

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1852.

VOL. IV.—NO. VI.

CYPRIAN.

Fourth and Last Article.

THE year 252 brought with it new trials for the Christian Church. There would seem to be a mysterious sympathy between the moral and physical worlds, by which every great catastrophe or crisis in the first is found to be marked more or less distinctly by corresponding tokens and signs in the second. When the foundations of society are about to give way, men's hearts are made often to faint and fear by strange signs of wrath in the course of nature. So it was before the destruction of Jerusalem; and something of the same sort we meet with in the last period of the old Pagan empire of Rome. The decline of the state, the breaking up of the ancient order of life, seemed to draw along with it calamity and disaster in all conceivable forms. The universal course of the world was so ordered, as to proclaim continually its own vanity and misery. On this subject we may learn much from Augustine. Long before his time however, these signs of wrath had begun to show themselves in the economy of God's providence, filling whole lands with ap-

VOL. IV.—NO. VI.

33.*

NEANDER AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN.¹

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER forms an epoch in the development of Protestant Church Historiography, as much as Flacius in the 16th century, Arnold at the close of the 17th, Mosheim and somewhat later Semler in the 18th; and was by general consent distinguished accordingly, even before his death (1850), with the honorary title, "Father of Modern Church History." We have from him, in the first place, a large work, unfortunately not finished, on the General History of the Christian Church, which extends from the death of the Apostles almost to the time of the Reformation;² in the next place, a special work on the Apostolical Period,³ and one also on the Life of Christ (1837, 5th ed. 1849), which together serve as a foundation for the main work; then several valuable historical monographies, on Julian the Apostate (1812), St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1813, 2nd ed. 1849), the Gnostic Systems (1818), St. John Chrysostom (1821, 3rd ed. 1848), the Anti-Gnostic Tertullian (1825, 3rd ed. 1849); and finally some collections of smaller publications, historical for the most part in their contents, in which he describes single persons or revelations of the Christian life, from original sources indeed, but yet in more popular form for the practical religious use of a larger public—above all his "Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des christlichen Lebens" (3 volumes, 1822, 3rd ed. 1845), a series of edifying life pictures from the first eight centuries of the Church.

Neander was fitted, as few have been, for the great vocation of a historian of the Church of Jesus Christ. By birth and early training an Israelite, and in truth a genuine Nathanael spirit, full of childlike simplicity and Messianic longings, in youth an enthusiastic disciple of the Grecian philosophy, particularly of Plato, who became for him, as he had been for Origen and other church fathers, a scientific schoolmaster to Christ⁴—he had, when

¹ Comp. my "Recollections of Neander" in the January number of the *Mercersburg Review* for 1851, and "Neander's *Jugendjahre*" in the *Kirchenfreund* for 1851, p. 293 ff.

² In 6 volumes, or 11 parts, from 1825 to 1852, the last of which comprising the period preparatory to the Reformation was published after his death, from manuscripts left in very fragmentary form, by Candidate Schneider. The first four volumes have appeared since 1842 in a second improved edition.

³ *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*, in two volumes 1832, 4th ed 1847.

⁴ In the academical gymnasium at Hamburg already, Plato and Piatara

he received holy baptism in the seventeenth year of his age, made the course inwardly, we may say, of the world's historical preparation for Christianity, the religious process of Judaism and Paganism in their direct current towards the Gospel, and had thus broken his path already to the only right standpoint of church history, where Jesus Christ is viewed as the end towards which humanity strives, the centre of all history and the key that alone can unlock its mysterious sense. Richly endowed in mind and soul, free from all domestic cares, an eunuch from his mother's womb and this too for the kingdom of heaven's sake (Math. xix : 12), without sense for the external distractions and vanities of life, a stranger in the material world, which in his last years was withdrawn even from his outward eye—all qualified and disposed him to bury himself, during a long and unbroken academical career from 1811 to 1850, in the still contemplation of the spirit world, to explore the past, and to make himself at home among the mighty dead, whose thinking and working belonged to eternity. As regards theology, he was primarily a disciple of the gifted Schleiermacher, under whose electrifying influence he fell during his university studies at Halle, and by whose side he afterwards stood for many years as colleague in Berlin. He always thankfully acknowledged the great merits of this German Plato, who in a period of general apostacy from faith rescued so many young men from the iron embrace of Rationalism, and conducted them at least to the threshold of the most holy place;⁶ but he was led himself to take notwithstanding a more positive course, and set himself free accordingly from the pantheistic and deterministic elements which adhered to the

