
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

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

plies to him; and since the sense of the passage not only strikingly accords herewith, but absolutely demands that the word be read, '*they pierced*,' (especially since no rule of grammar forbids it); we may, without violence, and with perfect propriety, adopt this as its proper signification." *Comment. in Ps.* xxii.

ARTICLE VIII.

NEANDER'S SERVICES AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN.[1]

Translated by Prof. H. B. Smith.

[The following Article was originally delivered by Dr. Hagenbach as an Academical Address before the University of Basle, apparently at the opening of his course of lectures, Nov. 4, 1850. It speaks of Neander exclusively as a Church Historian. The author is amply qualified to do this by his own proficiency in the department, as shown in his lectures on the Reformation, and on the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. His name was also prominent as a successor to the chair of Neander. In the translation the introductory paragraph was omitted. He then states that in order to get a clear view of Neander's services it is necessary to give a somewhat long sketch of what his predecessors, especially the German church historians, had accomplished. Long as this sketch is, comprising rather more than half of the Article, it is written with so much animation that it can hardly fail to be of interest to any who take an interest in Church History, or in Neander as a Church Historian.]

Church History, like all history, has come to be a science only by a gradual growth. The collection of the materials preceded the sifting of them; and this sifting again in all its separate parts went before the organic combination into a whole, and the spiritual mastery and artistic shaping of the masses of materials. Three centuries of the Christian era had already run their course when Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, was called to write the first Christian Church History, not only by his external position at the court of Constantine the Great,

[1] By K. R. Hagenbach, Professor in Basle. Translated from the Studien und Kritiken, 1851 drittes Heft, by Henry B. Smith, Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary of New York.

but also, with all his failings, by an inward fitness for the work. He made use of Flavius Josephus, for he took a large part of the Jewish history into his plan; he also used the History of Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian, which is now lost. The other Greek historians, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius the Arian, together with Theodorus and Evagrius wrote continuations of the work of Eusebius. This whole Hellenistic group of church historians gives us, from the nature of the case, an insight into the still continuing struggle of Christianity with Judaism and Heathenism. As the whole theology of the first centuries was of a preponderating apologetical character, so was it with their ecclesiastical histories. We may call them partizan — they must be so. It was necessary to bring into full consciousness the antagonism between the old and the new order of things, between what the world had till then considered sacred and what was now to be received as the salvation of the world. What wonder, then, that the glow of the persecutions just undergone casts its reflection upon the historical narration, and that this bears upon itself the very moles of that "great revolution of time," as the warrior bears the scars of the wounds with which he was smitten in battle; what wonder, yet again, that in the consciousness of a hard-bought victory the admiration of the conquerors now and then breaks forth into high-wrought panegyric!

In comparison with the Greeks, the occidental historians of the first centuries take a subordinate place. Eusebius was with them too the chief source, made accessible to the West by the Latin translation of Rufinus. Orosius, Sulpicius Severus and Cassiodorus stand here alone still on the basis of the old times. It was only later, when in consequence of the migration of the nations the German church began to influence the popular life, that there grew up that mode of writing history peculiar to the chroniclers, which brings together the affairs of both State and church in their concrete unity, and which laid the basis for the history of the general culture of the German national races. In this style Jornandes (550), Gregory of Tours (†595), Venerable Bede (†735), Paul Warnefried (†799), Einhard, Haymo of Halberstadt (†853) and others, wrote the history of the church and extolled the exploits of kings, and later writers described the lives of popes and saints with enthusiastic love. Chronicles and legends are the forms in which the mediaeval church history was first of all composed, and for the most part it is monks that use the pencil. Thanks, however, to the assiduity of these monks! They have brought massive building-stones to the edifice. The cloisters of Ful-

da, Hirschau, Lorch, Reichenau, St. Gall, of Old and New Corvey, Hirschfeld, Heisterbach, Göttweich and others yet, will be ever named as the fostering-places of science, especially of history. In the deeper mediaeval period, historical investigations were in the background in comparison with philosophical and theological speculation, but yet individual authors produced special works upon their own times and people.[1]

The time for a scientific exhibition of history had, in truth, not yet arrived. The triumphing church of the hierarchy, lived too much in the enjoyment of the present, to have the question, *how* and by *what means* it had become what it was, a matter of immediate interest. What we call "historical development," was strange to a time which, with fantastic youthfulness, wove together old and new, far and near, fable and fact, in one great invention, in which it rejoiced and was strong, without being disturbed by criticism. Where investigations were prosecuted, it could only be timidly and with great discretion, over against a priestly power which stayed itself upon its historical rights. How long it was before the deception of the donation of Constantine, and of the Pseudo-Isidoriac decretals was brought to light! Such inceptive critical assaults as those of Laurentius Valla, of Erasmus, and others, were preliminary messengers of the Reformation.

But even the Reformation of the sixteenth century had at first another office than that of constructing a history of the church. The sifting of the ecclesiastical tradition, was not its chief aim. It dug deeper, to the roots. It did not so much inquire, how the church *became* what it is in the course of time; as, how has it *been* from the beginning, and how *ought* it to be, according to the revelation given once for all. The written word of the Scripture was exhibited in the boldest opposition to the depravities which man had introduced into the church, as the only norm by which all that had grown up in the course of the centuries, was to be measured and judged. This theological investigation was turned to the study of the Scriptures, before everything else, in order thence to begin the reconstruction of the church. The thirsting souls streamed to the newly opened wells of salvation, and less heed was given to the course of the stream which flowed from these sources, at first more clear, then more and more turbid, till it disembogued in the slough, from which it was their first duty to rescue Christianity. Luther did indeed cast some

[1] Among the Byzantines, Nicephorus Callisti in the fourteenth century, whose work comprises the whole of ancient church history to A. D. 610.

sagacious and thoughtful glances into the history of the church, for it never was his will to break away wholly from tradition, (and here perhaps the Swiss Reform went before him); but to construct the history of the church in the light of the newly won principles, was not vouchsafed to him, whose life and strife were in the very thick of reform, nor yet to his coädjutors and fellow combatants in Germany and Switzerland.[1]

Historical studies can be entered upon anew, with profit, only when the storm of strife is in some measure laid, when the fermenting elements have formed a deposit, and new strata begin to be made, which are, as it were, the banks from which a look may be cast back upon the raging sea and its breaking waves. Thus it was in the sixteenth century. It was only after the peace of Augsburg, which concludes the history of the German Reformation, that we see men who belong to the second generation of the Protestants, disciples of the reformers of Wittenberg, unite in undertaking a grand historical work. Matthias Flacius Illyricus, whom many know only on the side of his immense theological zeal, and but few on his better side,[2] was the founder of the Protestant, and more especially of the Lutheran Church History. In the old city of Magdeburg, that fortress of pure Lutheranism, which had to suffer so much for the sake of its faith, this man, most zealous for the honor of Luther, united at first with his two companions, the Magdeburg preachers, Wigand and Judex, to whom others were afterwards added, in the publication of a Church History in the order of centuries, from the Protestant point of view. He was impelled to this, chiefly by the assumption which his opponents made of the uninterrupted purity of the Catholic tradition.[3] He wished to conduct the proof of the opposite position. He wished to show that the evangelical doctrine was the old traditional doctrine of the Catholic church, and that error and corruption had only entered into this church by degrees, and that in opposition to this corruption, warning voices had always been heard from the mouths of the witnesses to the truth. He had already composed a

[1] One immediate fruit of the conflict of the Reformation, was the account of the struggle itself, in the Histories of the Reformation by Spalatin, Sleidan, Sculletus, Bullinger.

[2] Twesten, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, 1844.

[3] It belonged to Protestant tendencies that special attention was given to the tradition respecting doctrine; cf. the Preface. Among other things, it is here said: Est igitur admodum dulce pio pectori in tali historia cognoscere, quod haec ipsa doctrinae forma, quam nunc in ecclesiis nostris ex ingenti Dei beneficio habemus, sit illa ipsa vetus, non nova, germana, non adulterina, non commenticia.

preliminary work in his "Catalogus Testium Veritatis," which he had collected from libraries in various countries, and from remote corners of cloisters, with a singular expenditure of pains and cost, and indeed not without craft and danger![1] Evangelical princes,[2] and rich people in private life, were called upon to contribute to the greater work which he had now in hand. It was printed in Basle. From 1559 to 1574, there appeared thirteen folios, each comprising a century. With the thirteenth volume, the undertaking came unhappily to a stop.[3] This work of the Magdeburg Centuriators called forth, however, a similar work in the Catholic church. Thirty years after its issue, Caesar Baronius, subsequently cardinal, put over against it his "Annales" from the archives of the Vatican, written from the point of view of the Roman Church.[4] Like two hostile encampments, Protestant Church History and Catholic Church History, from this time forth stood out in opposition to each other; the bulwark of the one was the Magdeburg Centuries, that of the other, the Annals of Baronius. Polemical objects controlled on both sides, the investigations and the narration of the results. The whole history of the church was looked at, to see whether it spoke in favor of, or against, the one or the other confession. Each in the interest of his party, made it the armory from which to get weapons for fighting his opponent. This was the course of things through the sixteenth and through the seventeenth century. Where history did not directly subserve polemical ends, it either degenerated into a mere matter of curiosity, and gave employment to archaeological amateurs, or it was restricted to investigations and emendations upon detached topics. This was in part the case in the Reformed (Calvinistic) Church, where learned Frenchmen, Dutchmen, and Englishmen,[5] busied themselves with collecting, publishing, commenting upon, and illustrating the fathers of the church, the councils, etc., emulating the

---

[1] Cultellus Flacianus.

