Church histories : Bright and Robertson.

Contributors

Clay, John
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

[Place of publication not identified] : [publisher not identified], [1861?]

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ynsxgd3x

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
https://wellcomecollection.org

John Clay Hoyle

With the author's compliments

8.

CHURCH HISTORIES.

BRIGHT AND ROBERTSON.

1. *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church.* By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street; J. H. & J. Parker, Oxford.

2. *History of the Christian Church to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great,* A.D. 590. By J. C. Robertson, M.A. Vicar of Bekesbourne, in the Diocese of Canterbury. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street.

3. *A History of the Church from the Edict of Milan,* A.D. 313, *to the Council of Chalcedon,* A.D. 451. By William Bright, M.A. Fellow of University College, Oxford, late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Scottish Church. Oxford and London: J. H. & J. Parker.

4. *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History.* By Dr. John C. L. Gieseler. Translated from the German by Samuel Davidson, LL.D. Professor of Biblical Literature and Ecclesiastical History in the Lancashire College. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

5. *Compendium of the History of Doctrines.* By J. R. Hagenbach. Translated by Carl W. Bach. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

We remember to have once heard broached the sapient opinion, that lectures given to ecclesiastical students should never take in less than four or five centuries each: the idea of giving anything like a picture of the times under view, or a description of the questions agitated, being of course to be eschewed. Had Mr. Bright, for one, acted on this erudite plan—to say nothing of the ruinous effects that must have ensued to the minds of the pupils, to whom his book was originally in substance delivered—we should have lost a very useful, though compendious, work.

In sober sadness—but that the abuse of a thing is no good argument against its use—we could almost wish that none of our modern Church histories, or other manuals, had ever been written; but that we had been left, like our forefathers, to work out our information from the original sources, each for ourselves.

For one of the pernicious results of the cloud of theological manuals, histories, commentaries, compendia, and cram-books of every kind, which overshadow the schools, has been to call into

being a vast array of half-divines—pretenders to a knowledge which they do not possess. These sciolists go just as deep as their authorities happen to be able to take them, and no deeper. When they have used up the sources from which they have got what little they know, they do not continue to add to their knowledge, but rest content. Their quotations are trite and second-hand. They possess no knowledge of antiquity, and therefore they have no true value for it or for its teaching. Their opinions, if they can be really said to have any, are such as are likely to be gleaned from works which are composed with the object of pleasing the greatest number possible. They are content with passing for men of learning with the world at large, and are quite unaware of the fact that, when thrown with men who have laboured to acquire from first sources what they have trusted to their cram-books for, they are sure to be seen in their true light, and set down at their real value.

As far as they foster such a race, Church histories, we repeat it, and other short cuts to knowledge, are rather a bane than a benefit. But to the diligent and earnest student, who has higher aims than that of being a mere manualist divine, and who would use his history as it may and ought to be used (not as if the writer were himself the final authority, but simply the accidental narrator of events, and the indicator of questions which have to be studied in their fulness at the fountain head), it will undoubtedly prove a great help in the attainment of that knowledge which, if he be a Christian layman, can never be out of place; and if he be a clergyman, it is his plain duty to do his best to acquire.

Mr. Bright's history was, as we have said, given substantially in the shape of lectures to his pupils at Trinity College, Glenalmond; and we put him forward because our following remarks will be chiefly addressed to those of the same class, who are looking about for a good Church history to take as their guide in their future studies.

Setting aside as unworthy of serious notice the impracticable nonsense mentioned above, which would be acted on by no one whose mind held any acquaintance with the facts and doctrines of ecclesiastical history as contained in their original records; or who had any idea as to what Church history in its fulness is; and who did not wish simply to injure the minds of his pupils by pouring into them diffuseness of thought, moral laxity of tone and inexactness; nor was content to substitute the bare and superficial facts of manuals, cram-books, and secondhand aids of all descriptions, for the fulness and richness of the pages of those who lived amongst the events they described: we will venture to say a few words, not unfounded on experience, as to

the principle on which theological lectures should be constructed, and of what they should consist.

The object of such lectures is not to make the student a finished divine. That is evidently out of the question: want of time alone would render such a result impossible. No young man remains a student longer than two or three years, and it is but little that the most diligent can do in that time towards the perfect mastery of his subject. The lectures are to form and train the perhaps hitherto undisciplined mind to accuracy of thought and diligence of investigation; not doing his work *for* the student, but showing him how he may best do it for himself; not attempting to make him at the time, but putting him in the way of making himself thereafter, a theological scholar. Their object is to point out to the student to what he should especially give attention, and what are the best authorities in each phase and branch of the subject; and not least, through respect due to the presence of his lecturer, to whom as his senior and superior he is bound to look up, to raise his moral tone, and inspire him with feelings of awe and reverence for his subject. Should the lectures fail in any one of these respects, it may be safely asserted that they will do no good at all, but much mischief.

Ecclesiastical history may, in some degree, be compared to anatomy. As it is necessary that a perfect surgeon should possess a knowledge of every nerve, vein, and muscle, and nothing can be too minute or too unimportant for examination, but rather, the more minute any portion of the subject may be, the more it is likely to repay the trouble of careful and elaborate study and analysis—so it is with ecclesiastical history; the instructor ought to have mastered every principle which has been in discussion, and to know, and as far as his mental powers allow, to retain and be able to apply every fact, and educe from it its historical consequences or its moral results. Perfect knowledge of ecclesiastical history contains the knowledge of the Divine dealings with men as far as they have hitherto been developed and can be discerned; and surely none of these can be of too little importance to be worth our consideration. If, as is likely to be the case, time does not allow the teacher to extend his instruction over any very considerable period, we conceive that he can do nothing so likely to profit the minds of his pupils as to confine himself to some one great period of history, and thoroughly master it in all its details; that, for instance, from the first to the fourth general council, or even a part of it, say, as perhaps the most important period of the whole history of the Church, the sixty years between the first and second general councils.

Thus the student would have an opportunity of learning the importance of dogmatic theology. He would acquire some in-

sight into the first principles of that faith which is founded on the incarnation, passion, and resurrection of God the Son, and the different truths which this or that heresy offends against and would destroy. He would learn the necessity, and the profound importance of definitions, and be taught to construct them for himself. He would watch the gradual development of ecclesiastical offices and power. He would be taught what was the construction and the moral weight of councils, diocesan, provincial, and œcumenical. He would contemplate the virtues and graces, the patience, fortitude, and submission so wonderfully displayed by the greater of the names of the Church of the period he chooses to study, the exercise of which is by no means confined to days of controversy and persecution, but which every member of God's priesthood is to this day in some degree, more or less, called on to practise; and, most important of all, he would by concomitant study, which the teacher should never forget, of the commentaries on Holy Scripture, written by the Fathers of the age he is studying, have his eyes, in some degree, opened to the wonderful depths and varied treasures of the Holy Scriptures themselves, and learn how those Fathers applied them to the establishing of the particular truth which required building up, or to the overthrow of the heresies which called for confutation, in their day. A course of instruction like this would be found to furnish no bad test of the fitness of those who were candidates for future ordination. The careless, the idle, the sensual, the incompetent, in a word, the unworthy, might rebel against such a course of undoubted labour; but the diligent and the earnest-minded, those who really desired to make themselves efficient members of the priesthood, would, we may fearlessly say, find in it a life-long advantage. Such men would thus gain an impetus to theological study, which could hardly fail to bring forth fruit in their after lives. Devoutness of mind, deeper appreciation of the Christian scheme, humility, love, zeal for truth, if even for themselves and in their own minds alone, would be among their rich rewards: to say nothing of the lesser acquirements of exactness of mind and thought; terseness of expression in their sermons, pastoral and other addresses; accuracy of scholarship for purposes of criticism; and, with these, increased powers of teaching and wider influence, in other respects, for good.

The question immediately before us is, what have the works placed at the head of our article done to forward so good an end? How far have they succeeded, and if they have in any degree failed, are there any, or what histories, so far, or in such respects, to be preferred to them? or is any class of works to be studied with them to supply their deficiencies in any particular line?

To answer this question will take us into a not, we trust, unprofitable discussion as to the merits and defects of some of the most important of the Church histories.

Those which on the whole are likely to have the most extensive use, are, we suppose, among Romanist authors, Baronius and Pagi, Fleury, Tillemont, Alexander Natalis: the Magdeburgh Centuriators, Spanheim, Basnage, Neander, and Mosheim, in his De Rebus and Dissertationes ,of the opposite class; the Bollandists, Mabillon, Cave, Dupin, the Benedictine Editors, Butler, and the Martyrologists as Biographers: of our own Church, Burton, Bright, and Robertson; and lastly, we fear, Gieseler, Hagenbach, and writers of their stamp.

Of all the Church histories that are, or perhaps ever will be written, Fleury is probably the most popular and the most widely read. Not that he gives a truer, fuller, or more profound view than others of the principles, actions, or characters which he discusses and describes. Far otherwise, he pretends to no extraordinary discernment in or art of describing character; he does not show himself a profound divine; he has no great powers of description; he is no dialectician or master of pathos. His whole work contains nothing that can be compared in its way with the description of S. Anselm's life and trials by our own Collier, or with the death of Bishop Fisher in Fuller. Still, wherever there is anything of a theological library, Fleury is sure to be found, to be consulted on all matters of doubt, and perhaps to be regularly and seriously studied.

One, but not the only reason of this (or it would apply with equal force to the work of Tillemont), probably is, that French is more familiar to the great bulk of readers than the Latin of Baronius, Pagi, Natalis, and others, who have chosen that as the language of their works. But the chief reason of the place which Fleury holds amongst historiographers is to be found, in our opinion, in his pleasant and airy narrative style. Analysed with strictness, his history will mostly be found to be little more at bottom than a statement of bare facts, as they might be acquired by no very profound or varied study of the originals; but its real poverty is so artfully concealed by a flowing narrative—there are such pleasant and enticing digressions in the shape of anecdotes and remarkable passages in the lives of the Saints—the chief writings of the Doctors are so takingly, though superficially, analysed, that, like a general who extends his line to mask his want of strength, he gives the ordinary reader an idea that his learning is much greater and his thought and observation much more profound and extensive than they really are.

And, although a Roman Catholic, he does not, like Baronius, strain every nerve and do all but pervert actual historical

documents to prove that the Pope always possessed those powers and that place in the Church which he has of late years claimed. On the contrary, as a Gallican of the seventeenth century, he, by implication, if not directly, lowers rather than exaggerates the papal demands. His deficiency consists in relating the facts, whether of general history or of private life, without order or method, or attempt at philosophical system. He errs in this extreme as much as Neander does in the opposite one. He gives us no adequate idea of the councils; he contents himself with giving a bare narrative of their acts. He instils no life into their debates: their actors seem shadows, and not men. We gain from him no information as to canon law. He leaves chronology pretty much to take care of itself. Still the ease of his style and the pleasant manner in which he keeps the reader's attention alive, and makes even a dull period interesting, are without equal among ecclesiastical historians, and are worthy of all praise. Hence we recommend our younger readers to lose no opportunity of acquainting themselves with his pages. He will do as well as any other to break up the ground for them, and will preserve them from carrying away the idea, as they might do for instance from Cave or Mosheim, that no history of the early Church can have in it anything of heart or life.

