinement was more rigorous, for Onesiphorus had to take much trouble before obtaining an interview with the prisoner (II *Tim.* I 17): 'he fared ill as far as bonds, like a criminal' (II 9). He had no hope of acquittal: he recognized that he was 'already being poured forth as an offering, and the time of his departure was come.' The gloom and hopelessness of the situation damped and dismayed all his friends: at his first hearing 'all forsook' him; yet for the time he 'was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.' In every respect the situation thus indicated is the opposite of the circumstances described on the first trial. *Phil.* occupies the same place in the first as II *Tim.* in the second trial; but *Phil.* looks forward to a fresh career among the Churches, while II *Tim.* is the testament of a dying man. In one respect, however, the second trial was like the first. Paul again defended himself in the same bold and outspoken way as before, expounding the principles of his life to a great audience, 'that all the Gentiles might hear.'

"Yet the circumstances of this second trial are totally different from that 'short way with the dissenters' which was customary under Domitian and Trajan and later Emperors. After his first examination Paul could still write to Asia bidding Timothy and Mark come to him, which shows that he looked forward to a considerable interval before the next stage of his trial. He was charged as a malefactor, crimes had to be proved against him, and evidence brought; and the simple acknowledgment that he was a Christian was still far from sufficient to condemn him, as it was under Domitian. It is a plausible conjecture of Conybeare and Howson that the first hearing, on which he was acquitted and 'delivered out of the lion's mouth,' was on the charge of complicity and sympathy with the incendiaries, who had burned Rome in 64; and the charge was triumphantly dis-

proved. The trial in that case did not occur until the first frenzy of terror and rage against the supposed incendiaries was over; and some other species of crime had to be laid to the account of the Christians charged before the courts. The second and fatal charge, heard later, was doubtless that of treason, shown by hostility to the established customs of society, and by weakening the Imperial authority.

“If our conception of the trial is correct, the precedent of the first great trial still guided the courts of the empire (as we have elsewhere sought to prove). It had then been decided that the preaching of the new religion was not in itself a crime; and that legal offences must be proved against Christians as against any other subjects of the empire. That was the charter of freedom (p. 282) which was abrogated shortly after; and part of Luke’s design was, as we have seen (p. 307), to record the circumstances in which the charter had been obtained, as a protest against the Flavian policy, which had overturned a well weighed decision of the supreme court.”<sup>1)</sup>

All this, however highly we may appreciate the labors of so high an authority on certain topics of Christian Archaeology, is certainly not historical theology. The very title of Dr. Ramsay’s book indicates that he deals with “St. Paul, the traveller and Roman citizen,” and not with “Paul, the apostle of Christ.” And while his work is highly instructive in various ways, also to the student of church history, the student, in order to capitalize the book for his theological studies, must contribute what the author of the book does not and would not furnish, theological interest. In this respect historical theology does not hold an exceptional position as distinguished from other aspects of theology. The study of dogmatical, exegetical, and practical theology may likewise be pursued without true theological interest, and in the absence of this interest a man

---

1) Ibid. pp. 360 ff.



may have passed through a full course of what should have been theological studies, without having become, in any true sense, a theologian.

What, then, is that theological interest, without which the study of church history cannot be theologically pursued? It is that frame of mind which St. Paul describes, saying: *I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified,*<sup>1)</sup> and: *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*<sup>2)</sup> The subject concerning which the theological student of church history must endeavor to make himself familiar is the Church of Christ from its origin to the present time, the Church of Christ, which is at all times built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone,<sup>3)</sup> which is at all times and everywhere to be found where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name,<sup>4)</sup> where there are those who continue in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers,<sup>5)</sup> and who make disciples among all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever Christ has commanded them.<sup>6)</sup> The theological student of church history will, therefore, investigate his sources of information for reliable *data* concerning the course of the Gospel among the Jews and the Gentiles, through countries and continents, decades and centuries, from the day when in many tongues the wonderful works of God were spoken at Jerusalem,<sup>7)</sup> to the present time, when, according to Christ's promise, the Gospel of the kingdom is being preached in all the world for all the nations.<sup>8)</sup> And since it is the Gospel of Christ by which the Church is built and preserved, the theological student will endeavor to learn in what measure the preaching of the

---

1) 1 Cor. 2, 2.

4) Matt. 18, 20.

7) Acts 2, 11.

2) 1 Cor. 9, 22.

5) Acts 2, 42.

8) Matt. 24, 14.

3) Eph. 2, 20.

6) Matt. 28, 19. 20.

Gospel, and especially the promulgation of the doctrine of justification, the *doctrina stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, was carried on at various times and in the various parts of the earth. Thus he will learn from the Acts of the Apostles and their writings that in the apostolic age Christ crucified and risen from the dead and forgiveness of sins in his name was the great cardinal subject of the earliest teachers of Christianity. But, at the same time, he will also find that false doctrines were very early disseminated even in the churches of earliest Christianity, and that the doctrine first assailed was the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith in Christ Jesus. He will further note that in the early churches the struggle of the spirit and the flesh was manifest in various ways, and that the corrective and preservative employed by the ministers of Christ was again the written and spoken word of divine doctrine, by which faith and love were fostered and made to bring forth fruits of the spirit for the glory of God. Passing from the Apostolic Age, in which the Gospel was spread and the Church of Christ planted and strengthened throughout the greater part of what was then the civilized world, the student would find, that in the days of the Apostolic Fathers the written and spoken word of God continued its course. He will find in Clement of Rome the doctrine of justification laid down in words as these: "All, then, were glorified and magnified, not by themselves or by their works, or by deeds of righteousness, which they had done, but through his will. And we, too, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus, are justified not by ourselves nor by our wisdom, or understanding, or godliness, or works which we have done in holiness of heart, but by faith, by which Almighty God had from the beginning justified all, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." <sup>1)</sup> But on the other

1) Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν, οὐ δι' αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας, ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιοῦμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ

hand, the very scarcity of such golden words as these in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers will bear evidence to a deplorable decadence of the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in Christ very soon after the apostles of Christ had gone to their reward. And at the same time the ascendancy of Gnosticism with its false Theology and Christology and Soteriology and Eschatology, the sprouting forth of Sabellianism and other unitarian heresies, indicated most energetic efforts of Satan to counteract the saving influence of the Gospel by a multitude of blows directed against the very heart of Christianity, endeavors to obscure and ultimately to eliminate the doctrine of our salvation and to substitute for Christ, unto Jews a stumbling block, and unto Gentiles foolishness, a man-made savior who could not save, and for saving faith the vainglorious wisdom, the wild speculations of rationalistic errorists too numerous to count and too various to classify. But from the writings of such defenders of the faith as Irenaeus, and from what is left of the arguments of the *ψευδώνυμος γυνῶσις*, the student will also learn that the Christians of their age still demanded the law and the testimony where they were expected to give a hearing to those who would be their teachers, that the written word of God was looked upon as the infallible source of doctrine and norm of life. Thus also will the history of persecutions by the rabble of heathen cities and by the police power of the heathen state under the Roman emperors reveal the uncompromising endeavors of Satan to stay the progress of the Gospel, to silence its preachers, to stamp out Christian faith, to wrench from the hands of Christian people the written word of God, and to reestablish pagan worship where Christianity had reared its pulpits and its altars. But no less will the history of these persecutions give testimony to the Gospel of Christ as the

---

*τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων, ὧν κατεργασάμεθα ἐν ἰσότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ὃ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἄμην. I. Clem. ad. Cor. XXXII.*

power of God unto salvation, whereby Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Sanctus, and Maturus, and Attalus, and Blandina, and all the glorious host of martyrs, were made victorious champions of Christ, testifying to him in the power of faith from scaffolds and pyres, in dungeons and chains and the jaws of wild beasts in the arena, and proving that all the enginery of hell was not sufficient to prevail over the simple and childlike faith of men, women, and children, upheld by the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Again, the theological student of history will, as he proceeds to investigate the Constantinian and post-Constantinian age, see Arianism and Nestorianism, Eutychianism and other heresies, rear their heads as so many monsters again assailing the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, the doctrine of Christ, the God-man, who alone could be the Redeemer of a sinful world. He will note the united efforts of emperors and councils and metropolitan bishops and conflicting parties to graft a rank growth of false doctrine on the withering trunk and branches of the church in spite of the valiant testimony of Athanasius and the learned Cappadocians and other witnesses of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, which had been handed down from the days of the apostles and shone forth from the more sure word of prophecy in a dark place. Thus the struggle of light and darkness continues through the ages, the fearful struggles of the Culdees on the British Isles and the European continent, of the Waldensians and Wycliffites, of John Hus and his friend Jerome, against antichristian Rome and its secular and ecclesiastical champions and serfs, antichristian chiefly because of its antagonism against the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Jesus, the only Savior from sin and death and the power of the devil. Toward the close of those dark ages the theological student will witness the rise of Humanism, not to make war against, but to join hands with, antichristian Rome, darkness resuscitated from the tomb of antique heathendom, with the

darkness conjured from the pit of hell by the first-born of Satan, for the purpose of forever extinguishing the light of the Gospel. And then, after a long reign of darkness, all the more hideous in its contrast with such rays of light as beam forth from the writings of that remarkable preacher, the best and greatest man of the Middle Ages, Bernhard of Clairvaux, the theological student of church history will behold the glorious victory of the everlasting Gospel in the days of the Reformation, when, to the dismay of antichristian Rome and under the frowns and scowls and vociferations of Humanism, God himself restored to his church, so long enthralled in darkness, the light of the Gospel and made the doctrine of justification to gladden the hearts of thousands and millions as it flooded forth with richness and purity unknown to the nations since the days immediately succeeding the Apostolic Age. And yet, after so glorious a victory, the struggle did not cease. The theological student, in his course through succeeding centuries, will witness Enthusiasm, Antinomianism, Synergism, Syncretism, Pietism, and Rationalism taking their turns in a long series of assault against the truth of God, and again chiefly against the doctrine of grace and faith and justification by faith as the central and cardinal doctrine of the Christian religion and of sound Christian theology, while at the same time antichristian Rome, after the failure of the Jesuitical counter-reformation with all its carnage and pillage, still endeavors to repair its battered and crumbling citadel under the leadership of a so-called infallible Vicegerent of Christ.