were his favorite study. The intimate friend of his youth, *William Neumann*, whose surname he afterwards assumed in Greek form at his baptism, with expressive reference at the same time to his inward change, wrote of *David Mendel*, as Neander was originally called, a. 1806 (in Chamisso's Works VI, p. 241, f.): "Plato is his idol, and his constant watch-word; he pores over him day and night, and there are few probably who take him in so entirely or with such full reverence. It is wonderful, how he has become all this so wholly without foreign influence, by mere self-reflection and honest true study. Without knowing much of the Romantic Philosophy, he has constructed it for himself, and found the germs for doing so in Plato. On the world around him he has learned to look with sovereign contempt." See, for a fuller view of Neander's education, the "Kirchenfreund," as before, a. 1851, p. 286, f.

⁶ Comp. especially Neander's article on *The past half century in its relation to the present time*, in the "Deutsch. Zeitschrift" established by Dr. Müller, Dr. Nitzsch and himself, 1st Vol. 1850, p. 7 ff., where he gives his view at large in relation to Schleiermacher.

system of his master from the study of Spinoza. This was for him of the greatest consequence ; for it is only on the ground of the recognition of a personal God, and of free personal men, that history can ever come to its right sense or worth. In his own particular department he was at any rate apart from this entirely independent ; since Schleiermacher's strength lay in criticism, dogmatics and ethics, and not in church history, although by his spiritual intuitions he exerted on this also no doubt a quickening influence.

From the beginning of his public activity thus, Neander appeared as one of the leading founders of the new evangelical theology of Germany, and its most conspicuous representative on the field of ecclesiastical and dogmatic history. His first and greatest merit now consists in this, that in opposition to the coldly intellectual and negatively critical method of Rationalism, he brought the *religious* and *practical* element of history again to its rights, without doing the least wrong at the same time to the claims of *science*. This comes into view very clearly in the preface already to the first volume of his great work, where he declares it to be the main object of his life to set forth the history of Christ, "as a speaking proof of the divine power of Christianity, as a school of christian experience, a voice of edification, instruction and warning, sounding through all centuries, for all who are willing to hear." True, he comes behind no one in learning ; with the church fathers in particular he was by years of intercourse most intimately familiar ; and although with his hearty dislike for all vanity and affectation, he never makes any parade with citations, his pertinent and conscientious manner of quoting still serves to show everywhere a most perfect mastery of the sources : for it is not by the number of citations, which at any rate may be had from second or third hand cheaply enough, but in their independence, reliability, and critical selection, that we may recognize the genuine scholar. With the most thorough knowledge of his material is joined also in him almost every other quality necessary for a scientific historian, a spirit of critical inquiry always profound, a happy power of combination, and no small talent for the genetic development of religious characters and their theological systems. But the theoretic matter is with him everywhere pervaded by a pious, at once earnest and yet gentle and deeply humble spirit. As Spener and Franke formerly, so Neander likewise views theology, and consequently church history also, not as an exercise simply of the understanding, but as a practical business of the heart at the same time, and has for his chosen motto : *Pectus est quod*

*theologum facit.** On this account, his works have a great advantage over the productions of the modern Tübingen school, as well as over the 'Text Book of Gieseler, which in point of learning and acute investigation at least deserves to be considered of equal distinction; in the case of which moreover we are bound to consider, that the author pursues a different object, and by his invaluable extracts from the original sources compensates in part for what of life may be wanting in the dry skeleton of his text. Neander moves through the history of the church with believing sense and devotional spirit; Gieseler with critical keenness of vision and cold intellect. The first lives in his heroes, thinks, feels, acts, and suffers with them; the second surveys their movements from abroad, without love or hatred, without sympathy or antipathy. The one kisses reverently the footsteps of his Lord and Saviour, wherever he may meet him; the other remains passionless and indifferent before even the most glorious revelations of the Christian life.¹