[2] In his preface, he complains bitterly that many great lords would rather spend their gold on dogs, the chase, festivities, and games of chance, than help out the church of Christ, by contributing to such a work.

[3] A continuation appeared in the epitome of the work by Lukas Osiander, 1607.

[4] Ad horum conatus infringendos, commenta detegenda, imposturas aperiendas.

[5] Blondel, Saumaise, Clericus, Ussher, Cave, Dodwell, Grabe, Lardner, and others. Comprehensive works upon the whole history of the church, by Hottinger, Spanheim, James and Samuel Basnage, Venema, etc.

Benedictines of the Catholic Church.[1] This toil of theirs is worthy of all thanks, though it is only a preparatory work, and not the science itself. To the Jansenists in the Catholic Church, and to the defenders of the Gallican Liberties, we are also indebted for several praiseworthy contributions to the same object.[2] Everything, however, still went on within the limitation of the different confessions, and with greater or less pretension to ecclesiastical orthodoxy. For even when Protestants and Catholics were fighting against each other with historical weapons, they both aimed equally to show that they were orthodox, either as the heirs or as the restorers of the pure church doctrine; and when they mutually accused each other of heresy, it was done, well aware that the charge of heresy was the gravest reproach which could be made against a church. Both parties held in equal abomination the names of Arian, Nestorian, Pelagian, and whatever else they are called, and ever since the zealous Epiphanius, in his work against the heretics, had classed the different generations of them with just so many kinds of snakes and adders,[3] no one has dared to put himself forward as their advocate. Thus the decided hatred of heretics had as free vent in the historical works of the Protestants, as in those of the Catholics; and the Protestants even felt obliged in this matter to be still more zealous in order to ward off all suspicion of any connection with these enemies of the church.

But there came at length, at the end of the seventeenth century, an advocate of the heretics, and not, as might be imagined, one of those free-thinking geniuses who, in anticipation of the coming of a century of philosophers, declared war against all that is positive, and saw in the so-called heretics the true heroes who fought beforehand for the dawning illumination. No; it was Gottfried Arnold, a deeply pious, Christian, believing man, who, it was thought, could only be reckoned among the pietists and mystics. He, filled like many others with sadness by the dead orthodoxy of his times, thought that he had made the discovery that there were very many profound minds, men who had sought for an original and peculiar way of exhibiting Christian truth, who had at all times been misunderstood by the proud and "godless clerisy," and put upon their list of heretics, and that such

---

[1] Montfaucon, Mabillon, Ruinart, D'Achery. Besides the Benedictines, Ruaeus, Baluze, and others.

[2] Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Bossuet, Ellies du Pin, and others.

[3] Adv. haer. in procemio: *αἱρέσεις ὀγδοήκοντα, αἵτινές εἰσι θηρίων εἴτ' οὖν ἑρπετῶν αἰνίγματα.*

pure gold might still be found in what the officials of the church had treated only as rubbish. He therefore wrote his "Impartial History of Church and Heretics,"[1] with the good intention of helping to its rights that party which had heretofore been all along put down, and from which, to speak with Tertullian, even the right of defence had been cut off.[2] And who will blame him harshly that from pure impartiality he became a very partizan, and that he now and then looked upon some unfortunate enthusiast as a prophet? Over how many has the *orthodox* church undeservedly broken its staff! And yet injustice on the one side cannot be made good by injustice on the other. The work of Arnold could only form a transition to a truly impartial narration of history, which should make itself known as such by an unbiassed and thorough exploration of the facts and by presenting the real contents of the history in a dispassionate style, reposing upon the quiet hearing of the witnesses. Wise and just men, like Calixtus, Buddeus and Weissmann, pointed out the way to such a treatment of history; but it was reserved for the renowned theologian of Helmstädt, afterward Chancellor of the University of Göttingen, John Lawrence Von Mosheim, to elevate church history to the rank of a science, by releasing it from all orthodox and heterodox partizan interests, and putting it erect upon its own feet.[3] It was not in a colorless impartiality, diluted to indifference, that Mosheim looked for the triumphs of history. Nor did he content himself with a dry aggregation of erudite materials. But a felicitous union of learning, acumen and taste, of religious earnestness and human sympathies, of precision and fluency of style, have won for him the honored name of Father of the later Church History. Mosheim was orthodox, but his orthodoxy did not make him unjust to other tendencies; he sought an historical understanding of them, as the naturalist seeks to account for the different formations and malformations of the external world. His interest in heresies was historical and scientific, not prejudiced either by polemical or apologetical aims. He stood as a master above his materials, and presided over them. If his power of combination sometimes led him too far, his merits are still incontestible in bringing into an organic whole what had previously been dispersed in the form of isolated observations. Thus he was the founder not only of the science of church history, but also of the art of composing it. Mosheim lived from 1693 to 1755, a period signalized by a great

[1] 1699, and in many subsequent editions. [2] De praescriptione haereticorum.
[3] Cf. Lücke, Narratio de Ioanne Laurentio Moshemio. Göttingen, 1837.

revolution in the movements of German intellect. Philosophy and polite literature began to unfold their wings; and though the influence of foreign nations was still felt, yet there were not wanting those who strove after an independent development. Mosheim was one of them. In his learned works he still made most use of the Latin language, which few have had at their command with so much certainty and purity; but in his sermons[1] he has left us no unworthy contribution to the history of German eloquence. As in church history, so in homiletics, the name of Mosheim carries us over into a new period.

But this new period could not be brought into existence without manifold vacillations and fermentations, which were especially rife, as every body knows, in ecclesiastical and theological affairs. The times of mildness and reconciliation, represented by Mosheim as a historian, and by Ernesti, Morus and Döderlein in exegetical and systematic divinity, were followed by a period of bold negation, of reckless criticism, of neology and of rationalism. Their chief leader in this direction was John Solomon Semler (1725—1791), who lived immediately after Mosheim. Discontented with the impressions which the prevalent pietism had left upon his youth, excited by the philosophy of Wolf, with an honorable love of truth but restless in various labors, he subjected to his criticism the whole historical basis of Christianity, even to the canon of the Scriptures themselves. Thus he also investigated much which until now had stood firm in church history, without attaining definite results. His destructive critical propensities made it impossible for him to reconstruct the history of the church with artistic skill; he failed in precisely those conditions for such a work which were so fortunately united in Mosheim, good common sense, taste, and the comprehensive insight that sees things as a whole. And yet the services of Semler in respect to church history are not to be lightly esteemed; he shook the dozing spirits into wakefulness, and, as a true, unwearied fighter, he ensured to criticism its rights in science.[2]

From the times of Mosheim and Semler church history assumed more than it had previously done the rank of a regular department, having its own representatives in the chairs of the universities. Text-books and compendia were made in increased numbers. Göt-

[1] Heilige Reden über wichtige Wahrheiten der Lehre Jesu Christi. Hamburg, 1725—1739, and often besides. On account of their excellence they were translated into the French, Spanish, Dutch, English and Polish languages.

[2] For a good estimate of Semler, see Franke, Theologische Encyclopädie, S. 370 sq.

tingen especially, since Mosheim shone there as a star of the first magnitude, has remained even to our times a renowned seat of historical science, particularly of ecclesiastical history. At Jena the learned Chr. W. Fr. Walch trod worthily in the footsteps of his father J. G. Walch. But there are two preëminent names, whose fame as church historians went out from Göttingen over the learned world, those of Planck and Spittler, both born in Würtemberg, the one a theologian in calling, the other an historian and a man versed in worldly affairs. With Gottlieb James Planck, who from 1784 filled the chair of theology at Göttingen, the science of church history enters into a new stadium, so far as the change in prevailing habits of thought imposed additional obligations upon the church historian. It had become necessary to connect the past with the present, to illuminate the facts of history with the torch of philosophy, or rather with the opinions in vogue among the majority of educated people. It was no longer enough to know what had come to pass in earlier times; even the critical separation of what was duly attested from what belonged to the region of myths and conjecture, appeared to be only a preliminary work. Men wished now also to know, *how* things had come to pass, and why they had come *thus* and not otherwise. As at the same epoch the investigations in the sphere of nature were prosecuted teleologically, inquiring after cause and effect and final causes, so in the sphere of moral freedom in which history moves, similar connections and relations of events were sought out. But this could not be done without applying to the events some *moral* standard, and inquiring after the internal motives from which in given relations the actions had proceeded. They also endeavored to understand what had occurred, partly as a result of human impulse or calculation, and partly from the concatenation of wonderfully coincident circumstances. This is the *pragmatic* treatment of history, as the English Gibbon, Hume and Robertson had written it, before the Germans made it theirs. Planck applied it to church history; and there are especially two works of his in which this historical method is carried out in a masterly manner. The one, "The History of the Origin and Formation of the Christian Ecclesiastical Constitutions,"[1] had for its object to describe that most difficult point the history of the external organization of the Christian church. The earlier orthodox Protestantism had been accustomed to regard the huge edifice of the mediaeval hierarchy with the greatest abhorrence as the cast-down bul-

[1] Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung. Hannover, 1805.

wark of Antichrist; but the time had now come in which the human mind felt itself challenged to draw near to the ruins of this overthrown greatness and ask, how and by what means did it become what it was; how could such a gigantic edifice grow up from its slight and unnoticeable beginnings? It was just this question which Planck sought to answer; although he starts with assumptions about the nature of the church, which are rather derived from the external circumstances of its origin, than from that spiritual might hidden within it, which not only waits upon but is superior to its external manifestation. Wholly accordant with that modern view which has become current since the time of Locke,[1] the church is to him only a private union of individuals voluntarily coming together, which makes its regulations according to present necessities, and which through the stress of external circumstances gradually came to be what at its origin was neither intended nor remotely anticipated.

