

hammered out the essentials of its content, gave it life by a stimulating approach, and applied it both directly and implicitly. An attentive student learned more about living the subject than one did about knowing it! In that sense many of his students entered the life of the church to make history and participate in its progress.

It is perilous to neglect the study of church history. Most of the circumstances we will meet at any given time have been met before and often the clue to their resolution is locked in the archives of the church. Our history is needed to allow us to face up to the existing situation and we can prepare for coming events as well. In this way we obtain a sound understanding of what we are, how we got here, and where we want to go. Church history needs to be revisited.

NOTES

^{^1} Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1971) 1, xvi.

^{^2} An example of this type of history writing is Elgin S. Moyer's *Great Leaders of the Christian Church* (Chicago: Moody, 1951).

^{^3} H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968) chap. 3.

^{^4} The saga of Hippolytus offers interesting speculation in this area. Would Hippolytus have received canonization if the *Refutation of All Heresies* had been known to have been his?

^{^5} For the heart of this issue see *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 16:1-2 (1971).

^{^6} Although the writer is much indebted for many historical insights to Paul Johnson, he finds his writings often indicate the negative infringement of this mood. Paul Johnson, *A History of Christianity* (New York, Atheneum, 1980).

^{^7} Perhaps the classic biblical example is found in 1 Kgs 22:13-16 in which King Ahab obviously understood something very different than what the prophet Micaiah actually said.

^{^8} *The Ante Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.) VIII, 487.

^{^9} Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1959) chapters XXII through XXIX. The account is presented in a very factual way from a somewhat secularist point of view.

^{^10} Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV:3. The account is repeated twice in Eusebius: III:14.

^{^11} See the interesting note in *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.) Series II, Vol. 1, p.161. Historical perspective is clarified in this note.

^{^12} For a modern history text that demonstrates this approach: Bruce L. Shelley, *Church History in Plain Language* (Waco: Word Books, 1982).

^{^13} Latourette, pp.xff. The seven questions offered by the author form the basis for his historical analysis and consideration.

^{^14} We have in mind chiefly the controversies known as monothelism, monophysitism, Nestorianism, etc. Later Christological problems such as Kenosis and the question of potential sin are probably in the same category.