Tillemont's work is, in some respects, a far greater one than Fleury's. His learning was much more accurate and extensive. He has nothing whatever of that superficial method of handling a subject which is vulgarly but emphatically called 'touch and go,' and which appears too often in the pages of Fleury. He knows that to have mastered thoroughly some one period of Church history is far more beneficial to the student than to have skimmed over the whole of it; and, in consequence, he does his work so thoroughly as he goes on, that a learner can strike in anywhere and take him as his guide for any period he pleases, sure of finding a truthful narrator, and (what is no small advantage to the beginner) of being made acquainted with the best general authorities, and not seldom of being introduced to a particular work which it is well worth while to study on its own account. It is impossible to consult his pages for any name or event in history, however trivial, without learning as much of them as can be known. He overlooks positively nothing. If he has a fault, it is that he is too minute, and, at times, too little discriminating of what is and what is not worthy of laborious narration. The gift at least of honesty cannot be denied him. So careful is he not to appear to give his own opinion for historic truth, that his plan is, to relate the events of each age in the *ipsissima verba* of the writers of the time, which he ingeniously dovetails

together, adopting the use of brackets wherever he adds anything of his own. To his text he subjoins notes, which seldom fail to contain valuable and original information. Among these, his chronological disquisitions, in which he follows, for the most part and as far as they serve him, a greater name than his own, Bishop Pearson, will be found most accurate and important. But the life and animation of a history must always proceed from the author's powers of placing before his mind's eye and realizing for himself the events he describes; and the plan of Tillemont's work renders it simply impossible for him to endue his pages with much of life-likeness. He does not vivify, or attempt to vivify, the characters he introduces, but passes them before our view as figures are passed over the field of a magic lantern, or as puppets are moved on the stage, of whose actions the showman, and not themselves, must be the interpreter. His characters are lay-figures, and not living men, *ὁμοιοπαθεῖς* with ourselves. As a putter together of facts he is perfectly unrivalled; but beyond the praise due to a compiler he has little claim. If, for instance, we compare his account of Arianism with Dr. Newman's, we see at once the difference between the mere collector of names, dates, and facts, and the thoughtful and philosophical historian. As a Gallican, his views are much the same as those of Fleury, perhaps in a slight degree more papal. As a whole, his work is one of so great value that we cannot consider a list of ecclesiastical historians at all perfect which, numerous as they are, does not include his volumes.

A more original mind than his is seen to be at work in the ponderous folios of Baronius. For thirty years he laboured indefatigably at this colossal undertaking, and he is said in the course of that long period to have gone over the history of the Church no less than seven times. It is divided, not like that of the Magdeburgh Centuriators into centuries, but according to the more easy and obvious arrangement of years; each year having assigned to it its own events, its date, and the names of the pope and emperor or emperors at the time. It is a history of the Universal Church, and not of the Greek or Latin Church alone; and it is no slight praise that one of the great scholars of the last century used to say of it, that although he had nothing more to learn, he could never open the pages of Baronius without finding in them some fresh food for thought. One of the most remarkable features in his history is his having brought to light, from the Vatican and other sources, a multiplicity of documents which before his time were utterly unknown. Had they all indeed been genuine, their importance would have been very great, but many are evidently forgeries, and he had not the critical skill necessary to enable him to detect imposture, and decide

between the genuine and the spurious. Moreover, his almost entire ignorance of the language of the Greeks compelling him to rely on the Latin versions of their works, renders his citations from them of little value. Indeed, he seldom tries his hand at that language, and when he does, is apt to make most remarkable and ridiculous mistakes. The weak point of his work is the ecclesiastical opinions maintained in it. The author adopts, as is known to all, the most extreme view of the papal power and prerogatives. To support them against the Centuriators formed, by his own confession, the great object of his work. Hence it is rather an apology for Ultramontanism, than an exponent of the principles on which the Church is based, and by which it is governed. And the author is no lukewarm or wavering champion of these views. They appear in almost every line, and to support them, theories are often invented, facts all but perverted, and the plain testimony of antiquity overruled, ignored, or escaped from without hesitation, and just as the particular case requires. We do not think, indeed, that to the Anglican reader his arguments will carry much conviction. For they will see the lamentable shifts to which he is often reduced, to account on his own principles for the events he is describing. Thus in his account of the First Œcumenical Council, finding that Eustathius of Antioch, Bishop only of the Third See, had the first place at the right hand of the bishops, before the Metropolitan of Alexandria and even the legates of Rome, which would be well-nigh fatal to his previous theory of the Pope as universal bishop and μόναρχος of the whole Church, having caused Constantine to assemble the council, (a discovery which it was certainly left to Baronius to make,) he is much perplexed to account for so anomalous and extraordinary an arrangement. First he suggests that it cannot have been because he was *præses* of the council, for Eustathius himself confesses that he had not taken the trouble to acquire much information about the bishops who were present, which the president must have done.[1] Secondly, Baronius admits that it cannot have been because he sang the hymn before the emperor at the opening of the council;[2] or because he made an oration to Constantine;[3] for Eusebius of Cæsarea also appears to have done the same. He has therefore to seek for a reason further a-field; and the kind of facts which he presses into his service, and the reasoning he constructs from them, strike us as being extremely original and characteristic. He finds that at the Council of Chalcedon the legates of the Roman see sat on the left, the Bishop of Constantinople next, and then the Bishop of

[1] Theodoret. Hist. I. vii. (8). [2] Eusebius, Vit. Cons. III. xi. [3] Ibid.

Antioch, who, however, was his superior in rank, whilst the Bishop of Alexandria, the highest of all, took the first place on the right. This last fact is decisive of the question with him. For as the Bishop of Alexandria was at this time under accusation of heresy, Baronius considers it settled that at councils the place of honour was on the left. The reason of this arrangement may, he suggests, have been derived either from the left hand having been the more honourable in the ancient heathen sacrifices, or from Jacob having laid his left hand on the head of Manasseh, who received the higher blessing, and his right on that of Ephraim, who had the lesser.

And in confirmation of this view, he adduces the facts that the Bishop of Jerusalem, in the Second Nicene Council, stated that he had seen a picture of the Blessed Virgin Mary on the left, and John the Baptist on the right: that in the Western Church the men occupied the left side, and the women the right; and in the sacred pictures S. Paul was placed on the right, and S. Peter on the left. Instances innumerable of the like manner of arguing are to be found in his pages: this is but one of many. Of course with these cases in point, it is proved that the papal representatives did, as such, take the first place in council; that the powers of the Pope at that time were therefore all that he now asserts them to be; and that he was, in consequence, the one chief bishop of the whole of Christendom: that all spiritual power, and, indeed, all temporal too (it is a small matter), are, or ought to be in subjection to him, and he ought to rule the entire Church and all crowned heads as he pleases, *nutu suo*. Baronius' instances, when urged to their conclusion, prove either this or nothing; it is for our readers to say which. In fact, his championship of the Ultramontane cause is such as to damage rather than to advance it; for it will be at once concluded, that if so learned and zealous an advocate can say so little for it; if it has no better proof than his conjectures, and is supported to so great a degree by documents either evidently forged, or of no known value, it has but little claim to be accepted. Wherever it be found, it is not in history. Indeed there is, to our minds, no more complete indirect disproof of the Petrine claims anywhere to be found, than in the pages of this their most strenuous advocate. Had there been anything whatever to be said for them, the diligence and research of Baronius must have found it out.

But despite the defects inseparable from every production which is the result of mere partisanship, we place in the very first rank—for some things first of all—among ecclesiastical histories that of Baronius. No other that we know of approaches it in varied information. Its author does not, like

Tillemont, tie himself down to a mere repetition of the words of the writer of the times he is describing, and when he has dovetailed them into one another consider his task done. He infuses into his narrative much of the vigour of his own mind, and makes his dramatis personæ not dead puppets, but living, thinking, acting beings.

Baronius too, we should remember, wrote under great disadvantages. With the exception of the Centuriators, none of the Church histories which now meet us at every turn had then any existence. He was almost the first to sink a shaft in that mine, which since his time has been so abundantly, if not so profitably, worked.

But Baronius should not be studied alone. It is impossible that a leader on a road so extended and hitherto so little travelled should not sometimes err; and to afford corrections here and there as needed, Pagi, of the order of the Franciscans or Friars Minors, composed his elaborate work. In this he exactly follows the order of Baronius, so that the two works can be studied year by year and page by page. Pagi is a kind of reviewer of Baronius on a large scale; and as such he corrects what appears to him erroneous and supplies what he thinks deficient in his author. The chronology of Baronius is the chief thing he discusses; and certainly one result of his strictures is to show how accurate in the main Baronius was in his calculations. But Pagi is not the only critic of Baronius among the writers of his own communion. The Church of Rome takes this author as its chief historical text-book; and all who have laboured in the same great field since his day—Tillemont, Fleury, N. Alexander—do not hesitate directly or by implication to protest against the exaggerated claims set up by him for the Papacy, and to set him right on other points on which he seems to them to go astray. In addition to these, such of our younger readers as may wish to study Baronius critically in his account of the earlier part of the first century, would do well to compare him with the work of Isaac Casaubon, which was written with the avowed intention of confuting Baronius, but was carried by its author no further than the year 34. We will dismiss our brief notice of this father of Roman Catholic historians, by recalling to the minds of our readers the advice of Selden, that 'we should study Baronius 'on one side of the question, and the Magdeburgh Centuriators 'on the other, and judge for ourselves as to where between them 'the truth lay.'

But among the historians of a larger scale we confess that we value very highly the learned and often profound dissertations of N. Alexander. In two folio volumes he discusses the history

and theology of the older covenant, and seven others he dedicates to the history of the Christian Church, her doctrines and customs, down to and inclusive of the Council of Trent. But although so voluminous and extensive, his work is much less oppressive to the student's purse than many histories that do not possess a tithe of its value. He follows the plan of the Centuriators in dividing his work according to centuries, instead of years like Baronius; but he does not, like other historians, content himself with simply giving a narrative of events according to their order. With him history is subsidiary to doctrine. And—which gives him his peculiar place as a historian—whilst he has a synopsis of the history of each century, he adds to it numerous and very valuable dissertations on the chief matters of importance, the doctrines, customs, antiquities and powers of the Church, the schisms, the different disputes, and doubtful questions of fact, criticism, and the like. These dissertations are mostly very full and satisfactory, and show their author to have been possessed not only of great learning, but also of a mind of much keenness and penetration. It is seldom that anything in his historical synopsis can be corrected, or that much can be added to his dissertations; and although he presupposes in his readers considerable acquaintance with history and theology, and writes rather for the theologian who already understands the subject, and who can therefore appreciate his speculations, than the beginner who has yet to make acquaintance with those first facts and first principles, the knowledge of which he takes for granted; yet, the study of these dissertations even by a learner will not be without the great advantage of teaching him how to arrange his facts in his mind so as to have them well connected, harmonized, and ready for use, and how to construct his definitions. His Panoplia also, or dissertations on the subject of the different heresies of each century, is very carefully drawn out, and is not beyond the depth of any who will take ordinary pains to master a branch of the subject which is not perhaps easy or pleasant in itself, but a knowledge of which is essential to the theologian.