This Christian religious spirit now, which rules Neander's historical writings, and his whole habit of thought, is still farther distinguished for its comprehensive *liberality* and evangelical *catholicity*. He differs from the subjective and unchurchly pietism of an Arnold and Milner, who likewise exalted the practical element, but were able to find it for the most part only among heretics and dissenters, not only by incomparably deeper learning and science, but in this also, that though himself disposed too more than he should have been to patronize certain heretics he still finds, with right feeling nevertheless, the main stream of the Christian life, in the uninterrupted succession of the Christian Church. From the orthodox Protestant, stiffly polemical style of history, on the other hand, which prevailed in the 17th century, he differs no less in this, that although constitutionally inclined rather to the German Lutheran type in its

* Those Hegelians who made themselves merry over this motto, and gave Neander in derision the title of a "*pectoral theologian*," only exposed in doing so their own shame. We cannot make theology too earnest or practical; for it has to do with nothing less than the everlasting welfare or woe of never dying souls.

¹ True, Gieseler also requires of the church historian "Christian religious spirit," on the right ground, that "we can never have a just historical apprehension of a foreign spiritual manifestation in any case, without reproducing it in ourselves" (Einl. § 5); but there is little trace of this certainly in his text, as from his rationalistic standpoint was naturally to be expected.

moderate Melancthonian form,* he rises notwithstanding above the limits of Confessionalism, and attaches himself to the standpoint of the *Union*, where Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism are apprehended as mutually supplemental parts of a higher whole. But his sympathies go away far beyond the Reformation, and take in also the peculiar forms of *Catholic* piety. For to him in truth the universal history of the Church is no accidental aggregate merely of outward facts, but a closely connected process of development or evolution, and an unbroken succession of the life of Christ through all centuries. He has won in particular the priceless merit, of having introduced a more correct judgment of the whole church *before* the Reformation; and above all of having brought home to the Protestant consciousness the theology of the church fathers over against the oldest forms of heresy, not in the service of this or that party, but in the interest purely of truth, without prejudice and in the way of living reproduction. This he did first in his monographies. In Tertullian, he drew a sketch of the African church of the second and third centuries, and taught the world rightly to appreciate this much misunderstood, rough but still natively vigorous Christian character, the patriarch of the Latin theology. In John Chrysostom, he portrayed the greatest orator, interpreter, and saint of the ancient Greek church. In Bernard of Clairvaux, he characterised with warm, though by no means blind admiration, the worthiest representative of monkery, of the crusades, and of the practical church mysticism, out of the bloom period of the previously so little known and so much decried Catholic middle ages. So did he feel himself at home in all periods, because he was met in all, though under different forms, by the same Christ. By such life sketches drawn from the original sources, and then by the connected representation of his larger work, he contributed mightily to force open the barriers of Protestant prejudice and bigotry, and to make room in some measure for a right understanding between Catholicism and Protestantism on historical ground. He appropriated to himself the deeply significant word of the Jansenist Pascal, one of his favorite writers: "*En Jesus-Christ toutes les contradictions sont accordées,*" and saw accordingly in these great

* Among all the characters of church history there is hardly one, with whom *Neander* had more resemblance, both of light and shadow, than with *Melancthon*. Both are of the John-like nature, of the mild, amiable, peace-loving, conciliatory, yielding temperament, and both may be considered in an eminent sense *Præceptores Germaniæ*.

antagonisms of church history also no irreconcilable contradiction, but two equally necessary, reciprocally complementary manifestations of the same Christianity—the reconciliation of which in some future time he looked forward to with joyous hope, as something that seemed to him already typically foreshadowed in the disciple of completion and love.¹

