

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *European Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_european-journal-theology_01.php

Evangelical Historiography: May a Historian Legitimately Look for God’s Hand in Church History?

T. J. Marinello

SUMMARY

This essay provides a qualified yes to the question of whether an evangelical historian can legitimately look for the hand of God in Church history. After noting that God is the master and creator of history, pneumatological reasons for this qualified yes are provided. Limits and cautions are then reviewed. First, the evangelical historian should not approach the interpretation of Church history with a triumphalist attitude. Second, he needs to be

aware of how it is his theological and other assumptions may affect his historiography. Third, he should be cognizant that historians from different parts of Christianity (or even different evangelical historians) may indeed see the active hand of God as causing a particular historical outcome, but for very different reasons. Ultimately, while an evangelical historian may see the hand of God in Church history, it likely only will be a glimpse and is subject to a revisit when more data is discovered.

* * * *

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Dieser Aufsatz beantwortet die Frage, ob ein evangelikaler Historiker berechtigterweise nach der Hand Gottes in der Geschichte Ausschau halten darf, mit einem qualifizierten ‚Ja‘. Nach der einführenden Feststellung, dass Gott Herr und Schöpfer der Geschichte ist, werden pneumatologische Gründe für dieses ‚Ja‘ angeführt. Dann folgt eine Untersuchung der Grenzen und Vorsichtsmaßregeln in diesem Bereich. Erstens, der evangelikale Historiker sollte nicht mit einer triumphalistischen Haltung an die Interpretation der Kirchengeschichte herangehen. Zweitens, er muss sich seiner theologischen und

anderer Hypothesen bewusst sein, und wie diese seine Geschichtsschreibung beeinflussen können. Drittens, er sollte dessen eingedenk sein, dass Historiker aus unterschiedlichen Lagern der Christenheit (oder sogar aus unterschiedlichen evangelikalern Lagern) durchaus die tätige Hand Gottes als Urheber eines bestimmten historischen Ergebnisses wahrnehmen mögen, doch dies aus ganz unterschiedlichen Gründen. Und schließlich: Auch wenn der evangelikale Historiker die Hand Gottes in der Geschichte sehen mag, so wird dies vermutlich nur ein flüchtiger Blick sein, der bei umfangreicherer Datenlage auch weiterer Überprüfung bedarf.

* * * *

RÉSUMÉ

Cet ouvrage apporte une réponse positive nuancée à la question de savoir si un historien évangélique peut légitimement chercher à discerner la main de Dieu dans l’histoire de l’Église. Après avoir souligné que Dieu est le créateur et le maître de l’histoire, l’auteur avance des raisons pneumatologiques pour justifier cette réponse positive nuancée. Il indique ensuite les limites de cet exercice et les précautions à prendre. Tout d’abord, l’historien évangélique doit se garder d’une attitude triomphaliste dans son interprétation de l’histoire de l’Église. Il doit

ensuite être conscient de la manière dont ses positions théologiques ou autres peuvent orienter sa démarche. Il lui faut encore savoir que des historiens d’autres confessions chrétiennes (ou même d’autres historiens évangéliques) pourront voir l’action divine comme la cause de tel ou tel aboutissement dans l’histoire, mais pour des raisons très différentes de celles qu’il croit lui-même discerner. Enfin, s’il est vrai que l’historien évangélique peut discerner la main de Dieu dans l’histoire de l’Église, ce ne sera que de manière fugitive et son appréciation sera sujette à révision en fonction de découvertes de nouvelles données historiques.

* * * *

1. Introduction

Exodus 33 and 34 record the renewal of the Mosaic Covenant after the failures of the nation of Israel as they worshipped the golden calf. These events of failure and renewal follow the record of the miraculous deliverance of Israel from 400 years of bondage in Egypt (Ex 7:4-5, 12:12).¹ At this juncture, Moses looks to the Lord for proof that he has indeed found favour in his sight and asks, ‘Please show me your glory’ (Ex 33:18).² With this event as a background, we come to the question, ‘What can an evangelical expect to see when he examines Church history?’³ Specifically, may an evangelical historian legitimately look for God’s hand in Church history? While this is not a new issue, this is an appropriate venue to address it once again.⁴

Before proceeding, a definition and a disclosure are in order. First, an evangelical is defined here as someone who manifests the characteristics of an evangelical as commonly defined by Bebbington’s ‘quadrilateral of priorities’, namely, ‘*conversionism*, the belief that lives need to be changed; *activism*, the expression of the gospel in effort; *biblicism*, a particular regard for the Bible; and what may be called *crucicentrism*, a stress on the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.’⁵ Second, this essay is written from an evangelical perspective. Thus, this is a short study of the feasibility of a particular historical method which originates out of a particular segment of Christianity.