It will not, we suppose, tend to our author's discredit with our readers to be told that he is one of those great Gallican Doctors who, from time to time, raised their voices against the exorbitance of some of the papal claims. In this he agrees with Launoy, Richer in his work on the Councils, which though condemned to be burnt was never answered, Peter Marc, Dupin, and others.

But we should warn our readers that Alexander Natalis, whilst he is in all questions of the papal power and supremacy a strong opponent to Ultramontanism, does in some questions

of doctrine certainly take that line which, being supportable only by papal dicta as opposed to the voice of the Church at large in the writings of her Fathers and in the decrees of her Councils, necessarily tends to the result which on other grounds and shown in other subject-matter he strongly opposes. For instance, he has dedicated some pages of his synopsis of the history of the fourteenth century, to the defence of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary against John de Montesinos. On the other hand he as staunchly affirms all bishops to be possessed of the same intrinsic spiritual powers as the Pope, who, he maintains, differs from his brother prelates only in his pre-eminence and primacy as the successor of S. Peter, the bishop of the chief see, and the centre of ecclesiastical unity. In a thesis on this subject he says:—

'"Jus (ligandi et solvendi) in Apostolos reliquos et in omnes Ecclesiæ principes, id est Episcopos, ab eodem fonte derivatum esse. Falsa itaque, temeraria, verbo Dei contraria, propositio est quæ ab hoc privilegio excludit Episcopos et Concilia, in quibus manet Petri privilegium cum ex ipsius æquitate ferunt judicium. Hæc propositio; "Ad solam sedem Apostolicam divino immutabili privilegio spectat de controversiis fidei judicare," episcopos et concilia excludit. Hac ergo ratione falsa est, erronea, verbo Dei contraria'—and he concludes emphatically—'Propositio igitur quæ hanc potestatem soli sedi apostolicæ attribuit, absolute et per se falsa et erronea est.'[1]

We think on the whole that if we were confined to a single ecclesiastical historian, we should prefer N. Alexander; for whilst his historical narrative is quite sufficient, and is for the most part exceedingly correct (though we admit that in this part of his work he does require to be watched and occasionally checked), his doctrinal dissertations are at once more full, more profound, and more lucidly expressed than anything of the kind to be met with in the historians with whom we have any acquaintance. In fact, treating it as he has done, he may be truly said to have made this branch of his subject his own. It seems strange indeed that in a Church boasting of such unity of opinions in her pale, there should be historians varying as widely from each other on one of their own first principles as Fleury, Tillemont, and Alexander Natalis on the one hand, and Baronius, Pagi, &c. on the other. To solve this difficulty however, is clearly not our business.

We now pass on to works with which our readers are, perhaps, more likely to be acquainted. We will take them in the order of the chronology of their subjects. No better guides to accurate knowledge of the history of the first and second centuries can, in our opinion, be had than the dissertations of Bishop Pearson, contained in his 'Opuscula' and

[1] Sæc. xiv. Dissert. xii.

'Cyprianicæ Dissertationes' prefixed to Bishop Fell's edition of that Father. His 'Annales Paulini' forms one of the most carefully compiled and accurate commentaries, as to chronology, on the Book of Acts that we possess, combined with which is a short analytic account of the life and acts of S. Paul; whilst the 'Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum,' concluding with Saul's departure, after his conversion, into Arabia, contains much valuable information that we should with difficulty find elsewhere, illustrative of the general foundation and early progress of the Christian Church. Succeeding to these come the two full and most elaborate dissertations, 'De Serie et Successione Primorum Romæ Episcoporum;' and it is not too much to say, that when the reader has mastered these, there is nothing more to be learnt on the period of which they treat.

And we advise those who really desire to make themselves acquainted with the history of the Church in the first three centuries, by no means to neglect the Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, which they may read with or without his Bampton Lectures, of Dr. Burton. We think that justice has hardly been done to this work as a repertory of facts. The author seems to have ransacked almost every known source from which to compile a history, and it contains in consequence an amount of information which we seek in vain in works of far greater pretence. It is, indeed, scarcely possible to consult its pages on any point at all connected with the main subject without receiving full satisfaction. A somewhat extensive experience of its value on this account induces us to give it a higher place among ecclesiastical historians than would, perhaps, be accorded to it by the majority of our readers. We think that in this respect it bears the palm from the less complete, but pleasantly written, we might say fascinating production on the same subject by the late Professor Blunt. It possesses, too, that great advantage which more pretending works are too often without, copious and useful indices. Yet it must be admitted, that the book labours under serious faults. It is uninteresting in style, and, as we think, partially inaccurate in its chronology, at least in its account of the life of S. Paul; and the characters described in it, from lack of anything like vivid conception or freshness of description, are scarcely more to the reader than automata; they are sadly wanting in the realities of men of flesh and blood.

Neander is more likely to find favour with general readers than Burton, especially with those of a metaphysical turn of mind. We shall not attempt to present our readers with graphic descriptions of himself, or the accidents of his history, like the one lately drawn by the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in

Oxford; for our business is to pass on to simple matters of fact: to state what we think the place among histories of the work of the great German, and what it has proved itself to us after some years of acquaintance with it. We should advise a beginner not to give much time to this author. He will, it is true, at first be greatly fascinated by his speculations; but his feelings will soon change. He will find himself perplexed by discussions which to him for a time can have little or no meaning. But when he has mastered the details of his work, and broken up his ground, then he will find it profitable to read Neander *with* other historians. His work, in truth, is not history, but his own deductions from, theories of, and refinements upon, history. Much of it is merely the result of the workings of his own mind alone. He does not give a statement of facts, or a description of events or of characters, but of what he supposes, or assumes, to have been the principles or the motives of the personages of his history. He substitutes philosophy, or rather, philosophising, for statements of facts; and in many of his refinements his correctness as to fact is a question. Not seldom, too, he is tempted to make a display of originality, where our own great divines had anticipated him; but, as might be expected, without his parade. The fault of his history is its unsubstantiality. Everything in it is seen as it were through a mist or haze. He must start an abstract idea, or originate some theory about almost every character of antiquity that he introduces on the actual stage. The personages of history who (to return to our former comparison) in the hands of Baronius are often like the bizarre figures of a dream, or a magic lantern, and in the pages of Cave or Burton are stone statues, rigid, lifeless, and immovable, become in his hands shadowy and unsubstantial figures, who exist not in themselves, but only in his theories as to their actions; aërial, transparent beings, through whom, by the light of his philosophising, we appear to see. Let Neander, we say, by all means be read, and be read carefully. He will teach the student of history to think, and suggest ideas the truthfulness of which it is wholesome and useful exercise to test. But by no means let him be read alone, or taken as the sole guide in the paths of ecclesiastical history. To attempt to attain to a knowledge of ecclesiastical history by his guidance alone would be like trying to hold water in the hand.

The Centuriators, and Basnage against Baronius, are each worthy of notice. They are both to be classed in the ranks of extreme Protestant writers. We should think the sum expended by a private person in purchasing the ponderous folios of the former, though not of any great amount, simply thrown away. The zeal of the Centuriators cannot be

doubted, but their learning was quite insufficient for the task they undertook—far inferior to that of our own great seventeenth-century divines; and in consequence they not seldom perplex the student, and mislead him into the mistake of imagining questions to be open which are not so, and of supposing that nothing more is known about particular points than they themselves know. If used at all, they should be checked, corrected, and filled up by the works of our own divines.

Basnage appears to us far more worthy of study. Indeed some profit is always to be obtained from him, which is not the case with the Centuriators. But he, also, writes in extremes, and in consequence more than one of the Romish divines have, from time to time, attacked and exposed his assertions. Anything said by him should be carefully verified, and therefore he cannot be considered, if taken singly and alone, a safe and reliable guide. Yet read with Baronius, whose work he has it mainly in view to correct, he will often be found very useful. The more so, as he arranges his history year by year, just as Baronius did, in order to afford the more easy reference to the work of the great cardinal. In fact, these two together, as far as Basnage goes, *i.e.* nearly to the end of the sixth century, would form by no means a bad Church history.

Another author of the same general class is Spanheim. His work, in the three folio volumes, may often be picked up for a few shillings. Each volume contains a different class of subjects. The first is dedicated to Ecclesiastical History, Chronology, and Geography, and its possession may save a student, to whom the cost would be a serious consideration, the necessity of procuring Charles à Paul, or any more modern geographer; for the maps, although rude and old-fashioned, with their contemplative lions, and human-faced serpents in the corners, will be found sufficiently useful and accurate for the purpose of attaining an ordinary knowledge of the geography of the early Church. The history is so far more complete than Basnage's, that he interspersses it with discussions on the doctrines and antiquities of the early Church. Some of the dissertations, indeed, in the second volume show a great amount of learning, and are of considerable value. That, for instance, in which he discusses, against the papal claims, the force of the Sixth Canon of Nice, may be said to exhaust the subject, and is alone worth the cost of the whole work. Spanheim has in one respect attempted to do that to which none of our more modern historians have thought needful, it seems, to turn their attention. He has in his second volume a diatribe on certain Liturgical ceremonies of the early Church; and though he views the subject quite in the spirit of a non-

conformist, and would have the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Holy Communion abolished, or left, at least, to the discretion of each particular worshipper: yet the praise is due to him of having broken ground on a portion of the history of the Church which other historians have passed over in contented silence. Again, the elaborate and learned dissertation on the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, contained in his second volume, is well worth careful study, by all who wish to see how greatly preponderating an evidence there is in favour of ascribing it to S. Paul, and how the modern shallow and flippant argument against his authorship, drawn from the variation in this epistle from his usual style (as if S. Paul, like any other writer, could not vary his style whenever he saw occasion for doing so), is dealt with by a man of real learning. And we would recommend those who possess this history, and are curious about S. Paul's meaning as to the baptism for the dead (1 Cor. xv. 29), to consult Spanheim's dissertation on the subject. Although we do not suppose that any one will easily be induced to adopt his view of the passage, which is that τῶν νεκρῶν should be read (by enallage) τοῦ νέκρου and should refer to Christ, and so the meaning simply is, what shall they do who are baptized into Christ, or received Christian baptism; yet we know no modern author by whom the subject has been treated so methodically, or who has brought to bear upon it such a vast number of authorities both ancient and modern.