The second great work of Planck, which was, however, first issued, rests upon the same general conception. It is called "The History of the Origin, Changes, and Formation of the Protestant Doctrinal System, from the Beginning of the Reformation to the Introduction of the Formula Concordiae."[2] The earlier orthodox Protestantism had held the doctrinal system of the church as laid down in the Confessions, to be definitive and complete, and all they had to do, was simply to defend it for life and death, against all opponents; but Bossuet, the learned apologist of the Catholic church, had already reminded the Protestants, that their own doctrinal system had gone through many sorts of variations.[3] What Bossuet had done with the interest of an opponent, and with superficial knowledge, Planck now undertook to do with far greater thoroughness, and with the needful caution of an historian in the service of his own church. For he justly thought that he was rendering it a service as a Protestant church, if he brought it to see that its doctrinal system had had a growth, that it gradually sprung up under certain conditions and influences inherent in the times. This he could only do as, with all reverence for the Reformers and their successors, he also set forth their human weaknesses, their passions, the policy of princes, and the prejudices

[1] Compare what is said in the work "Ueber die Zukunft der evangelischen Kirche; Reden an die Gebildeten deutscher Nation. 2 aufl. Leipz. 1849, s. 29.

[2] Geschichte der Entstehung, Veränderung und Bildung des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zur Einführung der Concordienformel. Leipzig, 1781–1800.

[3] Historie des Variations des Eglises protestantes. 1688.

of the times, all of these being points which the earlier historical narrations, prejudiced for their own party, had too little regarded, and which unquestionably form one element, along with others, in the development of human affairs.

As long now as this pragmatic method was employed in the service of a truth-loving, sagacious, and well-meaning mind, and as long as it was also built up on thorough knowledge, acquired by conscientious and personal research, as was in both respects in a high degree the case with the excellent Planck, so long it was favorable to a healthful excitement of men's minds. And it is certain that we are indebted to this mode of treating history, for a multitude of new points of view, previously unnoticed; we owe to it a more free and broad vision over the sphere of history; and very much which is now taken for granted as a matter of course, was then greeted as the direct result of such a philosophy of history. At the same time, with all our respect for the great merits of Planck, it is not to be denied that the method which he pursued, might lead to great deviations from the right path; the temptation to explain everything, and especially to interpret the greatest events by means of the concurrence of insignificant circumstances, might be indulged in, so far as to lead to that atomistic view of history which carries the "nil admirari" to an extreme, and robs history of its mysterious enchantments, and empties it of its genial and its ideal elements, and leaves us at last only a machine with innumerable little wheels and minute threads, which are put in motion sometimes by accident, and sometimes by the passions of men. Planck himself was often led too far by his fondness for pragmatism, and later science has learned to look at many things with other eyes than those with which he viewed them in his deservedly esteemed works.[1] But others went further than he. In Planck's soul there still lived a high veneration for Christianity, inherited from the fathers. He belonged to those theologians, firm believers in a revelation, who, with all the influence which they allowed the ideas of the times to have over their system, still held fast to the substantial scriptural doctrine respecting the historical foundations of Christianity with devout truthfulness of soul. But the state of the case must be altered when the spirit of the world got possession of this pragmatic method, when the subjectivity of the so-called sound common sense was elevated into

[1] Compare, for example, the works of Rothe, Ritschl, and others, upon the formation of the Catholic Church; of Baur, Dorner, Schneckenburger, and Schenkel, upon the doctrinal systems of the Protestants.

the highest authority, and history was judged of from this judgment seat. Then it became wholly dependent upon the spirits of the century; and, in accordance with the genius of the authors, it was sometimes made the basis for witty and ingenious ratiocination, and this was its best estate, and sometimes of insipid and superficial reasonings, which was most commonly the case.

With Planck, we mentioned the name of Spittler, a great name in his times! Louis Timothy Spittler was not a theologian; he was a statesman, a publicist, a man versed in public affairs. His investigations in the canon law led him into the sphere of general church history, which he then labored upon from worldly and political points of view, and also from an interest in the history of learning. He it was who delivered Church History from its theological exclusiveness, and made it a part of study in the sphere of general human culture, and for this he deserves great credit. The lectures upon Church History which he delivered at Göttingen, were frequented by students from all the faculties, by all who made any pretensions to cultivation. He first knew how to write a compendium of Church History; to wade through the prolix work of Schröckh, could hardly be exacted of a student of theology, to say nothing of a layman.[1] Spittler's "Outline of the History of the Christian Church," first published in 1782, and afterwards continued by Planck, was for a long time the guide in public lectures, and a favorite text-book with all who wanted a concise, clear, and animated view over the sphere of church history. Spittler was by no means an enemy of Christianity, but he assumed towards it the most objective position possible, one of cold superiority, the attitude of a civilian. He begins his history of the church in this way: "The world has never experienced such a revolution, in its first occasions so unnoticeable, and in its last, wide-spread consequences so very highly remarkable, as that which was made eighteen hundred years ago, by one who was born a Jew, Jesus by name, in the few years of his life." From this beginning, a conclusion about all the rest can be readily formed. Impulse and accident are the powers that rule in a church whose very founder was the work of accident. How much Spittler was accustomed to apply to all the events of history the standards of thought that prevailed in his own times, and how incapable he was, with all the wealth of his overflowing mind, of entering into the spiritual experience of earlier times, may be seen

[1] By this we do not mean to deny the merits of his work in other respects. Fleury's history (Paris, 1691–1720) written in a more genial spirit, was one of the chief sources along with Schröckh.

for example, in the judgment which he passes upon the founder of the Franciscan order, whom he describes "as a man to whom we pay the best honor, when we believe that he was deficient in brains." He also introduces his History of the Papacy,[1] with the expression of his astonishment "that the chief pastor of Rome, a man whose proper duty was only to catechise, to preach, to baptize, and to administer the Lord's supper, had become in the whole of the West the despot of all his peers, the despot of all kings." The great historian seems to have forgotten, that the chief pastor of Rome in the eighth century was and must be a different sort of personage from the chief pastor of Göttingen, in the eighteenth century.

What Spittler had attempted to do with real ability and great learning, began now to be the fashion, and to be so among those who got all their knowledge out of Spittler. The wisdom learned in compendia, strutted more and more. Reverence for the great characters in the church, for the fathers of the church, gradually decreased, and the diligent study of the sources became more and more infrequent. That Rationalism which at this period had the upper hand in the theological schools, was not favorable to historical studies in general. The more Christianity was levelled down from a positive religion into a general system of reason and of ethics, the less necessary did it seem to study thoroughly its historical development. Vague notions were current and enough. People spoke about Athanasius and Augustine, about the middle ages and their popes, about monkery and the crusades, in contemptuous phrases which they had learned by rote, and where the uses of church history were still praised, it was as a history of human follies and aberrations, a warning example to all who despised human reason!

From the period of Rationalism, we will single out one ecclesiastical historian, of great merit in several ways, Philip Conrad Henke, professor at Helmstädt. His Church History (1788–1823, continued by Vater) is written with diligence and skill, and with constant reference to the general history of the world; but under his hands even church history has, in a special degree, the shape of a history of human aberrations, fanaticism, hypocrisy, of calculation, or of narrowness of soul; these are the elements which he finds everywhere, even there, where the unprejudiced eye sees a real greatness which is to be measured by another standard than that of our modern notions of what is rational. He who sees in Tertullian only an extravagant head," in Augustine an "ingenious babbler," in Gregory

[1] Edited by Gurlitt and Paulus, Heidelberg, 1826.

VII. only "craftiness and baseness," and who calls him "a man without religion, truth or faith;" he to whom the Saint of Assisi is only a "valetudinarian in soul and body," "an unfortunate, crazy fellow, spoiled and stunted;" such a man shows that he is deficient in one of the chief conditions of an historian, the elastic power of mind and heart of entering into other states of mind than those which our every day world calls forth.