The reader will understand that in the brief space at our disposal we have only endeavored to give in a few outlines a perspective of what will chiefly attract the attention of a student of church history whose ruling interest is theological in kind and purpose. The doctrine of the Gospel is the source of life to the Church, and the well-being and prosperity of the Church is always and everywhere in proportion to the influence of such doctrine, the Church being

essentially the whole number of believers on earth, and faith coming by hearing and hearing by the word of God. The efforts of Satan and his entire kingdom of darkness against the church of Christ will, as a matter of course, be directed against that by which the church must stand and without which it must fall, and, on the other hand, the church militant can make a good fight against all its enemies only by the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Knowing and considering this, the theological student of church history cannot but be eminently interested in whatever the sources of History may have to say concerning the doctrine of grace in Christ, its preachers and teachers, its promulgation and dissemination, its struggle with heresies and sin in all their multitudes of forms and phases, its victories and conquests, its decadences and adulterations, its restorations and ascendencies throughout the periods of History. Without this interest determining the study of Ecclesiastical History, the History of the Church is a book of seven seals, an unintelligible mass of confused and confounding phenomena, a vast expanse of hieroglyphic inscriptions for which the key has been lost, and the study of church history an unprofitable and misleading pursuit, which had better be let alone entirely or left to the hands of lawyers and political economists and others who do not profess to survey the field with a view of acquiring theological knowledge, but rest content with having secured what the theologian could well afford to leave unhandled or to lay aside as of comparatively little avail for his peculiar purposes.

Since, then, the theological historian will, first of all, seek Christ crucified, as in theology generally, so also in historical theology, and since, therefore, the Gospel of Christ and its promulgation and dissemination, its preaching and defence, will in all periods of history be the first and chief point of interest to him, it once more appears that a category of sources of historical information far too little esteemed and often left unnoticed by students of history must be con-

sidered of first importance. These sources are the doctrinal writings of the teachers of the church, from the Epistles of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, down to the Postils of Dr. Walther. The history of preaching is a fundamental chapter of Ecclesiastical History and far more profitable, theologically, than the history of the persecutions and the Crusades and of the three great councils of the fifteenth century, and a few other chapters, taken together. The chief historical value of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, though they contain information on a variety of topics, lies in their doctrinal statements and their quotations from the Scriptures. What is most valuable in Justin's apologetical writings is his testimony for Christ the Savior and his information concerning the public worship in the church of his day, though what he yields by way of information concerning the Jews and Gentiles is not without its value. Irenaeus is one of our chief reporters on Gnosticism, and the better part of all we know concerning the Valentinians we know of him; and yet what is most valuable in his writings is again his testimony for Christ and his exhibition of Christian doctrine as drawn directly from the word of Scripture, and exhibited as the doctrine of the orthodox church of the second century. The writings of Clement and Origen are storehouses of information on many subjects; but the most important question the student may put to them is again: What think ye of Christ? Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy in his day, is rich in reliable information concerning the Arians and their wiles and ways, concerning the persecutions suffered by the defenders of the Nicene Creed at the hands and under the edicts of Christian emperors and the decrees of synods. But what is more noteworthy in his writings is his exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and their theological substantiation by the word of Scripture. The sermons of Basil and the Gregories, the catechetical lectures of Cyrill of Jerusalem, and the homiletical writings of Chrysostom, are sources of

information rarely noticed by most students of History, and yet more important than Tacitus and Suetonius and Ammian and Zosimus and all the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* in a heap. Again, to come lower down in the course of History, the *Regula Pastoralis* of Gregory I, which became and remained the chief handbook of pastoral theology throughout the Middle Ages, is a most important historical source, and more so by what it does not than by what it does contain. The work very clearly shows that the pastor who was shaped and who performed his pastoral duties according to this rule was not chiefly a preacher of the Gospel and a teacher who would make wise unto salvation. The greater part of the work bears the superscription: *Qualiter rector bene vivens debeat docere et admonere subditos*, and the first sentence of the *Prologus* runs: Since, then, we have shown, what the qualities of the pastor should be, let us now point out how he should teach.<sup>1)</sup> The first chapter consists of a summary of the subsequent chapters, which, according to this synopsis, contain nothing but *admonitions* directed to various classes of hearers. *Aliter namque*, says Gregory, *admonendi sunt viri atque aliter feminae, aliter juvenes, aliter senes, aliter inopes, aliter locupletes, aliter laeti, aliter tristes, aliter subditi, aliter praelati, aliter servi, aliter domini, etc.* In accordance herewith the superscriptions of chapter 2 to chapter 35 begin with *Quomodo admonendi*, and the chapters themselves with: *Aliter admonendi*, and the doctrine which runs throughout this entire *Regula Pastoralis* is a doctrine of works and not a doctrine of faith. Even where he speaks of Baptism, it is not properly God's sacrament, but man's repentance which, according to this blind leader of the blind, blots out sins.<sup>2)</sup>

1) Quia igitur qualis esse debeat pastor ostendimus, nunc qualiter doceat demonstramus.

2) Qua igitur mente, qui transactas culpas flere negligunt, vivunt securi de venia, quando ipse summus pastor ecclesiae huic etiam sacramento addendam poenitentiam credidit, quod peccata principaliter extinguit? Cap. XXX.



In like manner Winfrid, renamed Bonifacius by his lord, the Pope, and falsely bearing the epithet of "the Apostle of the Germans," bears testimony to the deplorable state of the Roman Church of his day in his sermons, which are again very rarely noticed by historiographers. They have a good deal to say of Winfrid's pilgrimages to Rome and his heroic combat with an oak tree, but fail to show that this so-called apostle was certainly not an apostle of Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners, but a preacher of the righteousness of works, and of works not chiefly according to the law of God, but according to the commandments of the synagogue of Antichrist, a teacher who in his doctrine maintained profound silence concerning justification by faith, and led his hearers straightway to eternal damnation. Again, the sermons of St. Bernhard are among the most important historical documents of the Middle Ages, bearing most comforting evidence to the fact that even amid the shadows of mediaeval darkness Christ and his righteousness was still comfort and consolation to many a troubled soul. But the joy of the student cannot fail to be chilled, when from the selfsame sermons it appears that they were not directed to congregations of Christian people, men, women, and children, in their various ways of life, but to the inmates of a monastery, who, like the preacher himself, endeavored to seek their souls' salvation in seclusion from the world, and rejoiced in a light hidden under a bushel from the eyes of multitudes who might have been gladdened by what was best in the sermons of this great preacher of the Middle Ages, at the same time lord protector of antichristian popes and the victorious adversary of the most brilliant rationalist of his time, Petrus Abaelardus. Anselm of Canterbury, in his dialogue, *Cur Deus Homo*, exhibited himself as a witness to Christ the Redeemer and Savior of sinners, and as a father of rationalizing Scholasticism. Jean Charlier de Gerson, the illustrious chancellor of the mother of European universities, who did much toward the condemnation of John