From the giants of the seventeenth century to the men of our own age and times, the descent is great. Foremost among the latter in some respects stands Mosheim, especially in the works which embrace particular periods only, his 'De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum,' and his 'Institutiones.' His history has been so well and in the main so truly described by the late Hugh Rose, that any words of ours would be superfluous:—

'Let any one take up Mosheim—and I mention his name without any disrespect, for he has done whatever could be done in his way, by actually wedging and driving in one fact after another into his pages, till they bristle with facts, and the heart and the imagination are alike beaten down and crushed to pieces—and see, when one has read his careful and laborious conglomeration of facts, what more we know of Christianity, as a rule of life intended to influence both individuals and nations, gradually to operate upon laws and customs, and institutions and manners, and gradually to cheer and bless all the sons of men.

'We toil through his pages with a reluctant and weary spirit, without ever going beneath the surface, or beyond dry details, without one movement of the heart for the cause which he is recording, and with lively pleasure only when we can lay the book out of our hands.

'In a word, in Mosheim there is no love of the cause, or, if the man had a heart, the writer thought it his duty to overlay his feelings with dry details of

barren facts, without the record of a single moral lesson to which they can lead, or a feeling which they can inspire.'

If anything is stated at all too strongly in this extract, it is, we think, in the last paragraph. It appears to us that the faults he ascribes to Mosheim himself were the result rather of the nature or, to speak more correctly, of the scale of his work. He had to compress into a space much too small, the history of nearly eighteen centuries, and what could be expected as the result but that which we actually have? A narrative overloaded with facts, which makes the work, indeed, of value as one of reference merely, but destroys all hopes of its utility as a history. But in his De Rebus and Institutiones, where he worked on a better scale, we see that after all the author had a heart and a love for his cause; neither of them were, perhaps, very warm, and the mere literary antiquary preponderates too much over the man and the theologian even in them; but they have their value, such, and of such a nature as it is. We do not know where again to find a more full discussion of many of the points treated of in these works. By one man's weakness another may be made strong; and there is no need because a given historian presents his work in a dry and lifeless form, and reduces what should be living and breathing men to mere blocks of stone, that therefore the reader should not bestow some life from himself upon the inanimate creations of his author. Indeed, unless he has in some degree the faculty of doing this, he will soon cease to study Church history.

Of the work of Milner it is unnecessary to say much. His readers are, in all probability, few, and real students of his pages are, we suppose, fewer still. His learning is notoriously insufficient, and his principles too narrow, and they differ too much from those of the early Church, to make him any guide at all as a historian of her views and actions. The shifts to which he is put to conceal the narrowness of his reading, have been so thoroughly exposed as to have made his name anything but happy among Church historians. Indeed, his work is not in any true sense of the term, a history at all. The narration of a few leading facts is made the vehicle for thrusting on his reader at every turn, and however little applicable to the subject in hand, his own opinions, which are made the test and touchstone, in one manner or another, sooner or later, of almost every character he introduces. His narrative is too flimsy to be called a history or to merit any place among historians, and considerably the larger portion of the work consists of doctrinal discussions and reflections of a cast peculiar to a zealous and thorough-going Calvinist.

Hagenbach's 'History of Doctrines' is a work very likely to fall in the way of our readers. It is translated by a member of the Lancashire Independent College, under the superintendence of Dr. Davidson; and with Gieseler's, which comes from the same source, is to be classed as a text-book, rather than as a history. This account of their publication will form at once a barrier to their reception by most of our readers; and there is little in their contents to redeem this objection. They both take that low view of the higher doctrines of the Christian faith which might be expected; but in particulars they differ from each other. Hagenbach divides his work into periods. The first two, which is all with which we are at present concerned, extend respectively to the death of Origen and to the Pelagian controversy, and the statements are exactly such as might be expected from a German neologist, endorsed by a Protestant Dissenter. The one tendency of the book is simply to Socinianism. We would not wrong the well-meaning and 'orthodox' among the Dissenters by supposing for a moment, that if they knew the contents and bearing of this most pernicious and heretical work, they would allow their sons to be brought up under its teaching and influence. The idea of the Sacraments as held by the Church is, of course, out of the question; but whilst our Lord is formally, and in some vague sense, acknowledged in the text to have had 'a higher nature,' such notes as the following from Lücke, to say nothing of deductions from the text by the author and translator, show what is really meant:—

'The more I endeavour to realize the manner of thinking and speaking current in the New Testament, the more I feel myself called upon to give it as my decided opinion, that the historical Son of God, as such, cannot be called God, without completely destroying the monotheistical system of the Apostles.'

One such note as this, cited without protest, and therefore of course as what is true, is to us, and will be, we think, to our readers, enough at once to speak the utter condemnation of the whole work, and certainly to show the theological bearing of Dr. Davidson, and all concerned in its publication. We say, too, (and those concerned in its publication must make the best they can of it,) that the book is thoroughly dishonest, and with a dishonesty of the meanest and most cowardly nature. The author does not venture to say at once as a man of courage would: 'The Church or early Fathers held such and such opinions; the fact cannot be denied, but they were wrong;' in which case he would at least gain a hearing for himself; but he states indirectly, by *suppressio veri*, by implication—in short, by every indirect manner possible, that they held what they did not

hold, and does not state what they did hold. Frequently, too, we have found citations which are asserted to carry, or are made to carry quite different ideas to those contained in the full text of the original authors. Monstrous assumptions are laid down as plain and incontestable truths, and if a given fact or statement cannot be denied in its historical phase, it is immediately explained away. If the early Fathers held what is here laid to their charge, they would have been as far from holding the principles of the Apostles, as is the author of the book himself. Thus it is of course known to all who are in any degree versed in the works of S. Clement of Alexandria, that both from his position as a teacher in the school of Alexandria, from the nature of his subject, and from his own personal feeling, he is more full and explicit on the subject of the Logos, than any other ante-Nicene Father. Yet, whilst giving a long and well-digested note on this subject, and following it up by another, in proof that the 'Logos' of S. Clement is the 'Son of God' of Origen, Hagenbach seeks to undo his own compulsory admissions, first, by the illogically expressed assertion that 'the subordination of 'the Son to the Father was the necessary consequence of a rigid 'adherence to the idea of a hypostasis' (§ 43); and secondly, by the utterly false and unsustainable assumption that S. Clement was only induced by his speculative tendency to call the Logos Himself 'the creator of the world' (§ 47), an assertion found in all the Fathers of the Church, and which follows of course, and as a necessary consequence, from the doctrine of His Godhead. It is notable, too, that even semi-Arian writers, such as Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his higher phase of doctrine, admit the same fact. Let our readers take courage: if they have by any evil chance for a moment become entangled by the sophistries and false assertions of this writer, let them diligently and with patience study the great work of Bishop Bull—the 'Defensio Fidei Nicænæ.' Here they will find all the questions which perplex the narrow powers of Hagenbach and his followers, fairly, honestly, and broadly stated, and as far as human faculties will allow, answered and explained. They will see that the points, not urged, but insinuated and implied as objections to the Christian scheme by these writers, are many of them verities intrinsically necessary and self-consistent, having also the outward testimony of ages; and that the real cause of the perplexity and errors of these moderns is simply their inability to cope with the subjects of which they have taken on themselves to be exponents. Thus will the honest inquirer learn how to answer such shallow sophistries as are contained in the work before us, and will obtain much of both sound and useful knowledge besides.

As we have bracketed this work with Mr. Robertson's and

Mr. Bright's, and intend to institute a comparison of an ecclesiastical history written by members of the Church, with one adopted by a Dissenter, we leave Hagenbach for the present, only adding further our conviction, that any competent unprejudiced person whatever who should undertake to compare the two, would at once confess that in truthfulness of statement, doctrinal soundness, moral tone and scholarship, the works of the Churchmen are immeasurably superior to the Dissenter's.

Gieseler may be classed generally with Hagenbach, although the difference between them as to doctrines is great enough to render it matter of wonder how the same person could have been instrumental in publishing both, and to make more inexplicable than it was before, what kind of thing a Dissenter's conscience, as to the doctrines of dogmatic theology, can be. There is one thing urged by Dr. Davidson in favour of Gieseler, which we think very significant. He tells us that, looking about for a text-book which he could put into the hands of his students, as the substratum of lectures on ecclesiastical history, he could find none so suitable to his purpose as the present. We are glad to know that no English Church history was found suitable to be used as a 'substratum for lectures on ecclesiastical history' by an Independent in his college, though we should have thought that Milner might have served his turn for want of a worse. The fitness of the German consists, we suppose, in his total ignorance, or ignoring of everything which we, as Churchmen, possess and value—the simple, clear, unwavering note of the the trumpet that proclaims the doctrines of our Lord and Saviour in His Natures and Person, the Apostolic and Primitive Doctrine of Sacraments, and the truth, doctrinal and practical, of a Church—any of which, the last especially, might make Dr. Davidson's pupils sit uneasily under his teaching, and haply cause some of them to desert their seats altogether.

We heartily congratulate Mr. Bright on the fact that his work has no chance of ever being made a text-book in the Lancashire Independent College. If it had, we at least should not fail to denounce it wherever our voice is heard, but he need not be alarmed that we shall have to condole with him on attaining to the martyrdom of a promotion such as this—of being coupled with a Hagenbach and Gieseler, commented on and familiarly used by Dr. Davidson, and helping to form the opinion of those who in due time are to go forth to the good task of sowing dissensions, and hindering the work of the Church wherever they can get a chance.

Mr. Robertson has given us a work which goes carefully over the ground from the Apostles' age to the pontificate of S. Gregory the Great. Its fault is, that it is compiled almost exclu-

sively from secondhand and modern sources. The references to original authorities are both few and meagre, and when we should be introduced to the great names of the period treated of, we are too frequently put off with those of Mosheim, Fleury, Tillemont, Neander, Gieseler, and the like.[1] He has given a narration of events rather than a history. His work would be the better for being rolled out. It has been written in too great a haste to press on; there is no repose about it, no breathing space allowed, no time for rest or reflection; but the reader is hurried on from one great question to another. Whilst a master of ecclesiastical history will find in it nothing that he did not know before, and now and then things that he will be inclined to dispute, the student who would be contented with it alone, would carry away, we should fear, little distinctness of impression from pages which state the great doctrinal questions too briefly, and with too much compression, and are frequently overloaded with a great mass of bare facts.

