

## HOW CHURCH HISTORY IS WRITTEN.

*History of the Christian Church.* By Philip Schaff. A new edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged. Vol. I. Apostolic Christianity, A. D. 1-100. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882. Large octavo, pp. 871.

**I**T must strike not only the Catholic, but even an impartial outsider, that there is something unreasonable, if not approaching the ludicrous, in the modern fashion of writing church history, as proposed in theory and carried out in practice by not a few of those who outside of the Catholic Church yet retain the Christian name. The writer of English or other profane history, no matter how strong his adherence to Protestantism, will never lose sight of the fact that he is writing the history of a commonwealth or state, one in its government, fundamental laws and institutions, one, too, in its people, no matter from what coalescence of races that unity may have arisen. It may be his duty to mention periods of domestic strife, transient outbreaks of rebellion or usurpation, just as he would not omit foreign wars, crimes, great calamities, or changes of legislation brought about by changed times; but he never forgets his main purpose, which is to write the history of one state, one people. It never occurs to him to identify rebels, usurpers, or other disturbers of the public peace with legitimate authority. But what he would not venture to do when writing the profane annals of an earthly state, he will do boldly, without any seeming consciousness of wrong, when sitting down to unfold the history of Christ's Church, God's kingdom upon earth.

The earliest and most venerable record of this kingdom is to be found in the inspired scriptures of the New Testament. And common propriety would suggest that they should be taken as model and guide by any one who sets about writing the history of God's kingdom. He might at least take the pains of learning from them what is the constitution and fundamental law of that Christian Church whose history and vicissitudes he undertakes to describe.

If there be any point of doctrine laid down with unmistakable clearness in the New Testament, it is the unity of the Church as to her belief, government, and the visible communion of her members in the profession of the same faith and the enjoyment of the same worship and sacraments. As there is but one Shepherd, there can be but one fold; as there is but one Lord, there can be but one faith, one baptism (Jo. x. 16; Eph. iv. 5). Nor is this

unity of belief and communion to be something vague, intangible, or invisible. Christ's people must form one body as well as one spirit. In one spirit we are baptized into one body. The one life-giving bread of the Eucharist, of which we all partake, makes us one body, though we be many (Eph. iv. 4 ; Coloss. iii. 15 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13, x. 17). All Christians must be "of one mind," "of one accord," not only in the bond of charity, but also in outward profession of the same faith, so that "all speak the same thing" (Phil. ii. 2 ; 1 Cor. i. 10). Heretics, that is those who presume to set themselves up against the teaching of Christ's Church, are to be warned, and if they remain obstinate are to be avoided, for they sin deliberately and so stand self-condemned. They are not to be allowed into Christian houses nor receive from us friendly greeting, lest we become partakers of their wickedness (Tit. iii. 10 ; 2 Jo. 10, 11).

But why should we quote further from the king's counsellors, and heralds, when we have the express words of the Divine Founder of this kingdom? In His prayer (Jo. xvii. 20-23), uttered on the eve of shedding His precious blood, that was to be the seal of the New Covenant, He beseeches His Father that not only the princes and rulers of His Church, but all who are hereafter to believe in Him may be one in faith as He and the Father are one. And he prays further, that this unity of belief may be to the world a standing proof of His divine mission and the divine origin of the kingdom He was to establish. "That the world may know that Thou hast sent Me" (*ibid.*). Our Lord, therefore, prayed for two things, first, that unity of faith might be the perpetual prerogative of His Church, and secondly, that this unity of faith should be an unailing mark to distinguish true from false Christianity, in other words to know Christ's work from that of Anti-christ, who would one day seek its ruin under pretence of reforming and improving it.<sup>1</sup> Who that has a spark of Christian reverence can endure the thought that these last words of earnest supplication were doomed to fall away from the loving Father's ears unheard or unheeded, and that unity of faith, instead of becoming the glorious prerogative of His Church forever, was destined one day to become the shameful token of unenlightened, effete Christianity? Such a thought, disguise it as one will, is simply rank blasphemy. And if right-minded men, who profess to read and study their Bible, but alas! do not, would only read and ponder these words of Christ, they would shudder at the thought of thus dishonoring Him who bought them. And if they read a little further in the

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the way in which Our Lord's Prayer is explained by all Protestant commentators, who yet retain reverence for the Christianity taught in the Gospel. See Westcott's Notes on St. John's Gospel in Canon Cook's "Holy Bible." New York (Scribner's Sons), 1880, pp. 246-47.

same Gospel they would discover that Our Lord knew full well that He would be heard by His Father. "Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard me, and I know that Thou hearest me always" (Jo. xi. 41, 42).