Hus, became in his advanced years the teacher of little children, for whom he wrote his treatise: *De Parvulis ad Christum Trahendis*. Savonarola, one of the grandest preachers of all ages, must, of course, be studied in his sermons, which, while they are not entirely silent on Christ crucified, still exhibit the great Dominican as a thundering preacher of the law rather than a comforting preacher of the Gospel, and a political reformer rather than a restorer of Christian doctrine and of the faith in Christ Jesus. Great was Luther, the true Reformer of the Church, in his denial of the arrogant claims of antichristian Rome and his unsparing exposure of the fearful abuses of which even such enemies of the Reformation as Duke George of Saxony and Charles V were not wholly ignorant. But he who would picture the greatest theologian of post-apostolic times and the greatest champion of the liberty of conscience in these latter days as great only in negation, would draw a caricature instead of a portrait of the man. Luther must be studied in his commentaries and sermons and the thetical portions of his polemical writings as the great preacher of justification by faith, the doctrine of grace without works, which was the keynote of the Reformation and preeminently the sword of the Spirit by which this heroic champion of God's truth victoriously laid low and vanquished Antichrist and his minions arrayed against the Lord's anointed. Luther's burning of the papal bull and decretals has been slurred as a vain act of bravado by such as failed to hear or to understand the words which constitute the better part, the very soul, of this significant historical act: *Quia tu conturbasti Sanctum Domini, ideoque te conturbet ignis aeternus*. The great classical work of Martin Chemnitz, his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, was a crushing critique of the antichristian theology of Rome and its Jesuit retinue; but the real force and power of the blows dealt by the *Alter Martinus* lay precisely where the strength of the first Martinus must be sought, in the clear and incontrovertible thetical exhibition

of the doctrine of man's salvation as set forth in the word of God. And, to come down to a more recent period of History, Walther was an eminently talented controversialist and polemic; but it is significant that his most voluminous works are his Postils. For what he was to the Lutheran Church of our time and country, he was chiefly and primarily as the greatest teacher of the doctrine of justification in the present century, and perhaps since the days of the Reformation, who was never more eloquent than when he proclaimed Christ our righteousness and the grace of God in him. And thus throughout the various periods of Ecclesiastical History the theological student of History will best succeed, or, in fact, can only succeed, in making clear to himself and others the real character of historical persons and the true significance of historical events, if he pays proper attention to the presence or absence of the light of truth as it beams forth from the everlasting word of God. This is for all times the only infallible source of Christian doctrine and rule of life, and also the polar star by which the theological historian can at all times determine, even in the most intricate maze of historical phenomena, where he is, and whom or what, theologically considered, he has before him in the historical personages, institutions, and events set forth in the sources of historical information. Without this light he will find himself all at sea amid a bewildering confusion of really or seemingly conflicting historical evidence. It is because of their ignorance, neglect, or perversion of Christian doctrine, and especially of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, that modern theological historiographers grossly misrepresent such historical subjects as the church of the Apostolic Age, Athanasius, Nestorius, Augustine, Gregory VII and Popery in general, Humanism, Luther and the Reformation, Pietism, Schleiermacher, and Leo XIII. We iterate and reiterate, that the first and fundamental point of interest to the theological student of church history must be Christian doctrine, and

especially the doctrine of grace, the doctrine of justification by faith.

Having said what we have said, we are only consistent in going on to say that he only who is thoroughly familiar with Christian doctrine is fully equipped for the theological study of church history. We know that more is requisite; but the knowledge of Christian doctrine is indispensable. Dr. Ramsay has written a historical work on St. Paul of 394 pages, and probably no one but Dr. Ramsay could have written this work, for the simple reason, that there is probably no other man living who is so thoroughly and intimately familiar as Dr. Ramsay with what was foremost in this author's mind, the geography and topography of the countries through which Paul traveled, and of the cities in which he sojourned or dwelled, as also the political and social conditions prevailing in the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era. And it was by this knowledge of what was his leading point of interest that he was enabled to write such a book. Where his information is not the result of his own original research, and hence not of a reliability for which he would be willing to vouch, he prefers to pass by in order to again put his foot where he feels at home. Thus where he might have dwelled more at length on what St. Paul experienced at Jerusalem and Caesarea he says, "On the details given of the incidences in Jerusalem and Caesarea I will not enter. I am not at home on the soil of Palestine; and it seems better not to mix up second-hand studies with the discussion of incidents where I stand on familiar ground." Thus Dr. Ramsay was eminently well equipped for writing a book on "*St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen.*" But while the work amply shows that it is largely based also on a careful study of the *Acts* and of St. Paul's Epistles, it is equally remarkable that there is in the entire work from cover to cover not one single theological statement. To write a theological biography on *St. Paul the Apostle* re-