Mr. Robertson's is not a history of the Church, and he does not aspire to its being considered one. It is, what he himself terms it in its preface, a readable introduction to the subject; and praise is undoubtedly due to him for having produced a volume which cannot indeed supersede the necessity of the use of others, much less can stand in the place of original authorities; but which is an accurate and useful manual, and may be made, to a certain extent, a text-book on the outlines of Church history, to be filled up gradually, and at length, by subsequent study. The student who comes to it uninformed, may learn from it accurately and satisfactorily in what age each great Father or notorious heretic lived; what were their acts and distinctive teaching; what the definitions, with their meaning and object, maintained by the great doctors of the Church—S. Athanasius, S. Cyril, S. Augustine, &c.; what the tendency and result of each particular heresy. With this information to commence from, he may go on to build up a superstructure of real historical and doctrinal learning. We must, however, take the liberty of reminding Mr. Robertson that his almost exclusive fondness for moderns, especially those of the German school, will

[1] For instance, in his account of the heresy of Nestorius, and the acts of S. Cyril, Mr. Robertson has cited no one ancient authority whatever; the only approach to such being a reference to S. Cyril's anathemas, in Routh's Opuscula. In consequence, he has given no adequate idea of S. Cyril's writings on the question, their genius or tendency, or what they did for the truth. He concludes his account of the anathemas with reference as authorities—to whom? Fleury, Tillemont, Schröck, Neander, Gieseler, and Guericke! It is the fault of the time to build upon and refer to authors, whose *opinions* indeed are very valuable, but whose *testimony* to the facts for which they are cited cannot possibly be anything. Dr. Stanley in this respect stands out in strong and happy contrast to Mr. Robertson, and some other compilers and editors of the time.

tell not only to his own disadvantage as a historian, but also to that of the student who may take the work as his text-book, and who will be driven to other sources for that information about, and views of, the early writers which is here denied him.

A few of the works, then, most worthy of mention, which treat only of particular periods of Ecclesiastical History, are, Bp. Pearson's treatises in his Opuscula, Ittigius on the first two centuries, Dr. Burton's and Professor Blunt's works on the Ante-Nicene Church, Isaac Casaubon against Baronius, to A.D. 34; Mosheim's De Rebus and Dissertationes; Dr. Stanley's volume, which contains a good and interesting account of the first Council of Nice, but one not, in our judgment at least, to be compared with Tillemont's; and a very interesting epitome of the Russo-Greek Church, derived from the translation of Mouravieff, by Mr. Blackmore, and other sources. Mr. Neale's History of the Eastern Church is most valuable for its dissertations. His plan of treating the patriarchates separately is the great fault of his work, in that an adequate idea of the unity of the Eastern Church is thus lost. Jansenius is the great historical exponent of Pelagianism; and, on the whole, perhaps the best idea that can be obtained of the history of the final separation of the East from the West is to be gained from the pages of Leo Allatius.

There is another class of writers who, in a treatise however imperfect on ecclesiastical historians, must not be passed over —the Biographers. Dr. Stanley has said that the lives of good men 'are the salt not only of the world but of the Church.' And in words with which, however, we cannot at all agree, he adds that 'in the lives of the saints, we see close at hand, what on the 'public stage of history we see through every kind of distorted 'medium and deceptive refraction.' But if Ecclesiastical Biography has its advantages, it has also the contrary. No history of the Church could ever be evolved from the lives of individuals. Their biographers are too apt to make their actions out of scale and keeping. They can scarcely avoid giving distorted views of facts. His true place in the Church evidently cannot be assigned to the subject of a biography, or his character drawn in true proportion when he is the only figure on the canvas: everything seems subsidiary to the particular individual, and he often appears to be, as it were, the Church itself of his time, whilst he is perhaps in truth a comparatively subordinate and unimportant member of it. There is apt to be no background to the picture, nor proper grouping. Biography, though it should most assuredly be studied *with* history, should never be substituted for it. Those who have most successfully grappled with the difficulties of their subject are the Benedictine Editors, whose

lives, for instance, of S. Athanasius and S. Basil the Great, form, by the power of their, we may say, wonderful grouping, no mean or imperfect histories of the fourth century. After these come Mabillon, Dupin, and Cave, in his 'Lives of the Fathers and Apostles,' and his 'Historia Litteraria,' of the latter of which the continuation is greatly to be desired. We say nothing of the volumes of the Bollandists, because the object of our remarks is simply the practical one of assisting younger men in the study of Church history, and it is not probable that the purses of many will endure the tax, or their shelves afford the room for the ponderous folios of these endless compilers.

We should recommend our younger readers not to pass by an opportunity of procuring a copy (which may be done for very moderate terms) of the second or best edition of Cave's 'Historia Litteraria.' It has this great advantage over the longer and more elaborate work of Dupin, that, often by comparison of one life with another, in a shorter narrative, important facts of agreement or opposition, of time, place, birth, or education, between two or more characters are observed, which in a long history would probably be passed over. But the work of Dupin is much the more valuable of the two in giving a good account of the writings both as a whole, and in each separate piece, of the subject of each biography. He dwells also at much greater length on the Councils. Cave has, however, acted on the happy idea of dividing his work into periods, accordingly as a heresy or some great name gave it notoriety. It is much to have continually before the eye a reminder of the great movements which were going on from time to time within or outside the pale of the Church. His 'Lives of the Apostles,' and 'Lives of the Fathers of the First four Centuries,' are, on the one hand, works very accurate and easily procurable. On the other hand, there attaches to both the serious drawback, and perhaps worse than drawback, of their being written in a style to which for dryness and want of interest it would be well-nigh impossible to find an equal. It may be said that this is a style which prejudges nothing, and to which an enemy cannot object that it savours of partisanship. But it is a matter of grave doubt to us whether an author, who is an undoubted master of his subject, and has unquestioned powers to direct the minds and form the opinions of others, can, under any circumstances, be justified in refraining from the exercise of those powers; from showing plainly where his sympathies lie; saying boldly what he thinks right and true, and why he thinks so; and endeavouring all he can to bring into, or confirm in his position (which *is* his, of course, because he thinks it true and right) those who take him as their instructor. As it is, the Gallios of Church history not seldom receive positive

support and confirmation in their indifference and lukewarmness from those very persons whose duty it is to rouse and warn them; and they are apt to conclude that the subject is as dry, uninteresting, and incapable of sustaining the weight of a decided conclusion in itself, as it appears in the pages of the author. What a model in this respect is Bishop Bull's Defensio! What earnestness and intensity of mind and purpose are seen in every page! What a variety of weapons are used in the combat with his enemies! Grave argument, profound learning, cutting irony, biting and playful satire, contemptuous exposure, stern denunciation, all are had recourse to in terms as the cause requires, or the adversary is deemed worthy. You cannot approach such a spirit and think that it is very little matter which side you take; that there is hardly perhaps any right or wrong at all in the question; that as much may be said in historic truth and moral honesty (though in a historian these are one) for one opinion as the other; that if other good qualities are present to a man, it cannot matter much what he thinks of a dogmatic doctrine; that there is not evidence enough, it may be, for forming a decided opinion.

This, then, is our objection to Cave's Lives, to say nothing of the want of animation exhibited throughout, which may be an artistic fault, beyond the cure of the author. The whole work gives no idea, or almost none, that he approaches his subject in any other spirit than that of a mere literary antiquarian, or that he had any deep feelings about the labours and the writings of those whose acts and sufferings he relates, or does not think one opinion and its converse, though the one be perhaps a vital truth, and the other a damnable heresy, pretty much the same thing at last; or, that the one is to be held, and the other reprobated, *ad salvationem;* but that the scales must remain nearly balanced, the decision be what will amount in fact, with most readers, to an open verdict. 'Give me a good hater,' said Dr. Johnson. We say, Give us as our guide in Ecclesiastical History, one who *has* a heart as well as a head; who has feelings, principles, opinions, a bias, if you will; and who does not hesitate to declare them. We would rather give our time and labour to the pages of Baronius, even when he is dedicating his heart and powers to the effort of making out a case for Ultramontanism, because there is in him intense zeal for his cause, rotten as that cause is, than plod wearily through the pages of a historian, where everything is orthodox indeed and tenable, but utterly, hopelessly lifeless.

Mabillon has contributed two great historical works, properly so called, to Ecclesiastical History—the 'Acta Sanctorum,' and 'Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti.' Of the former we must leave

those to speak who have any acquaintance with it. The latter, in six noble folio volumes, is in no respect difficult of attainment, and will certainly be found on the shelves of the real student of Church history. It commences with the year 480—that of the birth of S. Benedict—and goes down to 1121. It contains an account of S. Benedict, discusses his rules, and everything in any way pertaining to the order. The work also, in fact, includes a sufficient history of the crowned heads and other secular magnates of Europe, and in addition contains a minute account of the doctrines, the ceremonies, the controversies of the Church, age by age, with a statement of the writings of each individual whose life is depicted. The chief value of the work, perhaps, to an English student, is the account given of those members of the Benedictine order, who were from time to time concerned in the history of the Church in this country. It should be studied with Collier or whatever author the student makes his text-book of English Church history; and, as it is (to every English reader at least) capable of considerable compression, he would thus come to make a kind of practical epitome of it. But he who is yet a stranger to the work must be cautioned that, when using it with other historians, he must look for events in the life of any particular personage, not in a consecutive order of narration, but in the year in which it took place. Thus events which happened close together are often separated by an interval of several pages. This is, no doubt, a great drawback to the convenient use of the work, but it is a fault unavoidable by its nature and original plan; and it is remedied in a very great degree, we are bound to say, by a copious index at the end of each volume, by which any particular event can be found without trouble.

Another fault of the work is, that whilst it describes with the utmost minuteness whatever occurs within the Benedictine Order, all that happens without its pale, or that does not touch it at some point, is either passed over in silence, or is treated too briefly. In this respect, we confess, we prefer the work of Dupin; but on the subject of his order, Mabillon is, of course, the most full, and works on a far more extensive scale. We are bound to say that the great questions (doctrinal and others), which arose from time to time in the middle ages; *e.g.* Lanfranc's controversy with Beranger on the Eucharist, the acts and writings of Peter Abelard and others, meet with very careful attention, and are treated of fully, and with all possible fairness. In short, if the work is not in itself a great history, it is at least a source from which such an one might in some part be constructed.

The history of the Church is one great interpreter of Scripture.

The attempt of Arius and Macedonius to deny the Divinity of our Lord, and of the Holy Spirit, are, with the aid of the writings which that attempt called forth, our best exponents of those passages of Scripture which teach the essential co-equality of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. The heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches; the schemes which they constructed, and the arguments by which they sought to support them, with the confutations they received from individual doctors—S. Cyril and S. Leo, and from the Church in Council—teach us better than any formal commentary of the Unity of the Person and the Divinity of the Natures. Pelagius, by the manner in which he sought to set aside Divine grace, and substitute for it the powers of nature, and the writings on the need of the former, which he was the cause of calling forth from S. Augustine, has illustrated more strongly than is or can be done by any later commentator, the utter dependence of man upon God for all his gifts, and the especial need and weight of Christian truth, and of the Christian scheme on the point assailed. And thus the *corpus dogmaticum* of each age becomes the best guide we can have to the understanding and realising of the multifarious lines of Scripture.

And with the formal history and polemical writings of the Fathers of each age should be always united the study of their exegetical works; for they are evidently the best exponents of those doctrines and principles which during their time were attacked, and in the maintenance of which they passed their lives. It is the necessary want of this vitality,—the absence of the annotator speaking as of himself and his own doings,—that to us makes all the formal commentaries of writers who lived long after the questions they describe, comparatively lifeless and without value, flat and secondhand, and almost reduces even the best of them to that order of productions which is technically called 'scissors and paste.'