This wide hearted view of history, however, and unprejudiced acknowledgment of the great church facts of antiquity and the middle ages, which may lead possibly at last to still more weighty practical consequences than any which he himself could foresee or approve, has its ground with Neander, not by any means in a Romanizing tendency, which lay quite off from him and never entered his mind, but in his mild John-like Melancthonian temperament partly, and partly in his genuinely Protestant toleration and right valuation of the idea of personality and individuality—or in such a *subjectivity*, as raised a barrier against ultra-Protestant bigotry, no less than against Romanism or the absorption of the particular by the authority of the general. In this he is a true disciple of Schleiermacher, who in spite of the Spinozistic background of his philosophy possessed an extraordinarily keen eye for the personal and individual, and maintained everywhere its rights. What he asserted thus in the sphere of speculation and doctrine mainly, Neander carried out in history. He was pervaded with the conviction, that the free spirit of the Gospel could never exhaust itself in any fixed given form, but required for the complete representation of its infinite fulness a great variety of forms and tendencies. Hence he so often makes the observation, that Christianity, the heaven which is destined to pervade the whole of humanity, does not destroy natural capacities, national and individual distinctions, but only refines and sanctifies them; hence he shows himself such a friend to variety and freedom of development, and such a foe to all constraint and uniformity; hence his taste for monographies, and the impulse he gave to the wider cultivation of this most important method of handling church history, which by the mirror of some single representative personality holds up an entire period in concrete exhibition; hence the love and patience and conscientious truth, indifferent to nothing however small, with

¹ Comp. the closing words of his history of the Apostolical church, and the Dedication of the second edition of the first volume of his larger work to Schelling, where he alludes with approbation to his idea of three stages of development answering to the three Apostles Peter, Paul, and John.

which he follows the men and systems he unfolds, to whatever nation, time or tendency they may belong, in all their relations, circumstances and positions, in order then to collect the scattered particulars again into one organic general image, and to refer them to the idea that remains through all changes in unity always with itself. From the sacred reverence he had in this way for the image of God in the personality of man is to be explained finally the respect and popularity, which this no less pious than learned church father of the nineteenth century enjoys, in higher degree than any other theologian of modern times, among almost all parties of Protestantism, not only in Germany, but also in France, Holland, England, Scotland, and America, nay, so far as difference of ecclesiastical standpoint at all allows it, among liberal minded scholars even of the Roman Catholic church itself. He stands before us in this view as a true man of *mediation*, in the fairest sense of the word, in the midst of the different tendencies of the distracted Christianity of the present time, and has still as such a great and noble mission for a long time yet to fulfil by his writings.

Summing up what has now been said, the innermost peculiarity, the fairest ornament and most abiding worth, of Neander's treatment of church history, may be said to consist in the *organic interpenetration and living marriage of the two elements of science and practical religion*. The interest of edification is not attached outwardly to the subject in the form of pious reflection and declamation, but grows forth from it in a natural way; it is the spirit, which animates and fills the history of Christianity as such. Neander is religious, not *although*, but *because* he is scientific, and he is scientific *because* he is religious. That is the only sort of edification we may expect from a learned work, but which also we *must* expect, where it has Christianity and its historical development for its contents. Such benefit therefore ought never to be lost. A church historian without faith and piety is only able at best to set before us, instead of the living body of Christ, a cold marble statue without seeing eye or feeling heart.

But the task of church history calls for still more than this, in order that it may be completely fulfilled. While we respect and admire in Neander the organic union of the scientific with the *religious* element, we miss in him on the other hand the reconciliation of the scientific with the *churchly* element. We mean by this first a want of decided *orthodoxy*. In his treatment of the Life of Jesus and of the Apostolical Period, we meet views on the Holy Scriptures, their inspiration and

authority, as well as doubts on the strictly historical character of certain sections of the evangelical history, and on the genuineness of single books of the ecclesiastical canon, (namely, the First Epistle to Timothy, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Apocalypse,) which though by no means rationalistic indeed, are nevertheless somewhat too loose and indefinite, and make too many and at times too serious concessions, in our judgment, to modern criticism. His Life of Jesus particularly is in this respect, among all his works, the one that least satisfies the demands of sound faith, however much we must respect also the honesty and tender conscientiousness that lie commonly at the ground of his critical hesitations and doubts. There is on this difficult field at all events a scepticism, which in a moral view is more deserving of respect than that rapid and positive dogmatism, which either denies or carelessly cuts the Gordian knot, instead of bestowing serious and laborious pains on its solution. Full and unconditional reverence for the holy word of God, however, which we miss more or less in the whole Schleiermacherian school, requires in such cases, where science is not yet able to clear up what is dark, an humble bringing of reason into captivity to the obedience of faith, or a present suspension of decisive judgment, in the hope that farther and deeper inquiry may lead to more satisfactory results.