quires an equipment far different from that in which Dr. Ramsay is strong, and the chief and most indispensable requisite for the composition of such a work is a thorough knowledge of the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists, and of the proper application of such doctrine in the Christian church and in the various ways of Christian life. The study of Biology requires long and careful practice in the use of the microscope. An uneducated eye will see little or nothing in many preparations placed under the most serviceable system of lenses, and even what the tyro sees is of little value to him. The circumstances of a case may be submitted in all its details, but only the trained mind of a lawyer will at once or after careful scrutiny perceive and properly estimate the strong or the weak points of the case which would probably decide its success or failure in court. And thus without a sufficient knowledge of the doctrines of the Christian religion the student of the History of the Christian church will in the course of his investigations fail to notice a great many things which ought at once to attract his attention; and even what did come under his notice he would under-rate or overestimate or otherwise misunderstand and misinterpret, group together what should be separated, and separate what should be placed in the same file. Thus the work of Dr. Dubose on the Oecumenical Councils is thoroughly unreliable and misleading, chiefly because its author is thoroughly unsound in Christian doctrine. To the student of mediaeval history who walks in the light of Christian doctrine Marsilio of Padua will appear not only as the physician of Louis of Bavaria and the staunch defender of his king against the decrees and anathemas of the Pontiff then residing at Avignon, John XXII, but his book, *Defensor Pacis*, will also show what is of far greater importance, that in the first quarter of the fourteenth century there were those who clearly knew and openly professed the scriptural doctrine concerning the authority and sufficiency

of Holy Scripture, the true doctrine of absolution, of the church and the ministry, and other doctrines which, if they had been generally known and accepted, must even then have broken down the stronghold of Antichrist. No one but a Lutheran theologian can write a life of Luther as it should be written, and it just as truly takes an orthodox theologian properly to perform the task which no Calvinistic theologian could properly perform, to write a theological biography of Calvin or John Knox. And thus in general it is not presumption to say that only an orthodox theologian possessing the remaining requisites for historical research is thoroughly furnished for the study of church history. For he alone, inasmuch as he thoroughly knows and truly accepts all the doctrines of Christianity in themselves and in their proper relations to each other, is in full possession of the criterion whereby all historical quantities can be properly rated and arranged as to their nature and historical importance and significance in the history of the Church of Christ, which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, whose fortress and weapon of offence and defence is the word of Scripture, and whose chief task in the world is the preaching of the Gospel among all nations, whose prosperity depends upon and is betokened by the purity of doctrine abundantly and wisely dispensed by the stewards of God, and whose corruption and decadence is owing to and productive of corruption and decadence of doctrine in churches and schools and ecclesiastical literature. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that a Romanist, imbued with the doctrine of the Council of Trent, must first have ceased to be what that doctrine makes him, before he could begin to write a History of the Reformation or any chapter of church history without perverting historical truth, misinterpreting the records and in many other ways misconceiving and misrepresenting persons and institutions and events even where intentional falsehood may not be charged against him. D'Aubigne's History of the Refor-

mation is also unreliable in several respects, and certainly no Zwinglian or Calvinist will do justice to the German Reformation, since what is needful is not in him. No one can understand or correctly present the History of Pietism but a thoroughly sound Lutheran, to whose mind the true relation of Law and Gospel, faith and works, justification and sanctification, is perfectly clear, and it is necessarily a foregone conclusion that one who is himself in the dark concerning the *Malum Pietisticum* in its essential features is not the proper person to delineate a true portraiture of Pietism. In short, as there is but one true norm of doctrine and rule of life, which is true at all times and everywhere, so there is but one true standard by which all historical quantities can be reliably gauged, and that is the sound doctrine of Holy Scripture.

We know that what we have here outlined is looked upon by many as the height of presumption. We are told that historiography must above all be "impartial" or "unbiased." If this means that what is good and true should be so recognized wherever it is found, and that what is evil or false should be so set down wherever it is met, we are satisfied, and it is precisely for such impartial treatment of historical quantities that we must have the one true standard ever at hand and apply it with strictest impartiality. But every conscientious Lutheran writer of history will from various quarters be taken to task for having written from "an exclusive confessional point of view." With equal justice a revenue officer at a port of entry would be criticised for having gauged all the various articles imported from Germany and England and Japan and Brazil and the Philippine Islands from an exclusive American point of view, and according to American weights and measures only, instead of using yardsticks of different lengths for all the different fabrics coming under his hands. But as the revenue officer must not listen to such criticism, but stand by the instructions given him by his government and the

standards prescribed by this authority, so the theologian should abide by the law and the testimony, and rate according to this norm whatever he may meet on his way through the records of History from St. Luke's report of the birthday of New Testament Christianity to the historical accounts of recent events in the church of this world's eventide.

As an object lesson to demonstrate what the study of church history and theological historiography is apt to be without the knowledge and acceptance of the fundamental doctrines of Christian theology, we submit a few extracts from the *History of Dogma*, by Dr. Adolph Harnack, taken from the fourth volume of the translation of this work by Buchanan, published in 1898.