With the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, there came a reäction in the sphere of church history. The philosophy of nature, with Schelling for its representative, became in philosophical matters an opponent of the "vulgar Rationalism," and from the same general philosophical tendency, new demands were made upon historians and also upon church historians. Schelling in his "Lectures upon the Method of Academical Study," had attempted an historical construction of Christianity, in which, in the strongest opposition to that pragmatic method which interpreted history by its accidents, he had pointed to that higher necessity which has its basis in the eternal unity of the absolute nature of God. On the foundation of this speculative method, which took its position above history, Marheinecke, then professor at Erlangen, published in the year 1806 the first part of his "Universal Church History of Christianity," the only part ever published. There, in the Introduction, we read: "The office of history is to take what has been transacted in the world, all those individual events with which time has been filled, and to give them shape in accordance with higher ideas, and with freedom of soul, for purposes of spiritual meditation." "True history ought not to be a mere coin-cabinet of events, in which the single coins are put up for show, in an arbitrary or accidental connection, along side of and separate from each other. Every real history throws aside all that is merely accidental, as not belonging to its sphere; *for the historian receives his laws neither from the events themselves nor from the times in which they have occurred;* only what can be connected in the way of cause and effect is to be selected from the chaotic mass; the rest may remain in its place, and so long as it does not offer to us what is intelligible or understood, it is to be simply deposited in the archives of time." And in respect to church history we read: "As the idea of the history of the world in general cannot be understood without religion, so too, and more emphatically, will it hold true, that the history of the church will always remain an enigma as long as it is not considered from a supernatural point of view; for here all stands in more or less close connection with what is in itself sacred. A high and holy

spirit talks to us and calls upon us clearly and loudly from the very midst of history, one which independent of the world and its events guides the affairs of the universe behind the veil of phenomena by the reins of an eternal necessity, weighs out righteousness and justice, and moves everything onward to one single end. As in a mirror the eternal plan of God reveals itself, reflected in history.

It was a long time since such language had been heard, and it ought perhaps to have found a response in the nobler minds of the youth, who felt some presentiment that higher ideas were at work amid the confused changes of the manifold phenomena. And yet it remained the voice of a preacher in the wilderness. It died away again, and must die away because the preacher only set up what was too much an empty ideal, without filling it with the real, living substance. Speculation as such could not raise history up. On the contrary there was imminent danger that by such speculations, as much as by the previous pragmatism, a pure historical sense would be perverted, and that only one form of subjectivity would be substituted for another. Must not prudent historians become suspicious, when Marheinecke exhorted them to get their laws from somewhere else than from the events themselves, and from the times in which they had occurred? Might not the process of separating all that was called accidental from the fair form of history seem to be as arbitrary as the extravagant insisting upon what was accidental in the previous methods? Was there not here, too, a setting history all to rights for one's self, a dogmatism at the very start, which, only with greater philosophical pretensions, was to take the place of the earlier orthodox, and the later neological dogmatism? Such doubts would and must spring up at least among the historians of discreet observance, with whom everything depended on fixing firmly the objective facts, whether these were small or large, important or unimportant in the eyes of the philosophers. And as now in the natural sciences empirical research began again to claim its rights in opposition to that speculative poetry about nature which had called itself the philosophy of nature, so in the department of history the simple question after the facts began to take precedence, and the demand that we should be satisfied with these to be freely spoken out. The aversion to all coloring of the facts, since it seemed a marring of the truth, led historians now to a colorless exhibition of them; it showed itself in a very hard and dry style of presenting them, and they had a pride in this style, the pride of being very objective. But unhappily they confounded objectivity with a total want of heart and of sympathy

with events, and thus fell from one extreme into another. From some quarters it had already for a long time been made a canon, that the historian, and consequently the church historian, ought as such to belong to no religion; he ought not to betray sympathy either for the one or for the other form of religious belief. Church history written by a Christian ought not to read any differently from what it would if written by a Jew, a Mohammedan or a deist. But is not this the same thing as tearing the very heart out of the body of history; is it not taking from the flowers their exhalations and enamel, and changing the fresh garden of God in history into an herbarium? How can the church or theology be served by such a history, which, outside of the scholar's study, has no home either in the souls of theologians or in the heart of the people? But at the same time this purely objective method was not without some healthful influence; it had its rights in opposition both to extravagant and unregulated speculations, and to the narrowness of a merely partizan spirit.

John Ernest Christian Schmidt is the representative of this style of history. He was professor of theology at Giessen. His works were highly esteemed even by Schleiermacher. And in fact his church history, which is unfortunately incomplete and only partially continued by Rettberg,[1] is distinguished for a thorough study of the sources, acuteness in combination, and a worthy and quiet style. There is in him an unmistakable advance from rationalizing platitudes in the direction of solid science. The purpose of his book as he announces it, is to "excite younger theologians," who often contented themselves with traditional results and only repeated other people's judgments, "to personal investigations in the department of church history." And this result was so far attained, that from this time on, a new zeal in the study of the sources was awakened in the younger generation. The changes which were going on in all the relations of the times also contributed to this result. The violent concussions which signalized the revolutions of the nineteenth century and its political contests also worked upon science in a purifying and quickening way. It began in all departments to be more earnest and profound.[2] Especially in theology were there signs of a gratifying

[1] Giessen, 1800 seq. 3 aufl. 1827—1834.

[2] "After throwing off the foreign yoke the German mind was aroused to more self-consciousness. It showed its true nature by entering deeply into the study of divine things, by its longing to escape from the poverty and shallowness of the times and to feel the breathings of a higher spirit in the earlier centuries." Thus Neander wrote in the preface to the second edition of his Tertullian, p. viii.

change, first of all in the exegetical and historical departments. While in doctrinal theology the systems of rationalism and supernaturalism were still contending against each other, both starting from abstract data, the grammatical and historical method of interpretation began to be comprehended as the only sure basis of solid, theological studies. What Winer here did for exegesis, that was done for church history by Schmidt and by the learned Gieseler who followed in his steps, and who was then at Bonn and is now at Göttingen.[1]

While Schmidt had endeavored to excite to the study of the original sources, Gieseler in his admirable and still unexcelled Text-Book, introduces us directly to the sources themselves, since he lets them, as it were, speak for themselves in the rich and select extracts with which his pages are adorned. Whoever in such text-books seeks for direct spiritual excitement and refreshment of soul, will, in fact, not find it. He who does not bring to the study of them, in his own heart, an earnest enthusiasm for Christianity, will hardly get it out of books which are and were meant to be merely means of instruction. We find, however, in Gieseler, firmly as he holds to the objective point of view, almost to dryness, an admirable declaration which reaches out beyond this position, that the Church historian, without a religious and Christian spirit, cannot enter into the internal phenomena of the church, "because no spiritual phenomena external to ourselves, can be correctly understood in a historical way, without reproducing it in ourselves." "Only *such* a method of investigation is able to discover where, in history, the Christian spirit is wholly wanting, and where it is used as a mere mask, and what other spirit has taken its place; and it will also not misapprehend it when it is really present, even when expressed in manifestations foreign to our modes and ways." That is, a religious and Christian spirit is an essential requisite to a Christian Church Historian. Here is spoken the word which points out to us preliminarily, Neander's position in respect to Church History, and his peculiar merits. We say, "points out preliminarily," for this does not exhaust the matter.

Before Neander, there were not wanting those who treated Church History with a religious and Christian spirit, and chiefly from a practical point of view. Even at the time when the great majority of ecclesiastical historians assumed an indifferent or a hostile attitude, there were those who attempted to write an edifying history of the church. Thus the History of the Church by the English methodist

[1] The work of Danz which appeared earlier was soon supplanted by that of Gieseler.

[?] Milner, was in much esteem in certain circles, and the Church History of Stolberg also had an ascetic and apologetical character. Neander's merits would be very partially understood, if his history of the church were to be judged only as ministering to edification. It is one thing to prepare the materials of ecclesiastical history for edification, leaving out all that is not edifying, and illustrating the facts with pious reflections, and quite another thing to enter into the history *as such* with a Christian spirit, to grasp it in its own light, to exhibit it in harmony with its own spirit, without adding thereto pious and edifying modes of speech. This is what Neander has done. The fine interpretation of a Christian and of a scientific spirit, is that which constitutes his peculiar greatness, and this stands out so truly, and clearly, and singly, that we have to say, he is Christian because he is scientific, and he is scientific because he is Christian. He no more believes that Christianity is to be helped by a want of science, than he believes that science is to be aided by a denial of Christianity. He is very far from being willing to throw overboard as ballast, all that has not a direct use for purposes of edification. In the service of truth, which is everywhere only *one*, he subjects himself to the most toilsome investigations about matters which have no immediate connection with the practical part of Christianity. He is a *learned man*, one to whom nothing is too small which can in any way promote the building up of science; in little things he is exact, because his Christianity teaches him to be true also in what is least. He does not try (he did not need it) by pious words and phrases, nor yet by depreciating judgments about the productions of learned men, to cover up his own want of knowledge; he honors science even among those who are not Christians, even in his opponents, and makes use of every discovery, come whence it may.[1] He is also far from falsifying history, out of a mistaken zeal for the interests of Christianity, from beautifying what is hateful, from saying that the unholy is holy, and from covering with a veil the shadowy sides of the Christian life; with all his decision in favor of Christianity, he strives to be as just as possible to all the forms in which it has appeared. He endeavors to understand the doings of the enemies of Christianity and of the church, and in doing this to apologize for them so far as justice allows any palliation. And so he put before himself the office "of depicting the history of the church as a speaking evidence of

[1] How open he is to the instructions he received from reviewers among the Rationalists, may be seen, e. g., in his amiable confession about his relations to Von Cölln, in the preface to the second edition of his Tertullian, p. x.

the divine power of Christianity, as a school of Christian experience, as a voice, sounding through all centuries, of edification, of doctrine and of warning for all who will hear it." And this, he says, "was from my early days the leading aim of my life and my studies."