The earlier Protestant historians—those say, who lived for nearly two centuries after the Reformation—exhibited in their writings far more of the principle and spirit, without which Christianity becomes inconceivable or absurd. Knowing well that Christ had founded a Church and spread it through the world by means of His apostles, they did their best to identify Protestantism with the Church that He had built, and that His chosen Twelve had preached to the Jewish and Gentile world. To do this was no easy task, but they labored at it in spite of all difficulties, and we may well suppose with not a few misgivings. Again, when they had to speak of those early heresies that rejected or sought to undermine the chief mysteries of revealed teaching, they would denounce such blasphemies with a hearty vehemence that sufficiently attested the reverence they had retained for what they deemed the most important truths of the Bible. The spirit of private judgment, however, proved always and necessarily some drawback, for this is a hidden magical link that unites all heresies, no matter how different, by bonds of sympathy. And in the case of such heretics as Aerius, Helvidius, and Vigilantius, it would be hard to expect that a Protestant historian should denounce them as freely as he would Manes, Arius, or Macedonius, or condemn his own errors in the person of any heresiarch however ancient.

But the spirit of doubt and denial that lay at the bottom of the sixteenth century revolt against Church authority had to run its logical course. And more than a century and a half has passed since the seeds of rationalism, scattered more or less covertly through the many works of the Reformer of Wittemberg, seem to have been suddenly developed in the German mind. They had been ripening all the while, as our Catholic theologians had foretold long before. Yet, when they burst out into full growth and vigorous life, Protestant orthodoxy appeared shocked and pained as if by some unforeseen catastrophe. But the shock, real or affected, was not of long duration. It soon subsided into indifference. And this ere long was followed by acquiescence and adhesion. Rationalism became not only the fashion, but the recognized badge, as it were, of culture and science, while orthodoxy of the old pattern was derided and decried as another name for ignorance or blind adherence to superstitions that had had their day, but could never return to enchain the enlightened human mind.

It was not only the doctrines of the sacred books that were

denied, but the books themselves and their divine origin. Then was fully justified the warning voice that had been uttered centuries before by our Catholic forefathers in the faith. They had said to those who in the sixteenth century had raised the false cry of Gospel freedom, "You have taken to yourselves the liberty of picking and choosing (as your very name *ἀπειρις* implies) whatever doctrines you prefer out of the inspired books and rejecting the rest. Your children will follow in your footsteps and do yet worse. They will pick and choose out of the sacred volume what books they like and discard the rest." And the children have done and continue to do it. Having first declared that the volume has no sacred character, they condescend to allow the genuineness of such books as will stand the test of their critical investigation (so they call it); the others they reject in whole or part as the coinage of some Pseudo-Isaias, Pseudo-Paul, Pseudo-Peter, and the like. And it is with the aid of these arbitrary methods they consider themselves best qualified to discuss and decide on any and every Biblical question, theological doctrine, and the history of the early Church.

And to speak more particularly of the last-mentioned subject, their usual style of dealing with it would be amusing were it not so wicked and too often blasphemous. The history of the Church in its earliest period has for its principal sources the writings of the Apostles themselves, and of those who are called "Apostolic Fathers," viz., Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and others. It is simply astonishing to see how rationalistic "critics" handle these writers; with what bold presumption they decide on their thoughts and motives as well as their words; how they retain or reject whatever they please, guided seemingly by no law but their own caprice. Self-conceited, boastful blunderers, who could mistake Meinhold's fiction,<sup>1</sup> composed in our own day, for an historical

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Dr. Meinhold, an orthodox Lutheran minister of Pomerania, was a "hearty hater" of all the Rationalism of our day. He had a thorough contempt for the lofty criticism of the Tübingen school, believing it to be no scholarship at all, but windy pretence based on a love of novelty, rather than hatred of Christianity. He determined to puncture these wind-bags, and to do so, offered them as a bait his charming novel "die Bernsteinhexe" (the Amber Witch), remarkably well translated into English some forty years ago by Lady Duff Gordon. He pretended that it was an old chronicle which he had discovered in some Pomeranian archives. And the perfect way in which he imitated the German style and language of these centuries ago, lent color to his innocent artifice. The Tübingen school, for whom he had laid the trap, examined his book. Men who could tell every spurious or genuine verse in Matthew, Mark, Peter, Paul and John, applied their critical lens to the "Amber Witch," and after erudite examination decided that it was a genuine chronicle of the fifteenth century. The journalists and reviewers, who were only ordinary mortals, all suspected that he had only had recourse to the common artifice of romancers, like Walter Scott, Manzoni, and others. Meinhold himself kept quiet, laughing in secret over the stupidity and self-conceit of the Tübingen critics. It was only when he was formally questioned by

chronicle of three hundred years ago, can, *stantes pede in uno*, point out to you, if you will only take their word for it, every chapter, page, paragraph, and even single verse that is genuine, spurious, or interpolated in the writings of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, and the other sources on which depends the history of primitive Christianity.