Then again however we must pronounce the theological and historical standpoint of Neander so far unchurchly also, as he does not sufficiently recognize the *objective* and *realistic* character of Christianity and the Church, and betrays through all he has written on the subject, a disposition to resolve the whole mystery into something purely inward and ideal. In this respect he appears to us quite too little Catholic, in the real and historical sense of the word. True, he is neither a Gnostic, nor a Baptist, nor a Quaker, although he often throws out expressions, which torn from their connection sound very favorably for these hyper-spiritualistic sects. He by no means mistakes the objective forces of history, and knows well how to estimate the realistic element in men, such as Tertullian, Athanasius, Augustine, Bernard, and even in the Popes and Schoolmen, up to a certain point. He has much to say indeed of general spiritual tendencies which reveal themselves in individuals, and the opposite terms of idealism and realism, rationalism and supernaturalism, logical intelligence and mystical contemplation, and the various combinations of these tendencies, belong to the standing categories of his treatment of history. But then, in the first place, he carries these differences himself for the most part back again

to a merely psychological basis, to the different constitutions of human nature, that is, to a purely subjective ground; and the prevailing point of view with him is, that the kingdom of God forms itself from individuals, or in some sense from below upwards, so that, as Schleiermacher has once said, "the doctrinal system of the church is formed out of the opinions of individuals." In the next place we see plainly, that he himself is of spiritualistic and idealistic constitution, and does not always happily avoid the dangers, to which this in its own part needful and legitimate tendency is exposed. Hence his partiality for the Alexandrian Fathers, Clemens and Origen: Hence his too favorable representation, as it seems to us, of Gnosticism, particularly of Marcion, whom he even raises, on account of his pseudo-Pauline hostility to Catholic tradition, into a forerunner of the Reformation—which, if it were true, would do this very poor service: Hence his overstrained love of equity towards all heretical and schismatical movements, in which he sees almost always from the start the presence of some deep moral and religious interest, even where they rest clearly on the most wilful insurrection against lawful authority,—a love of equity, which, though not by any means in so high a degree as with the sect-patron Arnold, runs into a want of equity towards the historical church: Hence his undisguised dislike for all that he terms the *re-introduction of the legal Jewish standpoint*, with its special priesthood and outward service, into the Catholic Church; in which he sees a contradiction to the free standpoint of St. Paul, and to the idea of the universal priesthood, (which however even under the Old Testament had place *along with* the special priesthood, comp. 1 Pet. ii: 9 with Ex. xix: 6); although he cannot himself avoid attributing to this legalism a pedagogic mission at least for the education of the Teutonic nations: Hence his indifference towards fixed church organization, and his aversion to all confessional constraint in the Protestant church, which strikes him as "bondage to the letter," "mechanism of forms," and "symbololatry." True, as regards this last point, we must allow him right in the main over against those, who would re-pristiniate *vi et armis* some particular confession of the past, the exclusive Lutheranism for instance of the Form of Concord, without any regard to the enlarged necessities of the present time; and still more ground was there for his zeal against the philosophical tyranny of the Hegelian intellectualists and pantheists, who in the zenith of their prosperity aimed at supplanting the warm-full life of Christianity, by their dry

scholasticism and unfruitful traffic in dialectic forms.¹ But still the theological school of which we here speak is plainly wanting in a proper appreciation of the significance of law and authority in general,—a defect, that hangs in close connection with the false view we find taken of the Old Testament in Schleiermacher's theology and philosophy of religion, as well as with his onesided half-Gnostic ultra-Paulinism. The freedom for which Neander so zealously contends is seemingly of the latitudinarian sort, loses itself at times in the indefinite and wilful, and would cover for example Sabellian, Semi-arian, Anabaptist, Quakerish, and other dangerous errors, with the mantle of charity. Much as we may respect the noble mind that lies at the bottom of this, we must never forget still the weighty maxim, that true freedom can thrive only in the sphere of authority, the single only in the form of suitable subordination to the general, and that genuine catholicity is just as exclusive towards error, as it is wide-hearted towards the different refractions of truth.