Let us now come to a more close examination of this life and these studies.

John August William Neander was of Jewish parentage and was born at Göttingen the 16th of January, 1789. The larger part of his youth was spent at Hamburg, where he pursued his studies in the gymnasium, called "the Johanneum." In his youth he became a convert to the Christian faith, and afterwards pursued his academical studies in the year 1806 in Halle, continuing them in Göttingen. Planck was his teacher in church history. In the year 1811 we find him as a "private teacher," and in the following year as "professor extraordinary" at Heidelberg. Here he began his career as a writer in church history, and it was with a monograph upon the emperor Julian. Even in this work we encounter the peculiarity of Neander's mode of viewing history. While the older orthodox theologians had been accustomed in this emperor to abominate the apostate and to chime in with the invectives with which even the better fathers of the church, like Gregory of Nazianzum, had persecuted him from their point of view, and while on the other hand a great part of the later historians had let a sort of preference for him leak out only because he had turned his back upon Christianity, — Neander proposed to himself the fine task, and one fitted to the times, of endeavoring to understand this personage, partly as he was in himself, and partly in his relations to the times with which he had put himself in opposition. Neander is very far from misconceiving in Julian's character that strong religious impulse, which Strauss has recently stigmatized with the name of "Romanticism."[1] He estimates in a fitting way the predilection of the emperor, exalted even to fanaticism, for the vanished religion of his fathers, that zeal which he showed in sacrificing to the gods under the open sky even while the rain was pouring down, his enthusiasm for the Grecian mythology which he tried to interpret as having a deeper significancy, and his efforts for the elevation of religion and morality. Only a noble nature can worthily estimate what is noble, wherever it is found. The unprejudiced historian is also

[1] Der Romantiker auf dem Thron der Cäsaren oder Julian der Abtrünnige. Mannheim, 1847. The best thing in the book is its historical survey of the previous estimate of Julian's character. [This little work of Strauss runs a skilful and sarcastic parallel between Julian and the present king of Prussia.]

frank enough to confess, that the condition of the church in those times was not adapted to overthrow the prejudices of the heathen against Christianity; he rather shows that an impartial view of its nature was made difficult in many ways by the misshapen forms into which it had grown. But he is not on this account blind to the faults of his hero. He does not disguise his vanity which often led him to acts of injustice, nor his giddiness of brain which perverted his view of the simple truths of Christianity. Thus he is neither a severe judge nor a senseless admirer, but puts before us simply the image of Julian with his virtues and his faults, in his relation to the times in which he lived and in his living connection with these times.

Neander in his work on Julian had thus given evidence of his fitness for the writing of monographs; and after he had entered upon his theological professorship at Berlin he published in the year 1813 a second monograph: "Saint Bernhard and his Times." In this he makes a bold entrance into the heart of the middle ages. If in any one personage all the various blood-vessels, which run through the life of the middle ages, pulsate together, it is in this one man, in whose soul was living, as in perhaps no other, the ideal of that papacy to which the times were tending, who held in his hand all the threads of the ecclesiastical movements, who combined hierarchical sentiments with an extreme reforming severity, deeply religious views of the world and of self with the finest knowledge of human nature and of the state of the church, who gave to monasticism a new impulse and breathed into the crusader a new enthusiasm, who judged himself first of all with the strictness with which he judged others, and who even in his lifetime was the impersonation of such saintliness as it seems hardly possible can be to any time more than an ideal hovering over it. How unsatisfactory had been the previous representations of this man, whom Luther had already placed so high! How dubiously a Bayle speaks of him! How wan and colorless is the image which Schröckh gives us of him! Spittler and Henke cannot indeed deny him their reverence, but they can all the less forgive him his stern demeanor towards Abelard, and upon this they lay the most stress. Hence, probably, Henke calls him "a morose and denunciatory preacher." How now does Neander conceive of him? As a spotless saint? By no means. But he strives to understand him in connection with his times, and, what is still more, in connection with himself, with the inmost secrets of his personal life. He described the internal characteristics of his remarkable life, which others had thought that they had done up with the vague category of "monastic

asceticism and contemplation," with such depth of soul and finenes of spirit as was possible only to a nature as religious as was his. From that "intensive power" which came from Bernhard's life he sought to explain his influence upon the world; and from this central point of view, without calling everything good, he interprets even his deficiences, his ruggedness, his hard and seemingly unlovely conduct towards Abelard and the enemies of the hierarchy. He shows us also the reverse. He can understand an Abelard in his peculiarities as well as a Bernhard in his, and he brings before the eye of the observer these two great men in their struggle, repelling and completing each the other. And as he knows how to grasp the actors in this great drama of history in those individual peculiarities which they gave not to themselves and for which we are not to make them responsible, so, too, does he understand the times in which the drama is played. With what historical greatness he passes his judgment, for example, upon the crusades, when, in opposition to that belittling pedantry with which many criticise this romantic movement, he remarks: "It was indeed a misconception to try to rob with violence and shedding of blood that abode from which peace was to be spread abroad over the human race; these rude men did indeed relapse quickly from the devout feelings, which were not clear to themselves and had not penetrated their inmost life, into outbreaks of wild passion and of sensuality. But still we can see the traces of man's elevated origin in that enthusiasm, directed towards what the senses cannot grasp, that seized hold of whole nations, in those extraordinary efforts for what is itself extraordinary. On the lowest stage, most untrue to the original nobility of the human race, stands that cold understanding which looks down upon such times with an aristocratic compassion, not because it is enthusiastic for the true reality, but because that only appears to it to be real which is meanest among all vanities, because that which in such things is fairest seems to it to be insanity itself, and that is the working and daring for something which lives and has worth only in the hearts of men."

Neander did not confine himself to the writing of monographs upon remarkable individual characters. He also turned his researches to the History of Doctrines. In our general preliminary sketch we saw that the heretics had been by degrees brought into the field of calm investigation, and that after Gottfried Arnold's unsuccessful attempts, the great Mosheim first gave more importance to this part of church history. But it did not stop here. Since the end of the eighteenth century, the History of Doctrines had become a science

by itself; and, in connection with this, the heresies were no longer viewed as something single, isolated, and foreign. It began to be seen that, even though they were to be considered as disordered states of the body of the church, yet the history of these disorders was closely connected with the organism of the ecclesiastical life, and that even the historical unfolding of the *pure* doctrine, could only be understood in connection with its struggles with heresy; that to understand the physiology of the church, we must also know its pathology. This must hold good, especially of the first age of the church, in which Christianity had to uphold its distinctive characteristics in conflict with the ancient religious systems; and when the relapse into Judaism, or a continued adhesion to the form of the law, seemed as perilous as an abandonment to the fantastic influence of heathen mythological speculations. Judaizing Ebionitism on the one side, and Paganizing Gnosticism on the other, were the antagonistic tendencies, opposed to each other, yet often strangely intermingled with each other, between which the religion of redemption was placed, and against which it had to contend. It lies on the surface, then, that a more profound insight into the nature of Gnosticism, would greatly promote the study of the history of the church and its doctrines. Learned men had indeed before this given their attention to this remarkable phenomenon; particularly Mosheim and the French Calvinist, Beausobre, in his History of the Manichees. But they had only made a beginning, and given some hints for further study; very much still remained obscure and uncertain. Neander, in his work published in 1818, "Genetic Development of the Principal Gnostic systems," first treated this difficult subject in a comprehensive manner. Here he pointed out more definitely the sources of Gnosticism in Philo's ways of thinking, and in similar tendencies of the times; he classified the various Gnostic groups of speculation, sometimes very divergent from each other, and he sketched the special systems more sharply than his predecessors. Without interpolating his own interpretations, or hastily constructing from assumed premises, what can only be investigated in a historical way, he has, to use his own expression, "endeavored to exhibit the Gnostic systems in such a manner, that the ideas which animated them should be seen to shine through of themselves." By this method he first revived an interest in the Gnostics; he brought out into clear vision those ideas which were the soul of the systems, and which glimmer through the fantastic web of their bold combinations, in which had been previously seen only the creations of a rude imagination, or allegories abandoned to arbitrary in-

terpretations. Without being himself a speculative theologian, he awakened by this book a more thorough interest in the speculative side of Christianity, than many others have done, who only stand upon his shoulders that they may thus more easily depreciate himself.

After this work upon the Gnostics, Neander returned again with renewed love and vigor to biography, giving to the friends of church history, in the year 1821, his life of John Chrysostom.