By these remarks, which we have prefixed to an examination of Dr. Schaff's Church History, we do not intend to prejudge his book nor hold it up for the condemnation of our readers as the work of a professed rationalist. Dr. Schaff would be the last man to acknowledge himself such. But a rationalist he certainly is, if we are to judge him not by detached passages (written in a Christian sense), but by the whole tenor of his book. His rationalism may be more timid, more cautious, more refined than that of the Baur and the Tübingen school. But there is nothing to prevent rationalism from having its degrees, its less or more advanced stages, than positivism or any other system that is outside of Christianity. The drift of his book is eminently rationalistic, and any one of his disciples, any one who intends to learn from it as from a text-book—who does not skim it over superficially, but studies or even reads it with some degree of careful attention and accepts its teachings as truth—will soon find himself in a wretched state of doubt or, worse still, of dogmatism, which, whatever name it may assume, cannot honestly pretend to be called Christian. Unfortunately, the Protestant mind of the whole country is slowly but surely finding its way to the abyss of German rationalism, and many are closer to it than they would care to acknowledge. This happens principally in what are called our "seats of learning," colleges, theological seminaries, and the like. Some few even in the ministry speak out quite freely, and their frankness does them some credit. Others are more cautious,<sup>1</sup> and with good reason. There yet lingers a good deal of old-fashioned Protestantism in this country which cannot be insulted with impunity. It retains reverence for God, His only begotten Son, His Apostles and their inspired writings. It shudders, as just Christian feeling demands,

---

a letter from King John of Saxony, that he came out and acknowledged that every line and word of the romance was his from beginning to end. What did the infallible professors of Tübingen do? They came out with a proclamation declaring that they were right in their decision, and that Meinhold must have deceived the public.

<sup>1</sup> It is not more than a year since an Episcopal minister of New York declared publicly that many Protestant ministers did not hold the religious opinions which they habitually gave out from the pulpit, but lacked the courage to speak out what they thought. He referred, evidently, to those who spoke like Christians, while believing like rationalists. This candid acknowledgment (for, doubtless, he included himself in the number) raised a storm of indignant denial in many parts of the country, especially from the religious press, whose editors must have known the truth of the assertion.

at the thought of allowing the Holy Books of the Old or New Law to be treated as the work of ignorant or designing men, the outcome of a rude, imperfect religion, and only a little better, if at all, than the writings of Buddha or Confucius.

This class of Protestants must be gently dealt with. Their prejudices, as these Neologists consider them (and would so call them if they dared), must not be abruptly shocked, but must be delicately handled. The false teachers even seek to propitiate the unthinking crowd by occasional outbursts of sturdy Protestantism. And we all know how efficacious are a few timely tirades against Popery in lulling to unsuspecting repose the minds of most hearers and readers, and giving the safest assurance of the orthodoxy of the preacher or writer.

We regret that Dr. Schaff—in what all must acknowledge to be a learned and important work—should have laid himself open to the suspicion of having stooped to this petty artifice. It will be hard for any enlightened, impartial reader to resist the suggestion that his foul, reckless and (for an historian) undignified abuse of everything Catholic is only a shabby device to maintain his own character for orthodoxy and turn away attention from the rationalistic poison of his book. Or, to be more charitable, perhaps it is the intensity of his hatred to Rome that impels him unconsciously to break out into abuse of Rome and all that belongs to her, to vilify—and we are ashamed to say it—to falsify her creed. Others perhaps may suspect another motive. They will remember that years ago Dr. Schaff was accused of Romanizing tendencies. There was not a particle of ground for the accusation, unless perhaps that in waging war with the Catholic Church he abstained from the fierce, coarse language current amongst the sects. Time has shown that there never was any danger of his leaving the Protestant fold. But the memory of the charge haunts him still. It is a sore yet rankling within him; and he unwisely *vulnera cruda retractat*, by letting slip no occasion of flinging off this hated reproach. And how does he do it? By stooping to imitate the very men who accused him of being a Crypto-Papist in the use of ugly language against Rome! It is a pity that a man of his scholarly attainments and well-established reputation could find no better, more dignified way of repelling this or any other charge.

