LEADING FACTORS IN THE STUDY OF HISTORY

THE so-called conflict between Religion and Science is well known to all. There has been, and still exists, a similar conflict, less spectacular but nevertheless acute, between Scriptural Christianity on the one hand and the Modern conception of History on the other. It is the chief aim of this article to present to the Christian student certain considerations which may be helpful in resolving the tension between his spiritual experience and his academic studies. History, moreover, enters into many branches of study and, more particularly, is closely connected with the present-day study of Theology. It is hoped, therefore, that these words will also be of value to those who have constantly to deal with the word " development " and the urge to " cultivate a historic sense " in their theological reading. Incidentally, it is our purpose to show by quotations from recent authors that, as in Science, so also in History there can be observed certain tendencies which indicate that the modern mind is returning to principles more easily reconciled with those of Scripture than were the up-to-date ideas of fifty years ago. To be " up-to-date " is indeed no necessary indication of being nearer the truth, and the student of history realises that to be behind-the-times sometimes really means to be ahead of them, however important it be to keep abreast of modern thought and discovery.

I

The opening words and chapters of the Bible suggest three principles with which we may well begin:—

1. The study of origins is vital.
2. The philosophy dominates the conclusions.
3. The study must be as true to objective reality as possible.

1. *The study of origins is vital.*

" In the beginning." These opening words suggest that the first principle in the study of history is to be sure of the

beginning. Not only do the opening words of Scripture suggest this, but the three opening chapters of the Bible give an amplified and unmistakable indication of the vital importance of origins in historical investigation and presentation.

The historical student is always working backwards and forwards in time, seeking to establish a correct sequence in the order of events, endeavouring to understand the relationship between diverse facts and persons, to establish broad lines of cause and effect, and in the end to obtain a real, and at least relatively true, view of the whole. Such a view can only be obtained when the origin is securely established.

Some such thoughts as these are expressed by Gertrude Bell, who was a distinguished historian and traveller, when she writes: " It's a heavenly feeling when suddenly the thing jumps at you and you know you understand. . . . I don't think you get it out of books a bit, though books help to strengthen it, but you certainly get it out of seeing more and more, even of quite different things. The more you see, the more everything falls into a kind of rough and ready perspective, and when you come to a new thing, you haven't so much difficulty in placing it and fitting it into the rest. I'm awfully glad you love the beginnings of things, so do I, most thoroughly, and unless one does, I don't believe one can get as much pleasure out of the ends."[1]

Gertrude Bell's words end on the note of pleasure, and history is indeed a means of great pleasure and recreation. But it is meant to be more than this, namely a light from the past on the path which man treads. If this is to be a reliable guiding light it must be the clear light of truth. Gertrude Bell's words could be adapted in some such way as this: " Unless one has a real love and care for truth in regard to the beginnings of things I don't believe that it is possible to reach a correct and true end." In other words, if the terminus a quo of our historical studies be incorrect the terminus ad quem will also be distorted.

This truth in the realm of more serious thought is well expressed by Dr. Orr in his book on the Problem of the Old Testament. " It is the Nemesis of a wrong starting point in every department of inquiry that those who adopt it find themselves plunged, as they proceed, into ever deepening error and confusion; while a right guiding-idea as infallibly conducts to

[1] *Letters of Gertrude Bell.* Edited by Lady Bell. Pelican Books, vol. i, p. 85.

a view marked by simplicity and truth. If Kuenen and those who think like him are right in their first principles, they will find their theory work out easily and naturally in its application to the phenomena of Scripture: if they are wrong, their hypothesis will inevitably break down under its own weight, as did that of Baur in the sphere of the New Testament. . . . The ultimate test in either case is fitness to meet the facts."[1]

The student of history must therefore learn to think things through. He must ever be seeking to know the true beginning of whatever he is studying, and to present conclusions marked by "simplicity and truth".