As his Bernhard had presented a picture of the middle ages in the West, so does his Chrysostom depict the oriental church of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, the time of its flower. The life of the greatest orator of the ancient church, his first education in the maternal house, his wider culture in the schools of the Greek rhetoricians, his abode among the monks, his efficiency as bishop in Antioch and in Constantinople, his conflicts here and there with the powers of the world and of the church, with heretics and with orthodox, the persecutions he endured even to his death, which overtook him in banishment — all this passes before our sight in simple and luminous narration. We become acquainted with the Christian thinker, the sacred orator, the man of prayer and of faith, in the different circumstances of his troubled and tried life; we go with him into the depths of Scripture, we hear the thunders of his vehement speech, while he chastises vice in high and low, without respect of persons; we follow him again when in his Homilies he unfolds so clearly and calmly the consolations of the Gospel, and the virtues of the Christian life, or when in his work on the Priesthood, he sketches for us the ideal of a Christian priest, according to the conceptions of his times; or, again, when he gives to Olympias, a rich widow, instructions in the exercise of charity. And there are, too, strewed through this monograph, so many special and thorough investigations upon the most difficult subjects, that the study of it will ever be a great gain to those who wish to be introduced to the classic period of the oriental church.

Neander wished that the side-picture to Chrysostom in the occidental church, Augustine, might be executed by the hands of his friend, Twesten, — a wish which has not yet been fulfilled.

The writings of Neander up to this time, especially his biographies of Julian, Bernhard and Chrysostom, had all been composed in such a manner that, excepting the learned dissertations for the most part put into appendices, they could be read with interest by cultivated minds not theologically trained. His next work was

also intended to advance the study of church history in wider circles. In 1822 he published his "Memorabilia from the History of Christianity and of the Christian Life," a gift right fitted to the times! It was very welcome to the newly revived Christian feelings of the educated classes. Pictures, fresh and warm with life, are here brought before us: Christian men and women, Christian institutions and states of society are described to us with the hand of a master; many costly deeds of self-sacrifice and of faithfulness are rescued from oblivion. How attractive are the descriptions given us in the third volume of the lives and acts of the heralds of our faith, of a Columba and a Gallus, and of Boniface and of Anschar! and all this from the impression made by going to the original sources; all this by one who himself had lived it all over with them, experienced it with them, felt it with them!

But we cannot linger upon these pictures. We next encounter another of his greater works, the fruit of elaborate investigations, which forms a counterpart to his work on the Gnostics, that upon Tertullian, or as the author entitled it, "Antignostieus, the Spirit of Tertullian, and an Introduction to his Writings, with Investigations in Archaeology and in the History of Doctrines." Berlin, 1825.

It was no slight thing to exorcise the mighty spirit of this child of Northern Africa. How few had known him, how few had understood him! Tertullian, he who did not seek for the essence of things upon the surface but in the marrow, must always remain a riddle to that shallowness which likes to have everything so plain and straight, which, because it shuns thinking, calls everything dark and obscure that it cannot see into at the first glance. What offence has been given by his "credo, quia absurdum est," not marking the irony with which he here, and in fact uncouthly enough, would despatch that common, worldly understanding which sets itself up as judge over the highest things. Men have not been able to wonder enough about the coarseness of a theology which ascribes to God a body, not heeding what Tertullian meant by "body," and that is, a real, substantial essence, in opposition to that spiritualism which volatilizes the essence of God into an abstract idea. If any one, then Tertullian, is to be understood only in connection with his times and by means of the antagonism which he felt in his inmost soul to the Gnostic speculations. The ideality of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen may ever be more congenial with our modern consciousness than the Punic soul of Tertullian, clogged with sensuous images; that dusky Montanism of his which makes him see in art only a lie, and his

hatred to heretics and his hatred of philosophy may only repel us; his style, always wrestling for expression, may appear to us rough and rugged; yet we are still obliged to say with Schwegler,[1] "with all his hatred of philosophy, Tertullian is assuredly not the worst thinker which the Christian church can count," and we shall not find it far from the mark when Gfrörer[2] calls him the Tacitus of the youthful Christianity. We shall above all recognize the justice of Neander's description of the man, when after long and thorough study of him, he says: "Tertullian has acuteness and depth, dialectic skill, but no logical clearness or repose or order; he has a profound and productive soul, but not harmoniously cultivated. In him the power of feeling and of imagination prevailed over the power of forming clear conceptions; his inward life, filled with Christianity, hastened before the development of the mere understanding. Tertullian had more, and what was higher, in his internal life, in feeling and in vision, than he was able to bring out in the form of definite conceptions. A new inward world was opened to him by Christianity. Feelings and ideas struggled in his living and fiery soul, and he only wanted the fitting words in which to express them."[3] So much greater, then, is the merit of Neander in mastering this rough and not easily mastered material, in working into this inaccessible soul, and opening the passages and shafts which conduct to the hidden treasures of so rich a mind, obscure though it be. Such a work could be successfully achieved only by a persistent love, which is never weary in seeking out the truth, even where it is intertwined with error and overgrown with thorns.

After all these immense preparatory labors, which of themselves seem to surpass the power of any one man, Neander at length undertook a complete History of the Christian Church, in an extensive work, begun in the year 1825, and carried on in the second division of the fifth volume, or the tenth part of the whole work, to the second half of the era of the Middle Ages, when death took him away from its further continuation and completion.

You will not expect me to give even a sketch of this, the chief work of Neander. What has now been said, may suffice to show in

---

[1] Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Tübingen, 1841.

[2] Kirchengeschichte, I. s. 386.

[3] We give this citation from the first edition, because we are following the chronological order. In the second edition, 1849, the expressions are altered, but not essentially.

what spirit he treated of Church History. Before summing up, as is appropriate to the occasion, our final judgment in respect to Neander as a church historian, I must speak concisely of the other works which he produced during the publication of his Church History.

The history of the apostolic age, which, taken strictly, does not belong to proper church history, is still the foundation of that history. Neander felt that those who had been led by him to a living comprehension of church history, must be desirous to know his views respecting that primitive form of Christianity from which all its later states had sprung; he owed them an account of his historical understanding of Christianity itself in its very origin. The questions here involved, were additionally pressing, because the historical basis of Christianity seemed to be made tottering by that destructive criticism which had put in its lever precisely in this place. It was natural to expect that Neander would have first written the history of the Founder of Christianity; but he preferred to get at the point of departure, by going on in an ascending line up the course of the history, and he first published his "History of the Planting and Guidance of the Christian Church by the Apostles," Hamburg, 1832, in two volumes, as a supplement to his Church History, though complete in itself. He did not here intend to give a complete history of the apostolic age, but only so much as is set forth in the title itself, that is an account of the establishment and direction of the Christian church by the apostles.

In his monographs, Neander had already admirably described the apostolical men of later times, by transferring himself as it were into their internal life, by feeling with them what they had felt; and so, too, as an historical psychologist, it was of the first importance for him in this work, also to take the psychological point of view, and to have a living knowledge of the very soul of a Peter, a John, and a James, and above all, of the grand peculiarities of a Paul. And in these psychological glimpses were given, so to speak, the stars that were to guide him in the difficult and thorny path through which he was to walk. Neander is not of the number of those who would go round, or set aside by a dogmatical asseveration, the difficulties which occur in the scriptures of the New Testament. In the preface to his book, he openly avows that he cannot agree with those who think they render a service to the truth, by leaving everything as of old, or rather by bringing back the condition of theology to the state in which we find it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. "The word of God, indeed, which is designed to make everything new with

a perfectly rejuvenating power," remains for him eternal; but "the differences of philosophical statement" ought not on that account to disturb the fellowship of faith. "The coming forth of opposing tendencies is," he says, "unavoidable in our times of crisis, and it is far better than the death-like coldness and the dead uniformity that preceded it. On the other hand he appreciates the pious zeal and solicitude of those who are made fearful by these critical attempts, and he is very far from ascribing to them sinister motives and intentions as was often done with bitter passion by the other party. But yet he could not, for their sakes, be kept from continuing his labors, with his best knowledge and conscience, even with the knowledge that his criticism, mild and sparing as it was, would be to them a rock of offence. And now, at the time that the Life of Jesus by Strauss, had called forth that universal excitement not only in theological and ecclesiastical circles, but also in the highest as well as the lowest classes of society, of which we all still have a lively remembrance, now exactly the right point of time had come for Neander, now was the time for him also to exhibit the "Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical Connections and in its Historical Development." This work was published in 1837. Neander did not engage in this work without the tenderest reverence, and not without devout scruples. In the preface, he calls to mind a word of Herder's to Lavater, when the latter had exhorted him to a similar undertaking, "Who, after John, would venture to write the life of Christ?" He also mentions a confession of Anna Maria von Schurmann, that such an undertaking seemed as if one were to paint the sun with a coal, and that the life of a Christian is the best image of the life of Christ. And yet he attempted the task, for his doubts were outweighed by the necessity now so deeply felt of making as it were really present to us, the historically realized ideal of a life both divine and human, and of doing this from the point of view of that stage of development in life and science, to which we have attained; "for the image of Christ is not one which is rejuvenated yesterday or to-day, but it is still always rejuvenated with the race itself, and it infuses into the decaying world a new, heaven-aspiring, and youthful energy.