Forgetting, however, for the moment Dr. Schaff's anti-Catholic and Rationalistic bias, it is but fair to state that he has here and there passages breathing a truly Christian spirit, to which no Catholic can take exception, but must on the contrary award them his unqualified sympathy and admiration. There are other passages, too, which no Protestant can read without accepting him as a thorough exponent of most orthodox, old-fashioned, evangelical

Protestantism. But such detached passages are calculated to do harm and have done it. They have caught the eye and blinded the mental vision of his reviewers. For in them all we have found no word of condemnation, not even of warning, but one universal chorus of rapturous praise. The only exception was a Lutheran periodical, which ventured faintly to blame the author's lack of due reverence for Luther. But it had no eyes to detect his want of reverence for the Apostles and the Holy Ghost who inspired them.

Apart from all religious considerations, and viewing the work merely from a literary standpoint, it is simple justice to say that Dr. Schaff's history is well written. Though he was born in Germany and spent his youth there, his correct and judicious use of our language would prevent any reader from suspecting that English was not his native tongue. His book is, besides, replete with erudition, some of which will be new to most American readers. And the number of authors whom he quotes is sufficient proof of the patient, toilsome research that he has brought to the composition of his work.

By the very motto the author has chosen for his book and inscribed on its title-page, he sufficiently shows what is his conception of Christ's Christian Church. His reason for adopting it is this: "The secular historian should be filled with universal human sympathy, the church historian with universal Christian sympathy. The motto of the former is: *Homo sum; nihil humani a me alienum puto*;<sup>1</sup> the motto of the latter: *Christianus sum; nihil Christiani a me alienum puto*" (p. 25). This frame of mind in the Church historian he describes in the same paragraph as "a sound moral and religious, that is, a truly Christian spirit." He explains himself more openly on p. 26: "There is a common Christianity in the Church as well as a common humanity in the world which no Christian can disregard with impunity. Christ is the divine harmony of all the discordant human creeds and sects. It is the duty and the privilege of the historian to trace the image of Christ in the various physiognomies of His disciples and to act as a mediator between the different sections of His Kingdom." Christ's Church, therefore, is to be considered as made up of all those who justly or unjustly call themselves Christians. And all who call Him Master, no matter how discordant or contradictory the lessons they have learned from Him, are His disciples. This would only prove (*sit venia verbo*), that He is not a competent Teacher. Is not

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the celebrated line of Terence, praised by Cicero, Seneca, Saints Ambrose and Augustine, and other Holy Fathers and mediæval writers, and which, when first uttered, is said to have elicited applause from the whole theatre. We think Dr. S. should have let the famous line remain just as the poet wrote it:

*Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.*

this horrible to Christian ears? Yet it is the logical sequence of the author's theory. And if, as He promised, He is forever to abide with His Church, made up of jarring creeds and discordant sects, then He can only abide with her as a patron and encourager, if not an actual teacher of error. But is this the Bible conception of the Church in the Old or New Covenant? Was the old Church at any time made up of Jews, Jeroboamites, and Samaritans? or did our Saviour deceive the Samaritan woman when He told her (Jo. iv. 22) that salvation, and therefore the true way of worshipping God, as taught by Himself, belonged exclusively to the Jews: *Salus ex Judæis est?* The very fact that the Jews would not hold social, much less religious, communion with the Samaritans (ib. v. 8), shows plainly that the latter were considered to be outside of the Jewish Church. In the Church of the New Testament the lines are yet more strictly drawn. Heretics, as we have seen from St. Paul and St. John, are to be shut out by true Christians from religious communion, and even from social intercourse, where this may endanger faith. According to the beloved Apostle, heretics are not in the Church; and their going out of it is the best proof that in heart and soul they never belonged to it. "They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us they would, no doubt, have continued with us" (I. John ii. 19). And we have seen before that, according to our Saviour's prayer (Jo. xvii.), unity of faith was to be the distinctive mark, not only of the Apostles and disciples, whom the Father gave immediately into His hands, but of all who were to believe in Him down to the end of the world.