Speaking of Arianism and the doctrine upheld by Athanasius, the author says:

"How are the two mutually opposed doctrines to be judged from the standpoint of history, of reason, and of the Gospel? Each party charged the other with holding doctrines which involved contradictions, and, what is of more consequence, they mutually accused each other of apostasy from Christianity, although the Arians never advanced this charge with such energy as the opposite party. We have first of all to ascertain definitely how much they had in common. *Religion and doctrine are with both thoroughly fused together*, and, indeed, formally considered, the doctrine is the same in both cases, i. e., the fundamental conceptions are the same. The doctrine of the pre-existent Christ, who as the pre-existent Son of God is Logos, Wisdom, and world-creating power of God, seems to constitute the common basis. Together with this both have a common interest in maintaining the unity of God and in making a sharp distinction between Creator and creature. Finally, both endeavor to base their doctrines on Scripture and at the same time claim to have tradition on their side, as is evident in the case of Arius from the in-



roduction to the *Thalia*. Both are, however, convinced that the final word lies with Scripture and not with tradition." pp. 38 f.

Later on in the same chapter he says:

"Athanasius in making use of these presuppositions in order to express his faith in the Godhead of Christ, i. e., in the essential unity of the Godhead in itself with the Godhead manifested in Christ, fell into an abyss of contradictions.

"Unquestionably the old Logos doctrine too, and also Arianism, strike us to-day as being full of contradictions, but it was Athanasius who first arrived at the *contradictio in adjecto* in the full sense of the phrase. That the Godhead is a numerical unity, but that nevertheless Son and Father are to be distinguished within this unity as two—this is his view. He teaches that there is only one unbegotten principle, but that nevertheless the Son has not come into being. He maintains that the Divine in Christ is the eternal 'Son,' but that the Son is as old as the Father. This Son is not to be thought of either as created, or as an attribute of God, or as an emanation or a part of God, and is therefore something wholly indefinable. The thought of a theogony is rejected as emphatically as that of a creation, and yet the thought of an active attribute is not in any sense to be entertained. The Father is perfect for Himself and sufficient for Himself; indeed, although Father and Son have one substance, in the sense of a single nature, in common, still the Father alone is 'the God,' and is the principle and root of the Son also. *Quot verba, tot scandala!*

"Whatever involves a complete contradiction cannot be correct, and everyone is justified in unsparingly describing the contradiction as such. This the Arians sufficiently did, and in so far as they assumed that a contradiction cannot be seriously accepted by anyone, and that therefore the view of Athanasius must at bottom be Sabellian, they were right. Two generations and more had to pass before the

Church could accustom itself to recognize in the complete contradiction the sacred privilege of revelation. There was, in fact, no philosophy in existence possessed of formulae which could present in an intelligible shape the propositions of Athanasius. What he called at one time Ousia and at another Hypostasis, was not an individual substance in the full sense of the word, but still less was it a generic conception.

“If anything is clear, it is the fact that the thought of Athanasius—namely, the unity of the Godhead which rested in and appeared in Christ, could not be expressed under the traditional presuppositions of the pre-existing Son of God and the personal Logos existing from all eternity. We have here to do with the most important point in the whole question. The very same series of ideas which created the most serious difficulties for the Arians and which have been shown to occupy a secondary place in their system, seriously hamper the doctrinal utterances of Athanasius; namely, the Logos doctrine of Origen and the cosmological-metaphysical conceptions which form the background of statements regarding a historical person. The Arians required to have a created being, created before the world, changeable, of the same nature as men, for their Christ, and had to banish all other determinations from their conception, and so they could not make use of the Logos of Philo and the Apologists; Athanasius required a being who was absolutely nothing else than the Godhead, and so the Logos referred to did not in any sense fit in with his doctrine. *In both cases the combined Logos doctrine of Philo and Origen was the disturbing element.* And at bottom,—they both discarded it; Arius when he distinguishes between the Logos *nuncupativus* which Christ is, and the actual Logos of God; Athanasius when he banishes the world-idea from the content of the substance which he adores in Christ. In the view of Arius, Christ belongs in every sense to the world, i. e., to the sphere of created things; in that of

Athanasius he belongs in every sense to God, whose substance He shares.

“Arius and Athanasius both indeed occupy the standpoint of the theology of Origen which no one could now abandon; but their religious and theological interests do not originate in it. In the Gnosis of Origen everything spiritual stands to God in a two-fold relation; it is His created work and yet it is the same time His nature. This holds good in a pre-eminent sense of the Logos, which comprises all that is spiritual in itself and connects the graduated spheres of the spiritual substances, which, like it, have an eternal duration, with the supreme Godhead. To this idea corresponds the thought that the creatures are free and that they *must* return from their state of estrangement and their Fall to their original source. Of this we find nothing either in Arius or in Athanasius. In the case of the former, the sober Aristotelian philosophy on the one hand reacts against this fundamental thought, and on the other, the tradition of the Christ who is engaged in a conflict, who increases and progresses toward perfection. In the case of Athanasius what reacts against it is the ancient belief of the Church in the Father, the Almighty Creator of all things, and in the Son in whom the Father reveals Himself and has stooped to hold fellowship with man.

“It is thus not the case that the gnosis of Origen was simply halved between Arius and Athanasius; on the contrary, it underwent a fundamental correction in the teaching of both. But it was no longer possible to avoid the ‘*vis inertiae*’ of this gnosis of Origen, the contrary formulae which were held together by the idea of the Logos-cosmology as the basis for Christology. And now the question was which of the two was to be adopted, the Logos-*κτίσμα* or the Logos-*ὁμοούσιος* formula. The former freed from the latter was indeed deprived of all soteriological content, but was capable of intelligent and philosophical treatment—namely, rational-logical treatment; the

latter taken exclusively, even supposing that the distinction between the Son and the Father and the superiority of the Father were maintained in connection with it, simply led to an absurdity.