At the same time certain other considerations must be borne in mind, connected with the relative nature of our own conception of truth and the elusive character of absolute truth. For instance, in studying such a period as the French Revolution how immensely complex are its origins and how exceedingly difficult it is to present conclusions marked by "simplicity and truth"! The real origins and springs of such movements are shrouded in mystery and incapable of ultimate comprehension. Further still, what is true of a period in human history is even more true of the far vaster and more complex history of the whole human race. Yet this history cannot be understood until its true origin is established. Here comes the concluding question—Can this ever be done? The answer is that we do not really *know* anything definite, in the "historical" sense of the word, about the prehistoric origin of man. We don't know, and we can't be sure that we shall ever know. Under such circumstances—not in any way an exaggerated description of the actual state of present day anthropological research on this point[2]—the student of history may with perfect legitimacy and without any surrender of historical principles fall back on what he judges by faith to be revealed truth, viz., the first three chapters of Genesis.

II

2. *The philosophy dominates the conclusions.*

"In the beginning *God*." The words indicate not only the importance of origins but also the supreme importance of the philosophy adopted in the interpretation of history. It is

[1] Orr. *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 15.

[2] See *European Civilization*. Edited by Edward Eyre. Oxford, 1935, p. 8. The work is referred to again later.

recognised by many writers to-day that history cannot be reduced to a pure science. The outlook of the writer is bound to affect his arrangement and interpretation of the facts. This is true even of books on purely scientific subjects, and it is true also of any reconstruction of history no matter how professedly scientific or objective it may be. The writer who honestly acknowledges his own individual outlook is rather to be trusted than one who lays claim to absolute scientific impartiality. For such impartiality is non-existent.

Professor Wilhelm Schmidt says in regard to certain reconstructions of the origins of civilisation: ". . . in the very beginning of ethnological research Lafitau put forward his theory that the still existing uncivilised races could give us the earliest image of the life of primitive man. But it was the fate of ethnology that the widespread application of this principle in the nineteenth century was unduly influenced by the dominant evolutionist and materialistic theories of the time . . . the evolutionist idea was to trace the beginnings of human history in all its aspects, not from what was undeveloped but from what was most degraded. The more base, coarse, repulsive, and irrational a custom or idea was, the more primitive it was declared to be. The result was that attempts to fix the relative age and sequence of the various races were based only on utterly unreliable and imaginary estimates of time. . . . This method, which was really no method whatever, was in general use among the much earlier workers in ethnology, sociology and comparative religion up to the beginning of the twentieth century. . . . From 1887 onwards, opposition to all such methods developed in Germany. . . . It was in England that the evolutionist school held the field longest and most tenaciously. But N. W. Thomas and still more W. H. Rivers in his Presidential Address to the Section for Anthropology, British Association, on 'The Ethnological Analysis of Culture' (1911), and his *History of Melanesian Society*, broke with the dominant tradition."[1]

Professor Schmidt's words are well worth noting, and we quote once again: "The theory of development has, no doubt, done valuable service in the reconstruction of the history of primitive man. But we can no longer close our eyes to the

[1] *European Civilization*, vol. i. "Its Origin and Development." Article by Professor W. Schmidt, pp. 16, 17. (1935).

serious injury done to the study of primitive man by excessive devotion to theories of an undeviating progressive development along one single definite line. This has affected both the form and method of investigation and the results claimed as being secured from it. The assertion of man's descent from earlier and lower forms of life exerted more than one unscientific influence on research, and resulted in the adoption of an ill-directed method of procedure."[1]

Now all this, obviously, neither proves nor disproves " Evolution ". It is quoted here as an example and as a warning to the student. It is an example, and a most remarkable one, of the way in which philosophy has distorted history. It is also a warning, and particularly to the English student, to be aware of the great importance of the philosophic principle in history. Evolutionist theory has had a very strong influence on the writing of all kinds of histories—the history of religion, and more particularly the history of Israel, not excepted.

Professor Schmidt's words furnish us with an example of the way in which philosophic preconceptions affect the arrangement of facts, and a quotation from Professor Burleigh supplies us with a description of the attitude of the historian of to-day. First he quotes the words of St. Augustine: " Things that are past and gone and cannot be undone are to be reckoned as belonging to the course of time, of which God is the Author and Governor " (St. Aug. *De Doctrina Christiana II.* 44). Then he comments as follows: " St. Augustine is making the point that history, i.e., the unalterable course of past human events, is, like the world of nature, a subject for dispassionate scientific study. This theory not very long ago seemed quite modern, and influenced the ideals and practices of generations of historians. To-day it is largely abandoned. The historian has become an ' interpreter ', if not frankly a propagandist. Doubtless this change often involves some disloyalty to truth. But it is so far gain if it is recognised that even a historian cannot wholly free himself from bias."[2]

The student of history, therefore, should be aware of the fact that every history book, even a class text-book, is written from some particular point of view. He should realise the significance of philosophy in history, and should also be at

[1] *European Civilization*, p. 6.