The Church historian has no more right to ignore or pervert this New Testament characteristic of Christ's earthly kingdom than has the Church theologian. And what is true of her faith must also be true of her government. If she is an organized body—and the wisdom and power of her Divine Founder call for nothing else—she must be one and unchanging in her government. Nor can the historian lose sight of this without being unfaithful to his duty, and insinuating dogmatic error under cover of historical development. Yet Dr. Schaff gives this advice (p. 9), and has no objection to allow his readers to suppose that Papal, Presbyterian, and Congregational governments are mere outward forms of Church polity, either simply adiaphorous or nothing more than the outgrowth of human caprice or human ambition. Elsewhere, indeed (p. 486), he makes no secret of his own opinion, which is that in the Apostolic times there was no distinction between clergy and laity. And with that lofty superciliousness, which is the distinguishing trait of all Rationalists, even of the milder type, as if he alone possessed the key of Scriptural knowledge, he boldly de-



cides (p. 263) against all commentators, Catholic and non-Catholic, of the last eighteen centuries, that by the word *κληρων* (clergy, I. Pet. v. 3), St. Peter meant not *clergy*, but *laity*, viz., "the Christian people." The New Testament cannot be expected to furnish its own commentary, but a sufficient help to its meaning (apart from Church authority) may be found in the words and actions of those Apostolic Fathers who were educated in the school of the Apostles, and who represented and perpetuated their teaching. St. Ignatius, a disciple of St. John, speaks clearly enough of the difference between bishops, priests, and laity. And St. Clement, a Roman disciple of St. Peter, in a solemn document, written on behalf of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, says plainly that the chief priest (bishop or *αρχιερευς*) has his duties assigned him; as to the priests (*τοις ιερευσιν*) is also allotted their proper place, and to the Levites (deacons) their own ministry; while the layman (*δ λαικος*) is bound by the precepts that regard the laity.<sup>1</sup> St. Polycarp, too, in his letter to the Philippians (cap. v.), mentions deacons and priests as distinct from the laity.<sup>2</sup>

If there be any doctrine that has come down from Apostolic times to our own consecrated by the belief and reverence of all Christians, and holding its own unimpaired by quarrels over other doctrines, it is the inspiration of the books of the Old and New Testament. The New Testament cannot be supposed to vouch directly<sup>3</sup> for its own inspiration. But this has been sufficiently established by the teaching of the Apostles and the tradition of the Church. St. Paul calls all Scripture divinely inspired (*θεόπνευστος*, II. Tim. iii. 16); and St. Peter adds, that its authors were holy men of God, who spoke inspired or moved by the Holy Ghost (*ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*, II. Pet. i. 21). Catholic and Protestant alike acknowledge this truth, and to deny it is virtually to overthrow Christianity. Dr. Schaff amuses his readers by talking in general terms of inspiration, as if he held the orthodox view of it. He speaks (p. 571) of the New Testament books as "written under the special influence and direction of the Holy Spirit;" but when he comes to speak in detail of the "holy men of God," whom Catholics and orthodox Protestants believe to have been the chosen

<sup>1</sup> See *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (by Gebhart and Harnack), Lipsiae, 1876, vol. i., pp. 65, 66. The boastful arrogance of these two rationalistic editors is only matched by their contempt for Latin grammar and syntax. They make *perlustratus* a deponent participle (p. lxxvi.), and *regnatus* the equivalent of the passive participle "governed." "Ecclesia cui adscriptus erat auctor nondum *per unum Episcopum regnata* esse videtur." And these are the men who bow down before Theodore Mommsen, and join him in casting discredit on the classical scholars of Italy.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 120. If he does not mention the bishop, it may be easily explained by the possibility that the see was then vacant. Zahn's supposition that no bishops yet existed is quite gratuitous. The main point is the distinction between clergy and laity.

<sup>3</sup> Indirectly St. Paul's Epistles are vouched for as Scripture by St. Peter (II. Pet. iii. 16).

channels of God's revelation, he shows the cloven foot of Rationalism. He hints, when he gets the chance (p. 608), that inspiration, in its true sense, is incompatible with "the personal agency and individual peculiarities of the sacred authors, and the exercise of their natural faculties in writing." He seems inclined to fasten on Catholics and orthodox Protestant Christians a belief in this incompatibility, and regards it as an attempt on their part "to cut the Gordian knot," which is wholly of his own making. As far as the Catholic Church is concerned, we can only say that no such idea was ever entertained by her divines. From the great St. Jerome, who, centuries ago, studiously noted the difference in style between the rustic Amos and the courtly Isaias, down to the humblest theological plodder of our day, every one acknowledges, without hesitation, that difference of style or mental peculiarities, diligence, and skill in the searching out and making use of records, written or unwritten, are by no means incompatible with the Catholic theory of inspiration. Does Dr. Schaff imagine that no Catholic Father or theologian has ever read St. Luke's prologue to his Gospel, and that his able pen was needed to bring out its true significance?