When Neander put his hand to this work, he was very conscious that he would not satisfy all. He says, "I shall not be thought right by the hyper-critics who make sacred history a prey to the arbitrary and subjective notions of a rationalizing, sophistical, and trifling acumen, nor yet by those who imagine that all criticism, or at least all criticism on internal grounds, is a matter of suspicion. Both these

tendencies have this in common, that they are in conflict with a sound love of truth, with a truth-loving conscience, and that they are both foes to a healthful progress. I am convinced that impartial criticism, as applied to all that is given us in the form of historical tradition in the scriptural documents, is not in contradiction with that childlike faith, without which, neither Christianity nor a Christian theology is possible. On the contrary, it is only as we have such faith that we can receive that real consecration of a sanctified mind, without which, nothing in theology can prosper, and that real acuteness which looks into the depths of truth." It is not for us to decide how far Neander, in his "Life of Jesus," has met the just claim of criticism, nor how far he has solved the acknowledged difficulties. It holds true here, if anywhere, in magnis voluisse sat est.

As Neander had thus ascended backward from the History of the Church to the life of its Founder, so too he sent out beforehand single preliminary works bearing upon that later period of church history which still remained to be written out in its completeness. Upon the history of the Reformation, including the lives of the reformers themselves, it is remarkable that (so far at least as I am aware) he has left us nothing;[1] in his casual writings, however, he has given us traits from the life of the "holy" John Huss, as an evidence that the truly evangelical spirit is always similar in its workings. This was written in 1819.[2] He has also singled out two men from the times of the Reformation, little known before, or at least misunderstood and falsely judged, George Wicel[3] and Theobald Thamer.[4] The first of these, disgusted with the altercations in the Protestant church, went back to the Catholics; the latter, who ended by taking the same step, belonged to men who like Schwenkfeld, Sebastian Franck and others, wished to substitute a mystical and speculative religion of reason for the positive revelation, on which account Neander describes him as a representative and predecessor of some modern tendencies. One of the last essays which came from the pen of Neander shows us the freedom of soul and large historical sense with which he could pass judgment upon those modern spiritual tendencies which have sprung up in our century. It is a short contemplation upon the last

[1] A short essay upon Melanchthon composed just before his death has since been published in Piper's Evangelical Calendar for 1851, p. 196 seq.

[2] In his Gelegenheitschriften, 3d ed. Berlin, 1829, s. 217. With this may be compared "Erinnerungen an Marco Antonio Flaminio und das Aufkeimen der Reformation in Italien," see his work "Das Eine und Mannigfaltige des christlichen Lebens," Berlin, 1840, p. 111.

[3] Das Eine und Mannigfaltige, s. 167.

[4] Published at Berlin in 1842.

half century in its relation to present times, which appeared in the "Journal for Christian Science and Christian Life," edited by him in conjunction with Julius Müller, Nitzsch and others. How finely he there conceives the office of Schleiermacher, how mild and friendly his judgment of De Wette!

It would extend our essay beyond all proper bounds to mention all the smaller treatises, programms, casual writings and prefaces, in which this unwearied investigator now kindled a new light and now revived a beneficent recollection, or if we were to point out how the new editions of his works were improved and often wholly recast.[1] What we have said may be sufficient to give us so much of a picture of what he accomplished as a church historian in comparison with earlier writers, that on the basis of this picture, we shall be in a condition to bring to its close the office we proposed to ourselves, and to sum up in conclusion Neander's merits as a church historian.

From our sketch of Neander's writings we shall be convinced of the truth of what Nitzsch expressed in his funeral oration upon the departed, that "Neander was raised up and consecrated by the Lord for the great work of reviving the theology of church history." It remains for us to separate this position into its individual elements and to name the prominent qualities which make Neander preëminent as a Church Historian.

To begin with his learning; there are few who can here be placed on an equality with him. Few have studied the original sources as did he — have read so much and retained it so well in memory, that they could wander like him among all the past forms of the church with an ever wakeful eye. Neander never made a parade with citations; but in the very way in which he quotes we see that he only needed to put his hand into the great treasury, and that it willingly opened itself to him as often as he wanted to verify his statements. And not only in the originals was he at home, but also in the works written upon them in ancient and in later times, by German, English, French and Dutch authors. Classical as well as biblical literature aided him in his investigations; and especially was the consummate exegete a help to the church historian.[2] But it is not his learning alone which

[1] Of his historical essays we may mention those upon Pascal, Baxter, Wilberforce, Oberlin and others. His work on Tertullian was entirely rewritten in the new edition.

[2] Neander's exegetical lectures were not less esteemed by the students than those he gave on church history, and it may well be said that in this department too he formed a school.

made Neander to be the first church historian of his times,[1] the renewer and restorer of this science.

With his learning was combined a sound and sober criticism, such a simple and calm observation of the facts, as finds no pleasure in artificial and fanciful combinations. With the disciplined eye of the historical investigator, he looked over the conjunctions of events; by a sure tact he found what was similar and what was mutually dependent, and judged according to the law of reciprocal action, without wandering off into long-drawn and pragmatic discourse. But his proper greatness did not consist even in this. In acuteness, others may excel him; he himself put forth no claims to being very acute; he speaks in warning terms about that acuteness which is so acute, that it becomes crotchety.[2]

Is it then the *genius* which he displays in his treatment of history, which has won for him the wreath? If by genius, we mean that which is brilliant, which is pointed with wit, which glitters and glimmers, which excites constant surprise by quick and light flashes of thought, which carries us into transports, which will not let us be at peace for the ideas it forces and piles upon us, stroke after stroke, we can easily find authors of much greater genius than Neander. The spirit of a real genius does indeed impress upon Neander's writings the stamp which marks their value; but it is not the self-made, pretentious, and narrow spirit of the individual, nor yet the so-called spirit of the times; but that spirit which has *grown* to be what it is, which has drawn its stores from history, which has been nourished and ripened by the rays of that sun that shines through history, and thus been strengthened in its very roots, that is the spirit which breathes upon us, beneficent as the morning air, from the writings of Neander. Or, in other words, that which gives Neander, as a writer, such a hold upon our inmost soul, is not so much what men call genius, as it is his moral and religious, his completely Christian *character*. Character is what makes the historian; it is necessary to his greatness. Let us analyze the elements of this character.

It is first of all truthfulness, which fills us with high reverence for an historian, a truthfulness which is true in little things also, which esteems nothing lightly, which follows after truth in all its traces, and rests not till it comes to its grounds. To this truthfulness is added

[1] No intelligent person will think that we mean by this an absolute principality. The Latin would express it, facile princeps.

[2] In his preface to the Life of Jesus, p. xii: "vor der Schärfe, die allzu scharf, schartig wird.

in him real humility of soul; that kind of self-denial which seeks not its own but what is of God; and what is of God, is that which is real, which is objective, eternal and abiding in history. This humility knows how to descry the essential things in that spirit which moves the times; it knows how to see the guidance of God in the affairs of men. To want to know everything better and to make everything better than history knows it and than history has made it; to be master and critic of history in the sense of the incumbents of the lifted up chairs of modern wisdom, is foreign to such real humility of soul; and where its judgment is announced it is ever modest and just, conditioned and justified by history itself. To such truthfulness and humility love comes as a companion, to illuminate and perfect the character. And so the historian is not cold and heartless towards history, but enters with sympathy into the states he is called to examine and to exhibit. It is a love which does not, indeed, cover up shame with its proverbial mantle, but even where its office is to uncover it, it does it with forbearance, pointing to the balsam which history, like nature, has always ready for its own wounds. It is only such love, too, which is capable of inspiring in others an enthusiasm for history; it excites sympathy, where a fleeting and worldly sense becomes soon weary; it casts new light upon whole groups of events which the learned dulness of centuries has passed by without notice; for in history it does not seek for dissipation of mind, but for collectedness; it does not seek to be amused and entertained, but to be edified and taught. It is not in the storm of excited passions alone that it finds its element, but in the quiet fields of nobility and goodness, where is the salt of earth.

With all this we do not mean to say that Neander has realized the ideal of a church historian in all respects in equal measure; for what mortal could do this? Some qualities of the historian are shaped less consummately in him than in others. Directing his eye chiefly to the inward life, it was perhaps less acute in looking at the worldly side of church history. Unsuspicious himself, the movings of human passion in its subtler currents and windings remained to him unknown; and hence he did not feel himself called upon to trace them out. The web of ecclesiastical politics has been seen through by others with greater dexterity of soul, for he stood remote in most cases from political life.[1] And there is another side of history which also seems

[1] Gfrörer goes to the opposite extreme; he has a great predilection for the web of intrigue and chicanery, and leaves the religious agencies unnoticed, e. g. in what he says about the Gottschalk controversy in his History of the Carlovingians.

to have been less familiar to him, what we may call its aesthetical, its artistic element. Neander did not indeed belong to those Puritans who renounce Christian art altogether. But his simple, introspective nature, which made him neglectful of the fairness of external forms even in his personal intercourse, was not fitted to estimate, with the vision of an artist, the structure of the church in its architectural proportions, as it rises up before the eye of the imaginative observer. Thus, though he brought the long misunderstood middle ages again to honor, by going into the depths of its mystical visions, and showing that characters like Bernhard and Saint Francis are to be measured by another standard than that of the "vulgar rationalism;"[1] yet others have had a more open eye and a more living sense[2] for the grand poetry there is in the ecclesiasticism of the middle ages, as it comes out in the struggles of the hierarchy with the imperial power, in the various orders of clergy and of knights, in the pomp of the mass and the ritual, in the festivals of the saints, and which has built for itself a memorial that survives all storms in those gigantic cathedrals with their profound, symbolical significancy. It is indeed hazardous when the sense for these things becomes so predominant, as is the case with Hurter in his life of Innocent III, that the real essence of Christianity, the worship of God in spirit and in truth, retires behind the scenery of ecclesiasticism. Yet, still historical science in its perfection ought to be able to catch, in the living mirror of imagination, the most various impressions from all times, to body forth the past with artistic freedom, to create it as it were anew, and to breathe a fresh life into states of society which long since vanished away, without being dazzled by their enchantments. This is that union of poetry with history, which these later times have striven to attain.[3]

Neander's deficiency in the perception of artistic forms, has mani-

[1] It is unfortunate that Neander's intention of giving us a detailed account of the life of St. Francis (vide Piper's Evangel. Kalender, Vorrede s. v.) cannot be carried into execution.