[2] " The Hand of God in Human History." *Inter Varsity Fellowship Magazine.* Lent Term. 1941.

pains to realise that there is a true philosophic outlook which he should seek to find.

The importance of this philosophic element can hardly be over-estimated, for it is ultimately the outlook of the writer which dominates his conclusions. The student will therefore be wise to find out the point of view of the text-books he uses, and in doing so to study with careful attention the preliminary pages. For instance, the opening words of a well-known standard work on Hebrew religion run as follows:—"The Hebrews were Semites, and their religion, in its origin, did not differ from that of the Semites in general."[1] Here the writer really states not a fact, but his own interpretation of a series of facts. He reveals his own point of view which dominates his arrangement and interpretation of all the facts which follow through more than 400 pages of the text. Much in the book cannot be properly estimated unless the reader realises that this outlook is assumed throughout.

Whether this point of view is correct or incorrect is another matter. This the reader must strive to think out for himself. He will do well moreover to consider that the acceptance of a philosophy is more than most things an individual matter, and he has as much right to his own point of view as the most learned. Such a philosophy the Scriptures profess to give. No one should quarrel with the student who starts from the assumption that the religion of the Hebrews was in important original characteristics *different* from the religion of other Semites, should he be led to this conclusion on adequate grounds, scriptural or philosophical as well as historical. Whether his philosophy be evolutionary or anti-evolutionary, based on belief in revelation or the opposite, every man must decide on the highest and widest views of life to which he can attain.

III

3. *The study must be as true to objective reality as possible.*

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth . . ." So the Bible starts, and it proceeds to describe the creation of the tangible and visible world in which man is set. If you will, the scenery is here erected for the drama of history. There follows in the second and third chapters a fuller

[1] Oesterley & Robinson. *Hebrew Religion*, p. 3.

account of the creation of man and a description of his activities —moral, mental, and physical. Here, therefore, it is indicated that history is concerned not merely with ideas, as is philosophy, but also with the tangible and visible, with hard solid facts, with actual human activities. Because of all this the historian must be faithful to facts.

Here particularly is room for true Science. History has gained enormously in the last hundred years by the application of what is called Scientific Method. History is not a pure Art nor yet a pure Science. But it is important to remember that true and good historical writing has a very definite scientific texture. It is based on accurate evidences, on evidence the value of which has been carefully weighed; and it should also be based on facts which have been fitted in with all other readily available knowledge.

This objective element in history and the scientific approach is paralleled in the study of Archaeology, and here the words of Sir Leonard Woolley are worth quotation:—" In its essence Field Archaeology is the application of scientific method to the excavation of ancient objects, and it is based on the theory that the historical value of an object depends not so much on the nature of the object itself as on its associations, which only scientific excavation can detect. The casual digger and the plunderer aim at getting something of commercial or artistic value, and there their interest stops. The archaeologist, being after all human, does enjoy finding rare and beautiful objects, but wants to know all about them, and in any case prefers the acquisition of knowledge to that of things; for him digging consists very largely in observation, recording and interpretation."[1]

The objective element is emphasised in the words " observation and recording ", and in the same way the historian has constantly to remember that he is dealing with people who really lived a life which other people saw, and with events which actually happened at a certain time and in a certain place. For this reason dates and diagrams, pictures, maps and travel are all valuable and, indeed, often essential even to the advanced student. Dates and diagrams are necessary as symbols for different points in the stream of time, or for movements of people, etc.; and they should be accurate. Pictures, such as

[1] *Digging up the Past*, by Sir Leonard Woolley. Pelican Books. Pp. 15, 16.

original paintings or photographs of sculptures, enable the historian to visualise the living personages of ancient times. Maps are symbols of place and distance, and travel is a very great asset in reconstructing the past. It is an immense help, for instance, to see the hills of Palestine with one's own eyes, and to realise that though much else has changed yet these have not, and that the eyes of the Saviour looked on the same hills.