Nor, whilst making himself acquainted with arguments of the early writers, should the student by any means neglect their laws and decisions as left to us in the Councils. Some knowledge of the latter, indeed, though passed over in total silence by writers of the Gieseler and Hagenbach stamp, is absolutely necessary for one who aspires to be in the least degree a master of Church history. They show much of the practical every-day life of the Church. In them he will see with what enemies the Church had to contend; what legacies of depraved morality, and what a perverted sense of first moral principles, wherein evil is called good, and good evil—heathenness left behind it; and what strenuous and long-continued efforts it cost the Church to gain the victory. The practices prohibited by many national

councils before the first general council, show that the world at the time was, as a whole, little better than a vast Sodom, and prove, beyond question, that the Church was indeed its regenerator. Modern times may sin in grievous ways against the faith, and pay almost no heed to the Unity of the Mystical Body of Christ; and (not as of old those who suffer with Him, but) those who buffet and pierce Him may call themselves, and be considered by others His Saints and Doctors; but it is at least a comfort that those foul, unnatural sins of the flesh, which seem to have been for the first four centuries the ordinary deeds of many even of those who called themselves Christians, are to Englishmen unknown; and that practices which the Church had to struggle with all her vigour for centuries to put down, the civil magistrate would speedily take order for in this country, and at this day. Witness the revolting case of Leontius of Antioch, and the indignant but fruitless protests of S. Cyprian, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom against *subintroductæ*. The Church had for centuries to put up, even in her clergy, with deeds of infamy such as would not in these times be tolerated for a moment.[1] Witness the order of crimes that received their brand in the ante-Nicene Councils,[2] for the commission of which amongst us the criminal is judged unfit to live, certainly unfit ever again to mix in the society of honourable and well-conducted men. Amongst all that those ages produced of self-devotion and saintliness, fearful unblushing depravity also stalked openly through the earth, and there was no power immediately adequate to control it.

There is a passage of Dr. Stanley's, in his volume on the Eastern Church, which, although not free from that diffuseness of style which, in a measure, mars the beauty and usefulness of his whole work, and scarcely capable perhaps in all its assertions as they at present stand of bearing the test of strict criticism, yet contains in itself a great truth. It is so applicable to our present subject, that we venture to extract it for the reflection and gratification of our readers.

'Take the general councils of the Church;' he says, 'they are the pitched battles of Ecclesiastical History. Ask yourselves the same questions as you would about the battles of military history. Ask when, and where, and why they were fought. Put before your minds all the influences of the age which then were confronted and concentrated from different quarters into one common focus. See why they were summoned to Nicæa, to Constance, to Trent. The locality often contains here, as in actual battles, the key of the position, and easily connects the Ecclesiastical History of the age, with its general history

[1] S. Cyprian, Letter IV. p. 173, Fell and Dodwell's note. S. Basil to Paregonius, vol. iii. p. 149. Fol. Bened. S. Chrysostom's Two Treatises on the Subintroductæ. Council of Elvira (A.D. 313), Can. 27; Ancyra (314), Can. 19; Nice, Can. 3. Eusebius in re Pauli Samosat., book vii. chap. xxx.

[2] See Council of Ancyra, Cans. 16, 21; Elvira, Cans. 63, 68, 71.

and geography. Look at the long procession as it enters the scene of assembly. See who was present, and who was absent.'—

Study, we would add, very carefully the geography of the question at issue, as laid down in the sees, the bishops of which were present, and which are named with their signatures at the end or in the body of the council. One often, from this source, gets a hint as to the limits within which, as a whole, a given heresy was confined. And this frequently contains peculiar and valuable information that is well worth being worked out, and perhaps may even sound the key-note of the after history of a particular Church or country. But to continue our extract:—

'Let us make ourselves acquainted with the several characters there brought together, so that we recognise them as old friends if we meet them again elsewhere. Study their decrees as expositions of the prevailing sentiments of the times.[1] Study them as Mr. Froude has advised us to study the statutes of our own ancient Parliaments. See what evils are most condemned, and what evils are left uncondemned. Observe how far their injunctions are still obeyed and how far set at nought, and ask in each case the reason why. Read them as I have just now noticed, with the knowledge given us by our own experience of all synods of all kinds. Read them with the knowledge which each gives of every other. Do this for any one council, and you will have made a deep hole into Ecclesiastical History.'—P. 1.

On this account, then,—the revelations that the canons of councils make, as to the practical work of the Church in different countries:—the student of Church history should allot himself a certain period of time, amongst other subjects, to be given up to the quiet and gradual mastery of the acts and canons of the councils. Routh's Reliquiæ and Opuscula will furnish him with the text and a commentary on the canons of the Œcumenical and some of the earlier Councils; and to these he would do well to add the Pandect of Beveridge, a work for which there is simply no substitute; and, say, Richer; Berardus, if he can afford it, and Cabassutius. Richer shows the fallacy of the Ultramontane doctrine of the Pope as the final authority over councils; and Cabassutius gives the other side of the picture. Even these are, after all, but manuals to the councils, and therefore it would be advisable, wherever possible, to procure the full text of the councils themselves, and all that is commonly made to appertain to them; and, as it is never real economy or true wisdom to buy a worthless book,

[1] We scarcely know the exact meaning of Dr. Stanley in this expression. The canons of the Œcumenical Councils are binding on all Christendom. As regards matters of practice, indeed, some of their decrees have been fulfilled by obedience, and others are rendered null by the non-existence of the circumstances which they were framed to meet; but on questions of faith they are still in full force, and must so remain even to the end of time. In neither case can they be considered merely as 'expositions of sentiments.'

or a bad edition of a good one, Hardouin, or if possible, Labbe and Cossart, should be the work selected.

And let not the student, when he has his books around him and sees how numerous they are, give way to despair, and abandon his work as too great for him. Undoubtedly in the Fathers and Councils he has a great deal which he can never master, and indeed never need labour at; but the gist of all theology lies comparatively in a small space, and is grouped round a few great names; and though an individual will make but little impression on the mass by the labour of to-day or to-morrow, or even of a month, or a year, yet *laborare est orare;* he is answerable to God for his time as well as his other gifts. Let him only persevere, and as year glides away after year, and the snows of age begin at length to whiten his head, let him compare what a course of diligent and continued study has made him, with what he would have been had he suffered his life to dribble away in idleness, and we do not think that he will complain of time wasted or of labour thrown away.

And, as we have been speaking on the subject of Church histories in general, our younger readers will perhaps allow us, before we quit this part of our subject, to give them a few hints on one branch of it, which, though not, we confess, immediately connected with our present subject, may not be wholly without profit to them. We allude to the study of the history of our own Anglican Church. The best work by far, in our judgment, to be made a text-book is Collier. Fuller goes over nearly the same ground, and slightly preceded him in time; but there is too much in his work, great as it is, that has gained for him the name of the jester. He was one of the company of wits, and if he did not participate in, at least delighted to chronicle the wit-combats of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson at the Falcon or the Mermaid; and in consequence he seems to think it incumbent on him, on all occasions, to keep up the reputation of a man of wit. Thus, when you look to him for a grave opinion or discussion, he is apt to put you off with a jest or a quibble. There is, however, as no one can deny, much in his work which is of the highest value. His narrative of the martyrdom of Bishop Fisher is almost a master-piece of description; and his Essay on the Monasteries, their revenues, government, and internal economy, is of great worth. In the extent of half an octavo, Fuller has compressed nearly as much information about these ancient institutions as is contained in the ponderous quarto of Fosbroke. This portion of his history gives a peculiar and unique value to the whole work as a history of the English Church.

The student would also do well to add to his text-book a few works on subjects which can be treated only in a superficial

manner by a professed historian. Gibson's Codex will give him an insight into ecclesiastical law. From Archbishop Wake on Convocation, with its Answer by Bishop Atterbury, he may derive much information on a subject on which, not only for its intrinsic worth, but because it is so likely, before a long period has elapsed, to be brought forward in the country, he should have a definite and clear opinion. Dr. Pusey on the Councils will also be of value, as indirectly bearing on the same point.

And, with an English text-book, we should recommend, as far as possible, the use of contemporary historians. The Saxon Chronicle and Bede are the great authorities before the Conquest, and Matthew Paris will form a good and useful guide as far as he goes: *i. e.* to the end of the reign of Henry III. There is much in a historian, who was contemporary with the events which he describes, that cannot be found, at least with the same weight, in any other. Matthew Paris teaches us, what indeed the whole lives of Lanfranc, Anselm, and even Beckett confirm, that the papal claims were always, in this country, regarded as an usurpation, of which the nation long wanted only an opportunity of ridding themselves. The 'Beckett Papers,' a collection of letters by Beckett himself, his friend, John of Salisbury, afterwards Bishop of Chartres, and others, published by the late Mr. Froude, throw more light than perhaps anything else we have on the history of the times, and the personal characters of the Archbishop and his opponents. Of the councils of the English Church a sufficient account is given by Collier; and his statements are worthy of study, as showing from age to age to what vices our ancestors were most obstinately given, and what the Church had most resolutely to struggle against. Prominent among these, we are sorry to say, is ever found simony. Those who wish for a fuller and more original account on the subject, and to whom the great and costly work of Wilkins is as a mere *non ens*, will find satisfaction, as far as it goes, in the folio of Spelman. True, he gives an account of the councils only to the Norman Invasion; but this, as to the history of the councils of the English Church, is by no means the least important period.