Christianity and Churchliness are viewed by Neander more or less as contraries, while both those conceptions, according to the mind at least of the Ancient Church both of the East and of the West, are at bottom the same, and one the measure always of the other. Even the title of his large work: "General History of the Christian Religion and Church," seems to involve the idea, which at all events may very easily take its rise from the Protestant view of the world, that there is a Christian religion *out of* and *beside* the Church. We venture on this no positive decision, but believe that such a separation can hardly be reconciled with Paul's doctrine of the church, as the "body of Jesus Christ," as the "fulness of him that filleth all in all." The future must show, whether Christianity can be upheld without the Divinely founded institution of the Church;² that is, whether the soul can exist without the

¹ In this war with the Hegelian philosophy and its panlogism, he gave way frequently, in occasional utterances of his prefaces and still more in private conversations, to a sort of impatience and heat, which seemed to be in contradiction to his otherwise so placid and mild spirit. But hatred in this case was only reversed love. Let us bear in mind the polemical zeal of St. John against the Gnostics of his day.

² In which case, for example, the Bible and Tract Societies, (or according to Dr. Rothe the State,) would assume the functions of the Ministry, and instead of being in the church as auxiliary associations would usurp its place, and set it aside as no longer necessary. We are of the opinion

body, or must at last resolve itself into a ghost or Gnostic phantom, as certainly as the body without the soul sinks into a dead corpse. In the meantime we hold fast to the maxim: Where Christ is, there also is the Church, his body, and where the Church is, there Christ, her Head, is also, and all grace; and what God hath joined together, let not man put assunder.

With these main faults of Neander's Church History, which we have grouped together under the conception of unchurchliness in the broad sense of the term,—though on the other hand to be sure with the merits also before mentioned,—stand more or less closely connected several other subordinate defects. Neander is, so to speak, the historian pre-eminently of the *invisible* church, and has thus exhibited the development of the Christian doctrine and Christian life, especially so far as these express themselves in single theologians and pious men, in the most thorough and original way, herein surpassing in general all his predecessors. On the other hand, in all that pertains more to the external manifestation of the church, to its bodily form, he takes, by reason of the inward, contemplative, idealistic turn of his mind, less interest. This shows itself immediately in the sections on the *polity* of the church, which is treated by him even in the first ages in a very unsatisfactory manner, under the influence of his antipathy to the hierarchical element, (which however began undeniably to unfold itself in the second century already, as is shown by the Epistles of Ignatius, charged by him with interpolation even in their shorter form without sufficient ground). For the worldly and political side of ecclesiastical history, which comes into view particularly in the sphere of church polity, the relations of the Church with the State, the web of human passions, which unfortunately mix themselves at all times even with the most sacred affairs, the good man besides, with his guileless childlike simplicity of spirit and his recluse student life, had indeed no particularly sharp eye.' Whilst however he notices but little small and

however, that in the same proportion in which Tract Societies and other such voluntary associations, might pretend to go beyond their original sphere, and put themselves into the place of God's church, they would lose also the confidence of the sound Christian public and the blessing of heaven.

¹ Dr. Hagenbach, in his fine article on Neander in the "*Studien und Kritiken*" 1852, p. 588, takes notice also of this honorable defect of his character, and adds the remark: "The other extreme to him is found we may say in *Gfrörer*, who takes a pleasure in tracing the workings of intrigue and

low motives, he enters so much the more carefully into the deeper and more noble springs of actions and events, and substitutes thus for the outward pragmatism of his instructor Planck, who often derives the most important controversies from the most accidental circumstances and the most corrupt purposes, a far more spiritual pragmatism by which the interest of religion becomes the main factor of church history. If he causes us also almost to forget at times that the kingdom of God is *in* this world, it is only to make so much the more conspicuous instead of this the weightier truth of that declaration of Christ, which he has very characteristically prefixed to each volume of his larger work: "My kingdom is not *of* this world."