The historian must constantly bear in mind this tangible and visible element in his studies. He must deal with facts. He must be accurate and exact. A true history will be faithful to all the facts. A good historian will bear in mind the dictum that " facts are sacred ".

The Christian student must act and think in these matters in precisely the same way as other students. Though he has gained from the Scriptures and made his own a philosophy of life and history, he must nevertheless be prepared fearlessly to face the facts of history both within the Scriptures and without. In doing so his outlook will no doubt be deepened, strengthened and, where imperfect, modified. He need have no fear, however, that a truly faithful scriptural view will be at serious variance with any of the really established conclusions of modern investigation. On the question of the origin of man the whole of the first section of the volume *European Civilization*[1] can be referred to. On the side of Archaeology an attentive reading of *Bible and Spade* by S. L. Caiger can be commended. Although the author adopts the commonly accepted critical view, an attentive reading of the book will show that there is nothing of major importance in recent discoveries which conflicts with a straightforward scriptural and conservative view. Indeed, there is much agreeable to such a position. The very early and quite elaborate development of extensive writing, for instance, is agreeable with what Dr. Orr many years ago spoke of as " the essential Mosaicity of the Pentateuch ". In regard to the internal evidence and facts of the text of Scripture itself the theological student will do well to work carefully through such a book as that already referred to—*The Problem of the Old Testament*, by Dr. Orr. These writings will show that there is no necessary conflict between the facts of Scripture and the known ancient history of man. The scriptural traditional view is not out of accord

[1] op. cit., pp. 1-82.

with the known facts. It fits them equally well and in the opinion of some far better than the so-called modern outlook, which is largely tinged by an evolutionist or semi-evolutionist philosophy.

Three principles or considerations have been dealt with in the study of history. We have seen the importance of a correct view of origins to an understanding of the whole, the dominating position of philosophy, and the importance of being as true to objective reality as possible. In each of these we have seen that there is no necessary conflict between a simple straightforward scriptural philosophy and what we may call a true Historicism—not at any rate in broad outline. There remain two further considerations which may be of value to the reader. So we pass on to these.

IV

4. *Dissolution is as significant a factor as development.*

When reading the early chapters of Genesis it is clear that one of the main purposes of the narrative is to describe the entry of sin and death into human existence. The original purity and perfection is marred and broken by the fall.

The primary object of the narrative is of course to describe an original actual event which has governed the course of all succeeding history. At the same time, in another aspect, history ever since has been but a reiteration of the same story. So we see that Adam's sin in addition to being original is also typical of the sin of each individual, and the common characteristics are constantly repeated. So also, collectively, the fall of the first society is repeated in the fall of every society of man in succeeding ages. The world before the Flood was corrupt and cataclysm followed. Babel fell; and Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome, with Egypt, have all produced cultures which have fallen into decay or been swept away. Monarchy, priesthood, and the order of prophets tended to degenerate. In the history of the Christian Church we have the Church of Rome as an outstanding example of the corruption of an original ideal. Institutions tend to fall into moral and spiritual decline, though they remain for centuries outliving the collapse or alteration of societies around them. An example of this is the office of Roman Emperor, the title of which was not extinguished till 1806. Civilisations, political societies, and the predominance of certain races all pass away.

This is apparent not only to those who view things from a spiritual point of view but also to those who study history from a secular angle. A further quotation from Gertrude Bell in reference to Persia illustrates this:—"What a country this is! I fear I shall spend the rest of my life travelling in it. Race after race, one on top of the other, the whole land strewn with the mighty relics of them. We in Europe are accustomed to think that civilisation is an advancing flood that has gone steadily forward since the beginning of time. I believe we are wrong. It is a tide that ebbs and flows, reaches a high water mark and turns back again. Do you think that from age to age it rises higher than before? I wonder—and I doubt."[1]

This means that the student has to trace not only development in human affairs, but he has also to regard the phenomenon of decay. Further, he must seek not only to regard, but also in some measure to interpret. It is here that the early chapters of the Bible may give him help.