After mentioning the above historical works, some of them standing in the very first place, our readers will perhaps think us unjustifiably fastidious if we confess that, in our judgment, the history which shall be the best of all has yet to be written. Not that we suppose for a moment, or even wish (far otherwise) that such works as those of Tillemont, Fleury, Baronius, and Natalis, should ever be superseded. Such a result is as little to be desired as it is possible: but the existing histories contain, to our mind, certain deficiencies which we should be glad to

see supplied. As it is, some subjects which rightly belong to Church history are lost sight of altogether, and others are made to constitute a class of literature by themselves. Thus, how important it is that a teacher should know—not, decidedly, for the sake of directly treating of the subject, but that he may be able to form his definitions of the truth—what were the ideas contained in the great ancient heresies; whither they tended; what would have been their ultimate result could they possibly have succeeded in gaining a footing in the Church; and how they were met by the Catholic Doctors. Yet how small is the number of those who have any but superficial ideas on the subject! How few make (as they ought to do) their study of the heresies keep pace, *pari passu*, with that of the great Christian verities; and one reason of this is, that they are scattered about in so many different sources, that few can possibly make any acquaintance with the matter. How great a boon, then, would a historian confer on the Church who should supply this want! Let him write his history, not for the sake of merely giving another narrative of the *ordo rerum*, but relying *in minutiis* on those already written—Fleury's, if he will, or Tillemont's, or any sufficient one; let him rather lay stress on those questions which are by them overlooked, or kept out of sight, or described on a scale too narrow. Let him dwell more especially on the doctrinal questions. Let him first give a history—it *can* be done, at least in many cases—of the heresy (Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Monothelitism) as it had existed in germ centuries before the particular heresiarch gave it his name. Let him trace its progress, century by century, until, from a small and unimportant beginning, held by men of no ecclesiastical status, and confined within narrow geographical limits, it spread well-nigh, perhaps, into all countries and became an opponent which the rulers of the Church must spend life and limb to destroy. Let him, in his history of Arianism, not rely solely on his own statements and definitions, nor be content merely with a narration of facts, but let him give the theology of the movement as it existed to the actors in the scene; let him attach to his history enough of the writings of S. Athanasius, S. Basil of Cæsarea, the SS. Gregories Nazianzen and Nyssen, and Theodoret, the chief Fathers by whom the heresy was eventually confuted, to show, not only by what arguments it was overthrown, but (which is the first point) by what the truth was established. Let him, when Apollinarianism is the subject, give sufficient of the two books of S. Athanasius, and his letters to Epictetus and Adelphius, and the treatises of S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Basil, S. Ambrose, in the West, and Theodoret, to show what was their circle of doctrine and teaching, and

manner of application of Holy Scripture, on the humanity of our Lord, for it was in relation to this doctrine that that controversy was brought out. Let him, when relating the not less deadly, though apparently less important and prominent heresy of Nestorius, not content himself with a meagre page or two of his own views, constructed, perhaps, from the works of living men; but let him give a full view of the question from the writings of the times. Let him evolve gradually and with patience the two opposite views of the natures upheld by Nestorius and S. Cyril respectively, from their own works, and the then champion of the former, Theodoret, in his answer to the anathemas of S. Cyril; comparing the tenets of Nestorius with those of Paul of Samosata, and other heretics who had preceded him; and giving the idea of S. Cyril's points of doctrine, both from his anathemas, his De Sta. Trinitate, and De Incarnatione, his treatise, Quod unus sit Christus, his letter, vol. v., part 2, to Nestorius, and his books against the heresiarch, against Theodoret, and the heretical Bishops of the Oriens. He will also, by careful perusal of the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, the letters written by and to Nestorius and S. Cyril before the council sat, the Synodical letter of S. Cyril and other documents of the council, be able to impart much peculiar and valuable information on the subject. So with the Tome of S. Leo; it should surely be drawn upon more largely than is commonly done in a history of the heresy of Eutyches. As to the length to which such a history would extend, our readers need not be afraid. All that we have recommended may be contained in much smaller space than would appear possible at first sight, without the addition to the work certainly of more, at most, than another octavo volume.

Again, we will remind our readers that there is as yet no sufficient history, in our own language, of the separation of the East and West: the causes, doctrinal and practical, that led to it, and fomented and kept alive the strife until it terminated in the formal state of division. In other words, we have no full record; no such history as we might have and ought to have, of the Greek Church from the time of Photius in the middle of the ninth century, to that of Michael Cerularius in the eleventh. The works of Leo Allatius on the subject have never been thoroughly tested and made available as they ought to have been, but much of them that is evidently very valuable metal is allowed to remain in the ore.

Lastly, why in the histories of the Church are the Liturgies, and all those questions which are connected with Liturgies, systematically passed over, as if they bore no relation to Church history at all? Of course, the Liturgical branch of the great

subject of Church history is an obscure and difficult one, but this, as it strikes us, is a reason why it should receive the more attention. It *is* a branch of Church history after all.

A historian, we submit, should dedicate some portion of his work to this subject. He should begin, we venture to suggest, with giving the text of the four great primitive Liturgies which form the basis of the service of our own, and of every other branch of the Church, showing their points of difference from each other, and the *propria*, such as the prayer for the rising of the Nile in the Alexandrian, which render each applicable to its own sphere and to no other. He should affix their titles to each of the several component parts, and should give notes explanatory of whatever required elucidation. He should show the historical antiquity and authorship, and the geographical limits within which each was used: the Liturgy of S. James prevailing throughout the whole of the Orient, Judæa, Mesopotamia, Syria, and the Southern parts of Asia Minor: the Liturgy of S. Mark being used in the Churches of Alexandria and its dependencies: that of S. John in Ephesus; and S. Peter's as used in Rome, Africa, and most of Europe.

Then he would show the alterations of these Liturgies made as time went on by some of the greatest of the Fathers of the Church, and introduced by them into their respective dioceses. These changes are not merely matters of interest; they form part of, and therefore illustrate, the direct history of the Church. The historian will show how S. Chrysostom adapted the Liturgy of S. James to Constantinople; and how S. Basil framed a Liturgy on the base of the same for Cæsarea, and the Churches dependent on that see.

And for modern times he should give us on the one hand a picture of the Orthodox Greek Church, as now celebrating her worship; and on the other, he should point out how and where the many heresies which find their habitat in the East have each altered and perverted, after their own doctrine, the original Liturgies: how, for instance, as Renaudot tells us, the Nestorians have altered the true doctrine, by the insertion in one of their eucharistic benedictions of the words, 'Similitudinem servi 'accepit, hominem perfectum ex anima rationali, intelligente, et 'immortali, et corpore mortali hominum, et conjunxit illum 'sibi, univitque secum *in gloria, potestate et honore;*'[1] and show their animus by the anathemas which, we learn from the same authority, they were accustomed to heap in their service on S. Cyril, and the praises they give to Nestorius.

Such alterations go a great way towards defining the position

[1] Renaudot, vol. ii. p. 577.

of these bodies towards the Church, and explaining and illustrating their tenets and tendencies; and lastly, they make clearer to us what is our duty towards them.

And when he comes to the Latin Church, the historian will not forget to show what gradual additions were introduced into the Western Liturgy (to use the word in its widest sense) between the time of S. Gregory the Great and the Council of Trent. He will not fail to mark the points at once of agreement and difference between the Canon of the Mass, and the primitive Liturgies; and to show how the former was constructed from the latter, or perhaps *with* them.[1] He will tell us (if indeed it be known or can be traced) how the Sacramentaries of S. Leo (really or so called), and of Gelasius and Gregory, were developed into the Breviary; and when and by what Popes or Councils it was done. He will give the history more fully than we yet have it, of the substitution by Charlemagne of the Roman for the Gallican Liturgy (or Ephesine as it has been thought to be, and as it appears to have been originally) in France; and that of the removal of the Mozarabic from Spain. He will show carefully and at length, wherein those Liturgies were cognate with each other, and differed from the Petrine or Roman; and will rescue them from being, as they are now, a dead letter, as it were, of the Church. He will trace the Roman Liturgy in its adaptation throughout the greater part of Europe and the dependent Churches in Africa.

The origin of the two Liturgies as appears in our own land, those used north and south of the Humber at S. Augustin's landing, should next receive attention. The subject might, we feel sure, by due investigation, be cleared of much of the difficulty which at present envelopes it, and the existence of which causes, even among scholars, an amount of uncertainty, we are not afraid to say even of ignorance, which need not exist, and which we think, with a good history of the Church that should supply this wanting page, would exist no longer.

And when the subject of Liturgies proper is exhausted, that of the other services will take its place. Goar will afford much valuable information on those of the Greek Church; Muratori and Martini of the Latin. It is a most important subject, although Church historians have so entirely ignored it. The Sacramentary which goes by the name of S. Leo, and is known to be the most ancient of all the Sacramentaries and their foundation, may very probably be what Muratori conjectured, the compilation of some one after Leo's time, who united in one

[1] Brett on the Liturgies.

book whatever he found of Leo's or his predecessors'. The MS. edited by Blanchini dates from about 700, or a little later.[1] Next in antiquity are the Sacramentaries of S. Gelasius and S. Gregory: the MS. of the former is little less ancient than S. Leo's; and that of the latter—published by Muratori, and with so much justice, as we think, preferred by him to Menard's—is as old as the beginning of the ninth century. On these was based the Roman Breviary; the Sarum Use of Bishop Osmund; and on this again, the Service-books or Uses before the Reformation, therefore of course our own Prayer-Book. We can conceive few subjects of more interest, or that come more strictly within the province of the ecclesiastical historian, than the tracing out this descent of the modern books from these ancient ones: showing how, when, and why, and by what Popes and Councils the Breviary took its present form from the Sacramentaries, and bringing to light for ordinary familiar knowledge—that it may be no longer locked up in works difficult to be procured and requiring years for their mastery—the originals word by word of our prayers, benedictions, and collects. We are sure that such a course of investigation would tend to raise the estimation of our Prayer-Book. Whilst the Breviary, if stripped of the additions made since the time of S. Gregory, would be found to differ but little from our own book, a comparison of the Pontificale of S. Egbert and that of Rome with our own Ordinal would show how, on particular points, the English Church has always been at unity with herself, and held doctrines different from those of Rome.

And now, if these hints, or any of them, are judged of the least value, as indicating the requirements of a good history of the Church, the question is, how far have the works which we have brought before the notice of our readers fulfilled them? To compose a history which should be really worthy of a first-rate place among histories, would evidently require a long and intimate acquaintance with Councils, Fathers, Liturgies, and liturgical works; and would require, what Baronius for one, as far as he has supplied the want, gave to it, the work of a lifetime.

Mr. Bright neither has given, nor claims to have given us, such a book as this. What he has done is to produce an accurate and readable narrative of events from the Edict of Milan to the Council of Chalcedon; and in doing this he has very properly followed out no new idea, taken no new line, and has contented himself with conveying to students old knowledge in an exact manner and in a good narration. On all accounts we can

[1] Muratorius, de Rebus Liturgicis, p. 14.

certainly recommend his work as carefully executed, accurate, scholarly, and comprised in a moderate compass; and it possesses this great advantage over Mr. Robertson's, at least, that he goes at once to the fountain-head of authorities, and does not content himself with the voice of the moderns. The chief subjects of his work are Arianism, and its consequences, doctrinal and practical; Pelagianism; Nestorianism; and Eutychianism.

How great a difference is there in the outset between the definitions of an English Churchman like Mr. Bright, and a German like Hagenbach, or an English Dissenter like his translator. After describing Arius' Sorites,—

'The Father is a Father, the Son is a Son. Therefore the Father must have existed before the Son. Therefore *once the Son was not*. Therefore He was *made*, like all creatures, *of a substance that had not previously existed*,'—

Mr. Bright adds, in words which show that he has a clear mental idea of the real gist of the question, and is entitled to speak on it,—

'This was the essence of Arius' teaching. Trained in the schools of disputatious logic at Antioch, and by temperament devoid of reverence, he had accustomed himself to think nothing too majestic for the grasp of a syllogistic formula. He took his stand on the assumption that such a formula could comprehend the Infinite; that he could argue irresistibly from human sonship to Divine. And yet his argument to thoughtful minds is self-destructive; for it began by insisting on the truth of our Lord's Sonship, and ended by making Him wholly alien from the essence of the Father.'—P. 11.