In the same way the excellent Neander lacked also a cultivated sense for the *aesthetic* and *artistic* side of church history—a defect, which again however appears likewise as the shadow of a virtue, grounded in the unworldly character of his mind. Had he lived in the first centuries, like Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian and others, he might have seen in art, which was then so shamefully abused in the service of heathen idolatry, a vain show at war with the humble condition of the church, if not an actual "pomp of the devil." So far indeed now he does not go; he stands in no Puritanic opposition of principle to art, for just the all pervading leaven-like nature of the Gospel is one of his favorite thoughts; he defends even the use of painting "for the glorification of religion, agreeably to the spirit of Christianity, which ought to reject nothing purely human, but should appropriate, penetrate, and refine all rather, for its own use,"¹ and approves in his account of the image controversies the middle view, which keeps equally clear of idolatry and iconomachy as being both alike extremes. But a thorough examination of the influence which Christianity exercised just on this department of human life, a history of church sculpture, painting, architecture, music, and poetry, as well as of all that belongs to the show and symbolism of the medieval Catholic worship, is not to be looked for in his works. In this respect he is far surpassed by the spirited, though at the same time much less spiritual, *Hase*, who has first woven the history of Christian art, with fine taste, into the general body of

chicanery, but leaves out of sight in doing so the religious agency: see for example, the notice of the Gottesehalk controversy in his history of the Carlovngians."

¹ K. G. III. p. 400.

church history, in short but characteristic and pointed sketches. This indifference of Neander however to the beautiful as such, is fairly balanced to a great extent by the advantage on the other hand, that he does not allow himself to be repelled, like polite wits and worldlings, by the homely and poor estate, in which the Divine is often veiled upon earth, but knows how to appreciate the heavenly treasure in earthen vessels, the rich kernel beneath even a rough shell, or as he himself says in relation to Tertullian, "discerns the stamp of divinity in real life and brings it into view from what serves to obscure it in the present world."¹

From the same point of view lastly are we to judge also of Neander's style; which moves, heavily forward, as is well known, with tedious uniformity and wearisome verbosity, without any picturesque alternation of light and shadow, without rhetorical elegance or polish, without comprehensive classification, like a noiseless stream over an unbroken plain, and so far can by no means be recommended as a pattern of historical delineation; but which on the other side again, by its inartificial naturalness, its contemplative *Gemüthlichkeit*, its quiet presentation of the subject in hand, interests sound feeling and forms a true mirror of the finest features of the great man's character, his *simplicity* and *humility*. What is right here appears to us to lie somewhere in the middle, between the unadorned and uncolored plainness of a Neander and the dazzling brilliancy of a Macaulay.

In spite of all the faults now mentioned, Neander still remains, when we take all together, the greatest church historian which the nineteenth century thus far has produced; great too especially in this, that he never allowed himself, with all his reputation, to lose the sense of that sinfulness and infirmity which cleaves to every work of man in this world,² and with

¹ Preface to the second edition of his "Antignosticus or Spirit of Tertullian," p. xi. Comp. also the striking remarks of Hagenbach, l. c. p. 589, f., who for the completion of historical science rightly demands, that it "should take up in a living way the most different impressions of all times into the mirror of the fancy, copy the past with artistic freedom, create it as it were anew, and breathe into long since departed states the power of a fresh life, without suffering itself still to be blinded by their charm. This is the bond of poetry with history, towards which the modern age strives."

² Comp. the touching close of his Words of Dedication to his friend Dr. Julius Müller, in the second edition of Tertullian, written one year before his death: "although with you I well know, that no man is worthy of celebrity and honor, that in all we know or do we are and remain beggars and sinners."

all his comprehensive knowledge regarded himself, with right self-appreciation, as among many others a forerunner merely of that new creative epoch of Christianity, old and yet forever young, towards which he so gladly stretched his vision, with the prophetic gaze of faith and hope, from the midst of the errors and confusions that surrounded him in the present. "We stand," says he, "on the confines between an old and a new world, which is about to be called into being by the eternally old and eternally new Gospel. For the fourth time a life-epoch for the human race is in preparation by means of Christianity; we can furnish accordingly *in every respect but pioneer work* for the period of the new creation, when after the regeneration of life and science the mighty acts of God will be proclaimed with new tongues of fire."

Mercersburg, Pa.

P. S.

* Preface to his *Leben Jesu*, 1st ed. p. ix, f.
VOL. IV.—NO. VI.