The early chapters of Genesis emphasise the supreme importance of the individual. None other than the first pair were originally created. Of these, one, the man, was made first. This one man was the head and leader of the miniature society, and through his individual action and decision sin entered. This is all in accord with what we believe to be a fundamental truth of history—namely, that the history of the human race is only the history of the individual writ large. The reason for the corruption of institutions and the decay of civilisations is basically the same as the reason for the decay and death of the individual. After all, the story of a civilisation is made up of the activities in life and up to death of a vast number of human beings. This being the case it is only to be expected that over a period of time such a civilisation will exhibit tendencies similar to those observable in the individual. The individual is the true basis of human society and thus the life story of the individual is the key to an understanding of the history of the race.

Human activity tends in time to spend its force and enter into a decline leading to corruption and dissolution. Why is this so? In answer we may ask another question—Why does the individual reach his prime at forty or fifty and then experience a decline both physical and in the end mental and psychical?

[1] *Letters of Gertrude Bell.* Pelican Books, vol. i, p. 204.

In a word—Why does man die? The scriptural answer is plain and decided—Because of sin. The individual, and therefore the race, is fatally perverted morally and defective physically at the centre of the personality—namely in the will. Owing to this man's powers, spiritual, mental and physical are all weakened; and, since the will is the directive power of his being, man is unable to reach his true and highest objective. Hence an eventual weakening of powers and physical death. This is the case with the individual and it is the case also with society. The reason for the decay of civilisation is comprehended in the phrase " sin and death ".

These matters deal with ground which is obviously common to both History and Theology, inasmuch as both deal with the common factor, man. What we would emphasise is that the element of development has been over-emphasised at the expense of the factor of dissolution. This is due to a predominantly Evolutionist conception of Existence, reared in an age when the future seemed rosy. So-called up-to-date ideas are very largely conditioned by the state of the world at the time. Since 1900 the world has passed through a series of convulsions. Coincident with this there has been a rude shaking of the happy idea of continuous development. Forcibly, historians have been compelled to face some of the most disagreeable facts of human history. This is welcomed by those who maintain a scriptural position, inasmuch as it is a return to the realities of life and of revealed truth. Dissolution is a fact no less significant than development. True it is that there is real development—as for instance the growing unification of the world and the unity of mankind as inevitably interrelated. But, even here, the student is inclined to question how far and in what exact sense it is a development. Indeed, is it not in some senses a return to the original ideal?—maybe on a large scale and with added knowledge, but nevertheless something in the nature of repetition as well as of development. Once again we pass into spheres where our understanding cannot reach. We can, however, see that the factors of dissolution and death so heavily underlined in Scripture are also most significant factors in secular history. Moreover, scriptural views give explanations of these facts which cannot be found elsewhere.

V

5. "Sin and death" are, however, not the last words. Our fifth consideration is that *in spite of human sin and failure God has a redemptive purpose which He is working out, primarily in Bible history, but ultimately in all History.*

When we read in the opening words of Genesis that God said "Let there be light", the words can be taken not only in their prime and original sense as referring to natural creation: they also are figurative and perhaps in a sense prophetic of God's action in human history. There are constant parallels between God's activity in creation and redemption, for both come from the same hand and mind. So it is not surprising to find the imagery of light and darkness applied by the prophet to human history when he says:—"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined".[1] Here the reference, through prophetic intuition, is evidently to the Christ of the Gospel story who walked and taught in the land where the great Assyrian destruction and desolation had been worst. The same imagery is used by the Apostle Paul in speaking of subjective human experiences:—"Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[2]

Although the words are not used, yet exactly the same phenomenon of God's light shining in a dark place is found in the story of the Fall. Morally there is great darkness in the third chapter of Genesis, but just exactly here there is shown also to be light. The words of Jehovah were: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."[3] The words are often spoken of as the prot-Evangelium—the first indication in the Scriptures of that promise of victory to the Son of Man, which is the basis of the Christian faith. Eden's moral light was extinguished. The curse was laid upon man with sorrow and toil. And it was just at this point, in spite of man's failure and standing over against his sin, that God declared His redemptive purpose.

[1] Isaiah ix. 2.
[2] 2 Corinthians iv. 6.
[3] Genesis iii. 15.

In connection with this wonderful statement of the prot-Evangelium, in addition to the emphasis on victory there is to be noted a two fold emphasis on the individual and on conflict. Through the individual and through conflict the victory is won.