We insist that with or notwithstanding a man's peculiarities of style, temperament, accurate research, and preparation, he may be chosen to be the channel of communication between God and man; and, when he is so chosen, he becomes the mouthpiece of God, revealing the truth to His creatures. Though his natural qualities be left intact, nothing in them that is vicious, sinful, testy, or capricious, nothing that can impair or disfigure the truth will be allowed to appear on the pages of God's revelation. Paul, right or wrong, may disagree with Barnabas on his journey, or may fall out with Cephas about disciplinary matters. But the Holy Ghost does not intend to consecrate by His inspiration these personal feelings, whether well or ill-founded. And, whoever insinuates the contrary, can only mean—we will not say to dishonor the Holy Spirit—but most assuredly to overthrow the whole Christian theory of inspiration. This is what Dr. Schaff does throughout his book. He represents the Apostles as narrow-minded partisans, divided into factions, standing on their dignity, if not huffishly inclined, differing from one another in their views of Christian doctrine. And all this he has discovered, not from independent historical sources, but from their *inspired* writings. What his notion of inspiration is may be easily guessed from this. It is one which any Rationalist or Infidel will readily allow. Lest we be suspected of exaggeration we quote a few passages to show the irreverent, contemptuous tone in which he speaks of Peter, Paul, James, John, and the rest, after praising them with words which are often in themselves offensive. It is the *Ave Rabbi* of the Passion offered once more to Christ our Lord in the person of His Apostles.

ST. JAMES.—“James appears as the most conservative of the Jewish converts, at the head of the extreme right wing, yet recognizing Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles. . . . He must, therefore, not be classed with the heretical Judaizers” (p. 267). “He was an honest (!), conscientious (!), eminently practical, conciliatory Jewish Christian saint,—the right man in the right place, and at the right time, although contracted in his mental vision” (ibid.). “He represented, as it were, the extreme right wing of the Jewish Church, bordering close on the Judaizing faction” (p. 344). “He had more the spirit of an ancient prophet, or of John the Baptist, than the spirit of Jesus (in whom he did not believe till after the resurrection); but for this very reason he had most authority over the Jewish Christians, and could reconcile the majority of them to the progressive (!) spirit of Paul” (p. 345). “He undoubtedly differs widely from Paul. . . . There are multitudes of sincere, earnest, and faithful Christian workers, who never rise above the level of James, to the sublime height of Paul or John” (p. 271).

THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM.—Though the Apostles proclaim that the decrees of this Council were the work of the Holy Ghost (*visum est SPIRITUI SANCTO et nobis*), and the whole Christian world has ever so believed, yet Dr. Schaff has no more respect for it than he would have for an act of Congress, or of one of our legislatures. It was a “compromise” (p. 346) between conflicting parties, and, like all compromises, unsatisfactory. “It was liable to a double construction, and had in it the seed of future troubles. It was an armistice, rather than a final settlement” (p. 351). “The decree was deficient (!). It went far enough for the temporary emergency, and as far as the Jewish Church was willing to go, but not far enough for the cause of Christian union and Christian liberty in its legitimate development” (p. 349). He intimates that its illiberal character made it offensive to St. Paul, and that consequently he would not condescend to mention it in any of his Epistles. “Why does Paul never refer to this synodical decree? Because he could take a knowledge of it for granted; or more probably because he did not like altogether its restrictions, which were used by the illiberal constructionists against him and against Peter at Antioch” (p. 346). These illiberal constructionists, we are subsequently told (pp. 352 and 354), are the strict constructionists of the school of St. James.

ST. JOHN.—“In the first stadium of Apostolic Christianity, John figures as one of the three pillars of the Church of the circumcision, together with Peter and James, the brother of the Lord; while Paul and Barnabas represented the Gentile Church. This seems to imply that at that time he had not yet risen to the full apprehension of the universalism and freedom of the Gospel. But he was the most liberal (!) of the three, standing between James

and Peter on the one hand, and Paul on the other, and looking already towards a reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. The Judaizers never appealed to him as they did to James or to Peter. There is no trace of a Johannan party, as there is of a Cephas party, and a party of James. He stood above strife and division" (p. 423). "The theology of the second and third centuries evidently presupposes the writings of John, and starts from his Christology, rather than from Paul's anthropology and soteriology, which were almost buried out of sight (!) until Augustin in Africa revived them" (p. 426).