The doctrine, on the other hand, of Alexander and the Church, which insists on an Eternal Father and a Co-Eternal Son, who is such by essence, and neither by adoption, nor by promotion, involves, as Mr. Bright says, 'no Sabel-'lianism, no Ditheism, no partition of the Divine Essence, 'no denial of the Father's prerogative as the Unbegotten.'—P. 17. And he produces a quotation from S. Ambrose, De Fide, which well includes the matter in a dilemma for the heretical party:—'If they think the Son foreign to the Father, 'why do they adore Him? . . . Or if they do not adore Him, 'let them say so, and there is an end of it.'

Let us now see how the German and the English Dissenter speak of such subjects. The dissertation of Hagenbach on Arianism, Nestorianism, and their kindred heresies, is very brief; and we must, therefore, examine his doctrines on the general subject in the earlier part of his work. And, first, we think that some of our own historians, Mr. Robertson especially, have surrendered to the German the great advantage of appearing to have the ancient authorities on his side. Mr. Robertson has written a book perfectly sound in all respects, yet the

paucity of his references to early authors would make it seem to a young reader of German works, such as those of Gieseler and Hagenbach, arguing logically, as if his system of belief were of the date and growth merely of his modern authorities. Hagenbach broaches doctrines and opinions in no way resembling those of the early Fathers, yet, by the intimate acquaintance with their writings which he shows himself to possess, and the superabundant copiousness of his citations from, and references to, their pages, however little bearing out his assertions, he would easily impose on the unsuspecting student the idea that he must be their faithful representative. It is true that Hagenbach seems nearly to repeat the Fathers, and to base almost everything he says on their words. Yet it is equally certain, not only that to the greater number of his opinions and conclusions, none of them would for a moment agree, but that from most of them they would recoil with horror.

The original sin of Hagenbach's work is the tone assumed throughout towards Holy Scripture. He seems to have no idea but that it is lawful to handle it quite as we please, and to do just what we like with it; to understand it in any sense we judge expedient; to condemn it here, and to applaud it there; to accept it, or to reject it, as we think right. That anything like reverence, or even unusual respect, is due to it, is an idea which seems never once to have occurred to him. In a word, it possesses to him no claim to be considered inspired. It is nothing whatever of a rule of faith. It is, in its historical phase, to be dealt with as he would deal with the statements of Herodotus or Livy—to be commented on, in its doctrinal or moral, just as he would comment on Aristotle's Ethics.

Hence we find at every turn such expressions as the following:—

'Our Saviour, indeed, adopted many notions already in existence, especially the Mosaic doctrine of *one* God, and perhaps, to some extent, the prevailing opinions and expectations of the age, concerning the doctrine of angels, the kingdom of God, &c.'—P. 33.

'James . . . who gives an undue prominence to practical Christianity, and scarcely once refers to the doctrine of Christ, though he occasionally evinces a profound acquaintance with the nature of faith, and the Divine economy.'[1]—P. 35.

'The idea which the earlier Fathers were accustomed to attach to the term "Logos," was more or less indefinite; some understood by it a real personality (the pre-existence of Christ), others took it in an abstract sense (idea, reason, word, revelation, wisdom, Divine life, &c.)'—P. 115.

[1] The author reminds us of his compatriot, to whom it was objected, in a common room at Oxford, that S. Paul, on some subject, was against him. His *naïf* reply was,—'Powl, Powl? Oh yes, I know dis Powl. He was a ver clayver man. I have read his boke, and I don't agree wid it.'

To prove what is here at least implied, that any of the early Fathers took the term exclusively in its abstract sense, and denied it in the concrete, are brought forward two or three citations which are, as we need not say, wholly irrelevant:—

'Origen follows Hermas in classifying the demons according to the vices which they represent, and thus prepares the way for more sober and rational views, gradually to convert the concrete idea of devils into abstract notions.'[1]—P. 136.

'On the supposition that the devil did seduce our first parents, it is necessary to assign an earlier date to his apostasy than the fall of man.'—P. 138.

Such assertions, and such a manner of dealing with Scripture, are found almost in every page of the work, and they have unhappily been endorsed; more, they have been published (as far as he was able) to the whole world, by an Englishman; an Englishman, happily indeed not a Churchman, but an Independent. The Church, we are confident, would not for a moment have endured the idea of any one of her clergy being instrumental in the spreading abroad of such profanities without immediate censure, most probably, deprivation of his place in her ranks. Great indeed is the contrast, if only in religious tone, between the text-books of Dr. Davidson and the histories of Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bright, or any English Churchman who has given us a work on the same subject.

On the heresy of Arius (which we have under discussion), Hagenbach shows himself simply ignorant of the doctrine of those of whom he takes on himself to be the exponent. In the first place, he seems to confound the idea expressed by the term ὁμοούσιος (not distinguishing it from ταυτοούσιος), with that of Sabellianism, for he says that the semi-Arians endeavoured to abstain from its use—not because *they* thought it dangerous, but absolutely—'lest they should fall into the Sabellian error,' p. 252; and he cannot comprehend that the Church taught (against Arius) an equality of essence and (against Sabellianism) a diversity (and therefore of necessity a subordination) of persons; but he persists in referring the latter to the essence.

---

[1] We feel serious argument, in dealing with such an assertion, made as it is, beneath us.

'Ridiculum acri
Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res.'

We will remind our readers of Rowland Hill's reply to one who had asserted that 'angels were not actual beings, but only local figures of speech.' 'In that case,' said the humorist, 'I do not wonder at the conduct of Balaam's ass; for an eastern metaphor, with a drawn sword in its hand, is enough to frighten any animal of the kind.'

'In maintaining the sameness of essence, they had to hold fast the distinction of persons; in asserting the latter, they had to avoid the doctrine of subordination.'—P. 252.

We should recommend the readers of Hagenbach to study the 4th section of Bishop Bull's Defensio, where they will find the true doctrine of the Subordinatio Filii treated with all the lucidness of statement and depth of learning for which its great author is celebrated. It is needless to say that Mr. Bright's history of Arianism does not aim at this. Indeed, the only point which we note in it, as calling for discussion, is his account of the Council of Antioch, held in 341. Had he consulted Pagi, and the quarto of Schlestrate, he might have seen reason to think that there were possibly two Councils held in the city at that time—a Catholic and a semi-Arian. We say this, *pace* Mr. Robertson; for his argument that the Council was received through the efforts of the late Nicenes, S. Basil and the two Gregories, who had originally been connected with the semi-Arian party, seems to us insufficient; for the Council was received from the first (A.D. 341), and consequently before they came on the scene.[1]

We venture to point out what appear to us two desiderata in this part of the works both of Mr. Robertson and Mr. Bright, which, if supplied, would both make them easier of reference, and, as we think, impart to them additional interest. We wish that they had given two or three chapters relating separately and distinctly the history of the heretical and semi-heretical schools; *e.g.* that, like Dr. Newman, in his work on the Arians, they had given a succinct view of the different classes of semi-Arians. To this might be added an account, with a comparison of their doctrines, of Aëtius and Eunomius, Photinus, Acacius of Cæsarea, and such members of the lower schools of heresy. The same plan might have been followed with advantage in the case of the semi-Pelagians. And secondly, we wish that they had given, in a brief appendix to their works, a statement of the succession of Bishops to each of the great sees in East and West, during the time embraced by their histories.

On Pelagianism, Messrs. Robertson and Bright have both done what they could in their time, and with their space. The history of this great heresy by the former is much the better of the two. Mr. Robertson has evidently the deeper and more extensive knowledge of the question at issue. At the same time, to write a perfect history of Pelagianism would take more

[1] S. Gregory Nazianzen was born about the time of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325; S. Basil about 329 (Bened. Life, § II.). S. Gregory Nyssen was his younger brother.

years of reading than our historians have, as it appears, yet had to live. It was not done perfectly even by Jansen, though making it his life's work, and after reading through S. Augustine's entire works on the subject no less than thirty times; and perhaps it never will or can be done.

The question is a subjective one; and the historical element should therefore have been made subordinate to the doctrinal. Two personages alone should fill the foreground: S. Augustine and Pelagius. On them is the interest concentrated; and the doings of all the others, Popes or Bishops, are of quite secondary moment. But Mr. Bright has brought S. Augustine's contemporaries too prominently forward; by raising their consequence in the question he lowers that of S. Augustine himself. In fact, we can only say that a subjective question is related by him objectively; and consequently we can form from his pages little idea of the depth and wonderful power and richness of S. Augustine's works on the subject.

The heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, as being of a very different nature, and lying in a smaller compass, are more easily described. We prefer Mr. Bright's account of Nestorianism, on the whole, to that of Mr. Robertson. It is more fresh and life-like, being derived from original sources, which Mr. Robertson's is not. They both know better than to commit Hagenbach's mistake: 1st, That the question arose from the mere use of the term Θεοτόκος; and 2dly, that this expression had been brought into use 'by the increasing honour paid to the Virgin' (p. 273). They are aware that it had been used by Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, against Arius, upwards of a century before Nestorius, and, as a great authority enables us to add, by S. Dionysius of Alexandria, against Paul of Samosata, just sixty-eight years earlier still.[1]

Mr. Bright's description of the Latrocinium is the most graphic and picturesque part of his book; and his account of the Council of Chalcedon is also well and carefully done, though he would, in our opinion at least, have done as much or more for the great question therein debated, had he produced either in the original, or if so it must be, in a translation, the tome of S. Leo. But the doctrinal part (which is the permanent one) is made by him, as others have done before him, to give way to the merely historical (which was only the part of the day and hour), and for this treatment of the subject we see no adequate reason.

The tendencies of the histories of the Englishmen and of the Germans are as different as light to darkness. In those of our own countrymen reverence to authority, Divine and

[1] Suicer in verb.

human: humility and submission of the mere intellect and its feeble powers to the higher principle of faith, are seen in every page, and pervade their whole works. With the Germans, because we do not know what is not revealed, we have no certainty about what is. In consequence, to anything which they assert which happens to be out of the sphere of our own knowledge, we necessarily listen with the utmost distrust. We must carefully test everything we find in their pages, of which we do not at the moment know the absolute truth or falsehood. We cannot receive it because they say it: far otherwise, their assertions are too often rather a guarantee that what they say is not to be admitted.

They are a warning of what men come to, who make the doctrines of the Christian faith a matter of mere and exclusive intellectual exercise. In this respect, also, the works of our English Churchmen form a happy contrast. If the latter are sometimes rather dry, and if they lack the graphic powers of Dr. Stanley, they are at least productions of men of reverential and believing minds, who see that there is room for far more in Christianity than mere exertions of the intellect; and thus their readers gain the benefit (wholly unattainable from the Germans) of being at once taught the true faith of Christ and His Church, and of having their minds formed to study ecclesiastical history, as it always ought to be studied, in a spirit of humility and devotion; in the spirit of the truly wise, who 'soar but never roam;' in the spirit, not merely of learning what this Father held or that Council ruled, but of improving themselves in knowledge, and helping themselves to grow in grace, and thereby increasing their ability, according to their position, of doing God's work in their day.