We have already seen the place of the individual as the basis of society and it is interesting to notice how often the history of a period is summarised and epitomised in the life story of one man. In Bible history the patriarchal period is represented in Abraham, the formation of the nation is comprehended in the life of Moses, and the establishment of the monarchy in David. Similar characteristics are revealed in secular history. Perhaps the best example is that great period of individualism—the period of Renaissance and Reformation. Scholastic thought is represented by Erasmus and many-sided Art by Michael Angelo. Luther represents the Reformation in Germany and Calvin in Geneva and France, whilst the Counter Reformation was born in the spiritual experiences of Ignatius Loyola. These examples from secular history are an indication of the representative character of the individual, which is much more clearly brought out in Scripture. They also help one to realise the truth and reasonableness of what the Scriptures teach—namely, that all epochs, all periods and, indeed, the whole story of mankind can be studied in the Son of Man—Jesus Christ. In Christ the heart of the drama of History was reached and the victory won.

This, however, was only through conflict, which is an integral element of the prot-Evangelium. Conflict and suffering in the individual representative Man lead to triumph and the fulfilment of God's purpose in the Resurrection. Through such a conflict and suffering ending in a similar victory it seems that the Church of God is destined to pass. The dislocation and travails of our own day we believe are really due to a spiritual conflict between God and the devil—for there is enmity set between the woman's seed and the seed of the serpent. In some mysterious and unfathomable way the Church of God in the world is a disturbing element which provokes the powers of evil to attempt to overcome the good. Through all this God is working His purpose out and His redemptive work is carried on in spite of human corruption, failure and sin.

This particular aspect of History is practically invisible to what may be called the secular historical outlook. It is not treated of in any direct way in the books set or the syllabus arranged for ordinary academic studies. It will not be found emphasised in any of the normal biographies of political figures. The history of Missionary work, for instance, is practically ignored *in toto* in all the lengthy volumes of the Cambridge Modern History. Why is this so? Because they are written from an entirely different point of view. What they consider significant may be comparatively irrelevant from the point of view of God's redemptive purposes and plans. The historian needs the eye of faith to see these things and interpret them. The Christian student must hold fast by his Scriptures. They teach what has been of God in the ancient times, but for more modern days he must hold fast to this truth—that God's redemptive purpose is being fulfilled. It has been true in the past, it is true in the present, and it will be true in the future that " where sin abounded there grace did much more exceedingly abound." [1] Those words are true of the experience of the individual and also of the history of the whole race in each of its epochs and in its whole.

VI

How can we best summarise our conclusions? In general we maintain that a change is coming over the present-day approach to the interpretation of History, which can be compared with the changing attitude of the scientific outlook. In Historical interpretation this is largely due to the cataclysms, disintegrations, and convulsions of the modern world, and, speaking generally, there is a tendency away from the older evolutionist idea of gradual development. This more recent outlook lays emphasis rather on crisis and catastrophe and is more in harmony with scriptural views. The thought of crisis and conflict, coupled with the development of God's redemptive purposes, fits in with scriptural views of the Second Advent. There is still a tension, and probably always will be a tension between the scriptural position and modern Historicism. At the same time the tension has been considerably eased, and there is no need for it to be unduly acute.

[1] Romans v. 20.

By way of conclusion some advice may be offered. The student of history should always distinguish between historical facts and the interpretation of those facts, between the matter of history and its philosophy. The student of theology, particularly, should recognise that there is true, continuous upward development only along the lines of Divine initiative and revelation. All other developments are limited, and the study of the causes and character of catastrophe and crisis is likely to become more and more important in future years. The teacher may well bear in mind the salutary truth of the changeableness of fashion, and see to it that the Scriptures as they stand are the chief Text-Book both for himself and for his pupils. They alone represent History from the Divine point of view. The Christian student should weigh, and weigh carefully, these words of Dr. Emil Brunner:—

" The systematic theologian may perhaps, without seeming immodest, request the historian to listen to him when he again and again points out to him the philosophical limitations attaching to all historical work, thus reminding us that if the historian were also a believer, and were fully conscious of his faith, in his scientific work also much would become plain which he had not seen before, and he would no longer 'see' much which he thought he saw. *The historical instinct is an imponderable which is also strongly influenced by one's general view of the world and by faith, and upon the historical instinct finally all historical scientific work depends.*" [1]

A. W. H. Moule.

England.

[1] Emil Brunner, *The Mediator*, Lutterworth Press, p. 194.