ST. PETER.—"Peter stands between James and Paul, and forms the transition from the extreme conservatism of the one to the progressive liberalism of the other" (p. 522). "His knowledge gradually widened and deepened with the expansion of Christianity and the conversion of Cornelius" (p. 523).

ST. MARK.—"Mark has no distinct doctrinal type, but is catholic, irenic, unsectarian, and neutral, as regards the party questions within the Apostolic Church" (p. 635). On the very next page, in Rationalistic fashion, he contradicts all this, and quotes approvingly the remark of Dr. Morison: "There is not so much as a straw of evidence that the Gospel of Mark occupied a position of mediation or irenic neutrality in relation to the two other synoptic Gospels" (p. 636). Therefore Mark was and was not "irenic and neutral," and probably did not know his own mind. On the same page Dr. S. kindly concedes that Matthew and Luke "made their (historical) selections without altering or coloring the facts."

ST. LUKE.—"An irenic spirit, such as we may freely admit in the writings of Luke, does not imply an alteration or invention of facts. On the contrary, it is simply an unsectarian, catholic spirit, which aims at the truth, and nothing but the truth, and which is the first duty of the historian" (p. 669).

We could quote a great deal more, but what has been quoted shows the author's utter contempt for the Christian idea of inspiration. These "holy men of God," who "spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost," as St. Peter says, were narrow-minded partisans, who founded separate schools, and, when they did their best, only aimed at doctrinal compromises. We would rather see them openly denounced as demagogues and impostors by men of the stripe of Paulus and Renan, than hear them "damned with faint praise" by Dr. Schaff as catholic, irenic, unsectarian, honest, etc. These epithets to any Christian ear are more offensive than downright abuse. They only lead us to surmise that he would pour out the full measure of his rationalistic venom if he dared, if the ignorant Christian prejudices of the country, as he considers them, did not present too formidable a barrier to be attacked without extreme caution.

We have only a little space left to notice Dr. Schaff's virulent attacks on everything Catholic, or that Catholics regard with reverence. He begins with the Blessed Virgin, and denounces her whom all generations are bound to bless (either freely on earth or against their will in everlasting flames), as tainted with "actual and native sin" (p. 442). He thinks that she needs a Saviour, as if the Catholic Church (of whose doctrines he seems to know nothing) had not always taught and did not teach at this day the same thing. He shows his anti-Catholic hatred of her perpetual virginity by leaning to the hypothesis that the so-called "brothers of our Lord" (a Hebrew form of expression for cousins or relatives) were actually uterine brothers, children of the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph. This brazen-faced hypothesis is caught up eagerly by all who wish to dishonor our Blessed Lady and the Church that alone fulfils her prophecy by doing her homage. An Episcopal clergyman of Ohio, some thirty years ago, wrote a book in favor of this unchristian opinion; and his bishop wrote a letter approving the book, on the score that it would do good service against the Roman Church, and its reverence for the Virgin Mother of God. It is impossible for a Catholic, however strong-minded and impartial, to listen to these things without fancying them mere echoes of the hissing of that infernal serpent who writhes, crushed and bruised, under her virgin heel.

St. Peter, like a true Protestant, he holds in horror and detestation, because he identifies him with the Church of Rome, and delights in pouring out his gall upon the latter by abusing her Apostle and founder. Peter, according to him, was guilty of sin, of public scandal, of downright hypocrisy (p. 355). He surrendered a vital principle, and was willing to allow Christianity "to shrink into a narrow corner as a Jewish sect" (ibid.). "The whole scene (of Paul's quarrel with Peter) typically foreshadows the grand historical conflict between Petrine Catholicism and Pauline Protestantism (unmeaning, absurd words, which Dr. Schaff elsewhere makes a show of condemning as the invention of German Rationalism, but which he takes care to slyly insinuate as historically well-grounded throughout the whole of his book), which, we trust, will end at last in a grand Johannean reconciliation" (p. 358). He showed "cowardly fear of the narrow-minded Judaizers from Jerusalem." He was a "rock of offence and a stumbling-block" (ibid.). His modesty at the Last Supper was only "presumption." He showed his "consistent inconsistency" and cowardice by running away from martyrdom at the end of his life (ibid.). If Dr. Schaff hated St. Peter less, or loved truth more, he would have understood better the words of Origen and St. Ambrose, whom he has the face to quote in support of his wicked accusation. We may charitably suppose that he has quoted them second-hand, without read-