“Athanasius put up with this absurdity; without knowing it he made a still greater sacrifice to his faith—the historical Christ. It was at such a price that he saved the religious conviction that Christianity is the religion of perfect fellowship with God, from being displaced by a doctrine which possessed many lofty qualities, but which had no understanding of the inner essence of religion, which sought in religion nothing but ‘instruction,’ and finally found satisfaction in an empty dialectic.” pp. 46 ff.

In a foot-note referring to the opening words of the last paragraph: “Athanasius put up with this absurdity,” he adds:

“The Nicene Creed sanctioned it. One of its most serious consequences was that from this time onward Dogmatics were forever separated from clear thinking and defensible conceptions, and got accustomed to what was anti-rational. The anti-rational—not indeed at once, but soon enough—came to be considered as the characteristic of the creed. As there was everywhere a desire for mysteries, the doctrine seemed to be the true mystery just because it was the opposite of the clear in the sphere of the profane. Even clear-headed men like the later members of the school of Antioch were no longer able to escape from absurdity. The complete contradiction involved in the *ἁμοούσιος* drew a whole host of contradictions after it, the further thought advanced.”

Of Nestorius and his fellow-errorists Harnack’s study of church history has led to statements as these:

“But though we criticise the Christology of the Antiochians still more severely, we must not forget that *they held up before the Church the picture of the historical Christ*

at a time when the Church in its doctrinal formulae was going further away from Him. One has indeed to add that they also directed attention to the incomprehensible essence of the God-Logos which ostensibly remained behind this picture, and did not on that account possess the power of presenting the historical Christ to the minds of men in a forcible way. But still that these theologians should have done what they did at that time was of immeasurable importance. It is to them the Church owes it that its Christology did not entirely become the development of an idea of Christ which swallowed up the historical Christ. And there is still something else for which these Antiochians are to be praised. Although they professed to preserve the traditional elements of Dogma as a whole, they nevertheless essentially modified them by perceiving that every spiritual nature is a person and that what gives character and value to the person is feeling and will. This view, which was inherited from the Adoptionists and Paul, restores to the Christian religion its strictly spiritual character. But the Antiochians as Easterns were able to get possession of this knowledge only in a way which led from religion to moralism, because they based the spiritual on freedom, while again they understood freedom in the sense of independence even in relation to God. It was Augustine in his thought of liberty as 'adhaerere deo' and as '*necessitas boni*' who first united the most ardent piety with the recognition of Christianity as the spiritual-moral religion. It is, however, worth remembering that alone of all the Easterns the Antiochians and the theologians who sympathized with them took an interest in the Augustinian-Pelagian controversy—though they undoubtedly sided with Pelagius. For this interest proves that spite of the Eastern fog of mysteries, they were accessible to the freer air in which that controversy was fought out." pp. 170 ff.

With another heresy condemned by the church our author deals, saying: "Monophysitism, which limits itself

to the statement that in Christ out of two perfect natures, divinity and humanity, one composite or incarnate divine nature has come into existence, and which will have nothing to do with the idea of a free will in Christ, is dogmatically consistent. It has indeed no longer the satisfying clearness of the Apollinarian thesis; it involves an additional mystery, or a logical contradiction, still in return for this it definitely puts into words the by no means unimportant element of 'perfect humanity.' But this Monophysitism, when directly formulated as *ἕνωσις φύσεως*, certainly made it plain to the Greeks themselves that it was no longer possible to reconcile the Christ of faith with the Christ given in the Gospels; for the idea of the physical unity of the two natures and of the interchange of properties, which Cyrill had worked out in a strict fashion, swallowed up what of the human remained in Him. Arrived at this point three possible courses were open. It was necessary either to revise the doctrine of redemption and perfection which had the above-mentioned statement as its logical result—a thing which was not to be thought of,—or else theologians would have to make up their minds still further to adapt the picture of the historical Christ to the dogmatic idea, i. e., to destroy it altogether, which was logical Monophysitism, or finally, it would be necessary to discover a word, or a formula, which would mark off the dogma of faith from Apollinarianism with still greater sharpness than had been done by the catch-word 'perfect humanity.' It was therefore necessary to intensify the contradictions still further, so that it was no longer the concrete union of the natures which appeared as the secret, but the conception of the union itself already involved a *contradictio in adjecto* and became a mystery. If it could be maintained that the natures had become united without being united, then on the outside everything seemed to be as it should be, and Apollinaris was as certainly beaten as Paul of Samosata—and this was maintained." pp. 179 ff.

In another chapter, in which he professes to give us "a Sketch of the History of the Genesis of the Orthodox System" we read:

"Athanasius was no follower of Origen; he was more akin to Irenaeus. In giving the central place to the thought of Christ's unity with God, and in carrying it out, he also set the theology of the future, it seems, on a new, or rather on the old Irenaeian basis. But he was no theologian, or, better, he ceased to be one from the moment when he perceived the central significance of the above conception of faith. He hardly touched, let alone solved, the problem of correlating it with all the other results of temporary knowledge, with the whole of natural theology. He had enough to do in showing that a conception still alien, at any rate to the majority, and clothed in an unfamiliar word, was scriptural, traditional, and fundamental, and in obviating objections. A kind of system was rather constructed by the strict Arians—Aetius and Eunomius—by means of Aristotelian philosophy. Every professed system up till past the middle of the fourth century was heterodox, with the sole exception of that of Marcellus; but while he made a bold front against the whole doctrine of Origen, he seemed to fall into long refuted errors. His fate itself proves that one thing, in whose assertion orthodox and Arians were agreed, was already inseparably bound up with the Christianity of the cultured, viz., the Neoplatonic doctrine of God and his revelation. The one party—the Arians—might supplement it with Aristotelianism, the other might give the widest scope to the conception of salvation embodied in Jesus Christ, but in the above fundamental thought both were agreed, and the common veneration of Origen is proof of this." p. 333.