[2] To Hase belongs the credit of having first exemplified clearly this side of church history, which is now also treated by several other authors in a spirited and intelligent manner.

[3] As Neander was not directly attracted by the beautiful as such, so he was less repelled by what lacks beauty than are those in whom fancy and wit predominate. Even in the caricatures of saints, he seeks and finds something saint-like, without feeling the temptation of letting the shadows be seen along side of the light in these grotesque forms. Cf. his preface to the second edition of Tertullian, p. xi.

festly had an influence upon his style. The maxim holds true of him, if of anybody, le stile c'est l'homme. As he was careless in his habits of life, so too in his style. The spirit of the man does indeed betray itself everywhere, and shines out wonderfully in glorious utterances, which take hold of us all the more deeply, because they are the unsought expression of his lovely soul. But though a simple and unadorned discourse is more attractive to the unperverted sense, than that finical and high-seasoned mannerism which many, alas! call style, yet there is still unquestionably a genuine historical style, which, by its plastic simplicity, its nervous conciseness, and its masterly strokes of delineation, brings out before the soul the images of history, better than can our daily speech. And such an historical style as Ranke, for example, has the mastery of, is wanting in some measure in Neander. Narration and investigation, negotiations and delineations, go on in the same tone, in the same attitude, almost without rise or fall of cadence, without light and shade. He lingers upon some favorite subjects with a prolixity which is in marked contrast with other portions; and he often fails in giving a good general outline, and in the skilful distribution of his materials. In the artistic treatment of the materials those might easily surpass him who are far his inferiors in wealth of knowledge, in thoroughness of investigation, in profoundness of historical character. Others perhaps find that he is deficient in other things. Thus the speculative school of philosophy has denied to him the title of a scientific man, because he would not ascend with them to the heights of a philosophy, which constructs history by means of *à priori* ideas, or at any rate considers it only as the form through which the "immanent idea" is moving according to the trichotomy of the Hegelian logic. But we frankly confess that we see in this one of the merits of Neander. He has kept to what he so often declared should be the highest law in the case, and that is, that historical facts are not to be looked at through the "dim and borrowed glasses of the schools," but with a free and unperverted vision. And he was not wanting in the higher consecration which science can receive, in that which we may call the ideal view of history. On the contrary, he refers all the individual and manifold events to a higher idea which lies at the basis of the passing phenomena. Only this is not a philosophical category, brought from without and applied to history, but it is the truly "immanent idea" of history, and by this we mean an idea dwelling in the very life of history and moving it onward; it is the heart, the very soul of history; it is, to speak the very word, it is the Spirit of the Lord, whose influence and

efficiency, Neander strives to trace, with a soul allied thereto, and which he seeks to get possession of in the same measure in which he gives himself up to it in humility and self-forgetfulness. Neander's historical sense was especially repelled by two tendencies; the one the speculative tendency which makes everything just as it thinks it should be by means of *à priori* laws; the other the false and dead orthodoxy of the letter, which limits everything by some positive, ecclesiastical form, which misunderstands, and, were it possible, would stop the flow of history. Both these appeared to him to be forms of an unwarrantable scholasticism, which scoffs at the divine power there is in history, and, mild as he was in his usual judgments, he would speak as if irritated or bitter, when the one or the other of these tendencies tried to get the upper hand.

The services which Neander rendered to Church History are not exhausted with his writings. The living word, by which he worked as a teacher, the encouragement, the excitement, the guidance he imparted by his instructive personal intercourse, these things can be truly estimated only by those who had a part in them. How many have sat at his feet, and been won by him first and perhaps for always to the study of the history of the church; and this, too, in addition to the great multitude of those whose hearts were awakened by him for the practical service of the church and led in the way of salvation for themselves and for others. Neander's school is wide-spread; and where in later times has any talent shown itself in the sphere of historical theology that did not pass directly through this school at least in part? From this school have sprung whole branches of church history, especially that of the monograph, which in the last three decennia has borne such fair fruits. Some whole sides of the life of the church, as the History of Missions in its separate portions, the History of Christian Morals and Manners, of benevolent activity, and the History of the Internal, Spiritual Life of the Church, were first brought out by him into a clear light and woven into the web of ecclesiastical history. But the departed one has given us in his own life the most admirable addition to the History of the Church; for Neander's appearance is, as has been well remarked, the appearance of a Father of the Church for the church of the nineteenth century. Not only will his name be named with those of the great church historians, with the names of a Mosheim and a Planck, and in many things above them; but as a theologian for our later times Neander is to be reckoned in the number of those who have understood their

time and have labored for it, in a purifying, quickening and reconciling spirit.

Schleiermacher, De Wette, Neander. Yes, these three, now gone from us, (whom I name before all others because I have the singular happiness of owing to them more than others my own theological character), Schleiermacher, De Wette and Neander,[1] once united as colleagues in one of the principal universities of Germany, each great in his way, each helping to complete the other's. They abide no longer with us, and the coming generation of theologians can now only look up to their illustrious forms as we gaze upon the heroes of the times of our fathers. They will reverence in them, if they be not unthankful, the founders of a new form of theology, of a theology which, it is to be hoped, will neither be circumscribed by the old bondage of the letter, nor yet let itself be forced back from its positive foundations by the pretensions of that tendency of the times which sets itself in a hostile attitude to Christianity. These three names will shine in the firmament of theological science, as long as an unprejudiced examination of Scripture shall form the basis of theological science — so long as a sound philosophy, not snatched from the air, but taken from the inmost nature of man and purified by revelation, shall remain the companion of theology, and so long as true and living historical investigations shall bring the present and the primitive times of Christianity together and shall mediate between them.

The last words with which Neander separated from his friends and from the world were the words, "Good night." Oh! that no bitter irony may turn this simple wish of a pure heart into an evil omen; Oh! that that night may never break in upon us which shall obscure to our vision the brightness of this three-fold star, that night of barbarism, in which the powers of darkness shall interlock their hands in the covenant between superstition and unbelief.

---

[1] The putting them together is not an empty phrase. That these three theologians were very different, even in essential matters; that there was between Neander and De Wette for a long time an estrangement which began to be adjusted only in the last part of their lives, could be unobserved only by a blind man. But none the less may we regard each in his way as breaking the path for later times. That in which all three agreed negatively was in the protest against all unjustified reäction in the sphere of theological science, the preservation of their independence against this or that form of dogmatism. But still more empaasis is to be laid upon the community of the three on the positive basis of finding *the only ground of salvation in Christ.* Sufficient evidence of this could be cited, were it necessary, from the writings of all of them.

No! far from us be this thought! Rather will we direct our eyes, as a worthy close of this solemn hour, to the prophecy which the deceased uttered at the end of the preface to his Life of Jesus: "We stand," he says, "on the boundaries between an old and between a new world, which will be called into existence by that Gospel which is ever old and ever new. For the fourth time there is preparing a new epoch of life for the human race by means of Christianity; and therefore can we, in every respect, only labor in preparation for the times of that new creation, in which, after the regeneration in life and in science, men shall proclaim with new and fiery tongues the great works of God."

ARTICLE IX.

RECENT WORKS ON ASIA MINOR.

"THERE is no country that now affords so fertile a field of discovery as Asia Minor." This observation was made by Mr. Leake in 1824, and it is still substantially true, notwithstanding the important investigations which have since been made by a number of eminent travellers and scholars. In point of deep and absorbing interest, it is in some respects not inferior to Greece, Egypt, or Italy.

The fabled Argonautic expedition sailed along the shores of Bithynia and Pontus. Here are the plains of Troy, and the scene of the great epic poem of antiquity. In regard to the earliest settlers of Lycia, we have more correct information from Homer and Herodotus, than from any other writers. Both almost claim this province as their native country, being perfectly familiar with its original legends. They tell the story of Europa's visit, and of her sons taking possession of the country. Some of the most beautiful parts of the Iliad recount the history of the Lycian heroes, Sarpedon and Glaucus, and the exploits of Pandarus. The climate of the country, and its beauty and fertility are frequently praised. All the remains termed Lycian, recently discovered, probably belong to the age of Homer, and that immediately subsequent. Much of the rock architecture, the sculptures, the language and the coins, do not refer to Byzantine, Roman, or even Greek subjects, which are known. Some of the most valua-