ing them, from his Rationalistic masters, Hilgenfeld, Tischendorf, and Lipsius. Peter, we have it repeated by Dr. Schaff, *usque ad nauseam*, was a married man, and carried his wife about with him on his missionary excursions; and this he makes an argument (p. 262) against "the claims of the Papacy!" One would suppose that Peter's marriage was a secret discovered for the first time by Dr. Schaff. Every Catholic has heard of it, and acknowledged it from the days of the Apostles to the present time. But following St. Jerome and the Fathers of the Church, we treat with deserved contempt Dr. Schaff's gratuitous romance about St. Peter's living with his wife after his call to the Apostleship. There are a few burning words in St. Jerome (*Commentary on Osee*, cap. ix.) touching heretical hatred of chastity, which we can scarcely forbear quoting in this connection, but we let them pass. Dr. S. thinks Peter's conduct at Antioch "irreconcilable with his infallibility as to discipline," and even with his "alleged supremacy" (p. 263). Now, why does Dr. S. deliberately falsify (we really can use no milder term) the doctrine of the Catholic Church? He knows, as well as any Catholic theologian, or the Vatican Council itself, that neither St. Peter nor his successors are infallible in disciplinary matters. And his saying so, against his better knowledge, is simply an effusion of blind hatred, which will not commend him to impartial readers. It is at utter variance with the canon he himself lays down: "The historian must first lay aside all prejudice and party zeal, and proceed in the pure love of truth" (p. 25). Let him abuse and decry St. Peter, if he will; but let him not belie or misrepresent him or the Church that was built on him. We are asking for very little. And if he could be shamed into the decency of common logic, where Catholic belief is concerned, we would ask him to think twice before asserting that the argument for Papal infallibility, drawn from Luke xxii. 31, 32 (*Rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua. Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*), "would logically imply also that every Pope must deny Christ and be converted, in order to strengthen the brethren" (p. 256).

There is a great deal more of this anti-Catholic venom in Dr. Schaff's book, which is neither compatible with truth nor with the dignity of history. It is simply the pent-up indignation of an angry partisan, which he has neither the tact nor the good manners to restrain within proper bounds. And it shows that a man may write very becomingly of the way in which the historian should conduct his work (see pp. 22-27, § Duty of the Historian) without being willing or able to realize his ideal.

To sum up all that we have said in a few words, Dr. Schaff is nothing more than a bitter, unscrupulous, anti-Catholic partisan, who, to gratify his hatred of the Church and her Founder, has no

difficulty in sacrificing historical truth in a book which he and his admirers call a *History of the Christian Church*. As an expounder of Protestant Christianity honesty does not shine amongst his qualifications. He is simply a cunning, Rationalistic wolf, dressed up in Evangelical sheep's clothing.

---

## THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY IN ITS THREEFOLD SOURCE.

### THREE REPRESENTATIVE BISHOPS.

*Don Fray Juan de Zumárraga, primer Obispo y Arzobispo de Mexico. Estudio Biografico y Bibliografico por Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta.* Mexico, 1881. 8vo, 371, 278 pp.

*Monseigneur de Saint-Vallier et l'Hôpital Général de Québec.* Québec, 1882. 8vo, 743 pp.

*Leben und Wirken des hochseligen Johannes Nep. Neumann, aus der Congregation des allerh. Erlösers, Bischofs von Philadelphia, von P. John Nep. Berger, aus der Congregation des allerh. Erlösers.* New York. Benziger Bros., 1883. 12mo, 405 pp.

**T**HERE is something grand in the sources of our hierarchy, recent though it be, and apparently unable to boast of ancient glory; of heroic prelaty confronting with dignity the assaults of error wielded by the power of Rome, the sophistry of Greece, the brutal tyranny of feudalism, or greed and passion cloaked in the rags of would-be learning. Our hierarchy seems to date back only a century; yet this is but a dim and poor idea. The eye of faith reaches farther back, back into the annals of the Church.

Three ancient European sees, betokening and representing as many time-honored hierarchies of the Old World, full of the apostolic injunction, extended their ministry to the ends of the earth, beyond the vast ocean which sobbed and seethed unceasingly before them. And from this threefold source come lines of bishops blending into the present hierarchy of the United States.

By a singular Providence, a petty strip on our Atlantic coast