Whatever all this may be, it certainly is not historical theology, nor is it theology, nor is it even history, but gross perversion of both history and theology. The author of this so-called History of Dogma, how learned and well-

informed he may be in various respects, is manifestly laboring under profound ignorance of the very nature of Christian Dogma; and thus it is that under his hand heresies become truths and truths heresies, both flowing from the same source. Mysterious doctrines of divine revelation become absurdities, sanctioned by an Oecumenical Creed. The greatest theologian of his day is pronounced no theologian at all, and confirmed heretics are made the benefactors of the church. And under the circumstances it could not be otherwise, except by a series of inconsistencies. Historical knowledge is to know, not only *that* persons and things were, but also *what* they were and *why* they were what they were. But to determine what Arius and Athanasius and Nestorius and the Nicene Creed really were is and must be beyond the grasp of Dr. Harnack as long as he lacks the chief equipment of a theologian and a theological student of church history, the knowledge and acceptance of even the rudiments of Christian doctrine.

But there is still another reason why the history of the church can be theologically studied only by a theologian who really is what that name indicates. Theology is a practical habitude of the mind, comprising also the aptness and willingness to instruct others in the knowledge of divine truth for the salvation of souls, and to defend the truth of God against its adversaries, and with this interest at heart, theology, also historical theology, must be theologically studied to secure theological results. The proper frame of mind for the successful study of medicine comprises an earnest desire to learn what is necessary for the practice of medicine or the education of others for medical practice. Without this interest to prompt his endeavors the student may perhaps acquire a certain amount of anatomical and physiological knowledge, but he will not become truly a medical man. This is the reason why many who have secured the *Medicinae Doctor* find themselves very inadequately prepared for medical practice, and in fact begin to



study medicine in the proper spirit after the completion of their medical course, study the therapeutics of pulmonary diseases and rheumatism as they have never done before, since now their science is put to the practical test of which they thought too little when they were medical students; and not infrequently aspiring young physicians have after a few years of practice sought the lecture rooms and clinics of foreign universities, and there acquired what they had felt in need of. Thus also the theologian who studies Ecclesiastical History and knows what he is about will find in the records of former times and events the ailments under which the church in those days, and more especially the teachers of the church, or men considering themselves as such and so considered by others, have suffered, the efforts, successful or unsuccessful, which were made to cure such ailments, the fearful ravages made by heresies and abuses when they developed into epidemics spreading over great parts of the church, as in the days of which Jerome wrote: "*Ingemuit orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est,*" or when Popery had joined hands with the Black Death in the widespread destruction of body and soul, or when Rationalism brought spiritual starvation over millions. The science and art of war, to be profitable for military practice, must be studied as it is at West Point and Annapolis, or in the campaigns of domestic or foreign wars, not by reporters for the press, but by such as would by such studies habituate themselves for the service in the army or navy of their country. The theologian, too, is to stand, and to lead others, in God's holy wars, and with this interest at heart the student of church history will go over the records of earlier days with a view of familiarizing himself with the tactics both of the enemies of Christ and of the defenders of his truth, the weapons of offense and defense used on both sides, the failures and shortcomings of the leaders and of the rank and file of the church militant, and the distressing consequences of such deficiencies; the

standards about which the followers of the captain of our salvation would rally, and the banners and watchwords whereby the enemies were and may to-day be known. In the various states of our Union agricultural schools are connected with the state universities, not for those who would become lawyers or musicians, but for such as would by the instruction and training offered there render themselves more highly fitted for agricultural pursuits, and it is with this calling in view, that the studies comprised in the curriculum of such schools should be pursued. The theologian is a worker in Christ's vineyard, and the church is God's husbandry. From the days of St. Paul and Apollos there have been those who planted and watered, while God gave the increase.<sup>1)</sup> But through all ages there was also the enemy who persistently sowed his tares among the wheat, and the study of church history is a journey through the fields on which God's harvests ripened, as sowing or watering was faithfully or less faithfully performed, and where thorns and thistles and weeds of many kinds endeavored to occupy the ground and change the garden of God into a brambly desert; and much that the student of church history hears and sees may teach him lessons which otherwise he would only learn by painful experience, perhaps very dearly purchased at other people's expense. Thus the history of the Reformation abounds with most valuable instructions for Christ's husbandmen in the church of the present day, and there is no period of the history of Christianity which is entirely void of such lessons. Yet, with all the profusion of opportunities to profit for the faithful performance of a theologian's duties, many have failed to benefit by what might have been theological study of church history, because they plodded their weary way through the centuries aimlessly and chiefly rejoicing in the progress they were making from the primitive church through the dark

---

1) 1 Cor. 3, 6. 7.

ages and the era of the Reformation down to the age of Rationalism in the eighteenth century, because they knew that the end of the journey was at last drawing nigh and their course of history almost complete when the milestones had begun to indicate the nineteenth century. On the other hand, theological controversies have frequently proved very powerful incentives to profitable historical studies, especially to those who found it their allotted task to take an active part in the defense of truths assailed by errors which disturbed the peace of the church in earlier days until they were exposed and overcome by defenders of the faith who have long since entered into their Savior's rest with the church triumphant.

A. G.

---