Returning to the matter at hand, what generally is seen when one examines the history of the Church? Jesus said in Matthew 16:18, ‘I will build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.’ To study Church history, then, is to study the outworking of this promise. The second person of the Trinity said he will establish something and he guarantees its unassailable endurance. When one examines Church history, however, what actually is encountered? The examiner quickly becomes enveloped by the many and noteworthy failures of the followers of Jesus Christ to reflect his teachings and values. What constitutes a failure? That depends on the examiner. For example, if the historian comes from one particular background, failure may be found in the insistence of the Reformers and other early rebels not to be under the authority of *sancta mater ecclesia*. From this perspective, the Lord left only one Church, the one, holy, apostolic and *Roman Catholic Church*, whose fidelity is guaranteed in

part by the organic link through the laying on of hands in the succession of bishops from the time of the apostles until today.⁶ If the reader comes from one of the Orthodox churches – and especially the Russian Orthodox Church – the failure of fidelity by the Roman Catholic Church is confirmed in the fall of the first Rome for heresy, and the ‘fall to the infidel’ of the second Rome (Byzantium) for trying to reunite with the first Rome.⁷ The subsequent shattering and fragmenting of the Western Church as a result of the Protestant Reformation is seen as further evidence of the failures of the Roman Catholic Church. If the reader comes from one of the many Protestant denominations, and especially from one with a ‘gathered’ ecclesiology,⁸ the failure of both the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox churches may be traced to their departure from New Testament teachings regarding the content and practice of the Gospel. Accordingly, depending on from which part of Christianity one comes, failures are readily seen in the other sections, if not in one’s own as well.

In addition to these divergent views of failure, however, there are similar views regarding the failures of the Church. For example, almost everyone within twenty-first century Christianity looks with disdain at the Inquisition’s persecution of men like Galileo for supporting a heliocentric system as opposed a geocentric universe; many shun a favourable view of the era of the Christian Crusades; and some shrink back from the various church-state allegiances which have come to grief in the Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant traditions.⁹

2. The Bible

Nonetheless, should an evangelical be able to study Church history and seek the face of God, to detect his hand at work in the unfolding history of his Church? If so, why can such a seemingly outrageous claim be made? What possible support for such a position can be found? The answer is found in the inerrant revelation of the character and conduct of God; it is found in the Bible. To find answers to our questions, then, we need to consult the text. As this is done, an important observation is in order.

God is both the master and creator of history. Karl Barth notes that ‘there is an element in which [all history] is immediate to God and immediately posited by Him’. Accordingly, all historical study becomes ‘soulless and intolerable’ when God’s

perspective is not accepted or even considered.¹⁰ More simply put, God is the maker of the world as well as the maker of time to include the unfolding of its sequence as its master.¹¹ Throughout the Old Testament we find examples of his activity in the history of Israel. Further, the incarnation of the Lord Jesus, or as one has called it the Intemporisation, recorded in the New Testament, clearly demonstrates a God who is active in his creation.¹² Repeatedly throughout the Old and New Testaments, God declares that the purpose of his actions is to bring glory to himself (e.g. the Exodus: Ex 7:5, 9:14, 10:2, 11:9; the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus: Phil 2:7-10). His outworking of his purposes happens in an orderly fashion which brings greatest glory to himself (e.g. Isa. 41).¹³ Accordingly, the point of discussion is not whether God is purposeful and active in history; the Bible clearly says that he is as ‘the Author and Guider of the world’s history from the beginning’.¹⁴ In fact, Claus Westermann rightly notes that ‘God’s deity is shown to be such by the continuity of his action in history.’¹⁵ The Lord God as master and creator of history even challenges the ‘idol gods’ and their worshippers both to recount what has happened as well as to use this knowledge to predict the resultant, purposeful outcome (Isa. 41:21-24).¹⁶

3. The person

The question at hand, then, is whether or not an evangelical historian can detect God’s purposeful, active hand when studying a portion of that history, the history of the Church. A qualified yes is offered in answer to this question. So how can this be?

First, the evangelical is indwelt by God the Holy Spirit (Jn 14:16-17; 1 Cor 6:19-20). This indwelling and simultaneous baptism into the body of Christ occurred at the time of the believer’s justification (1 Cor 12:13). Secondly, the evangelical also benefits from the illuminating work of the indwelling Holy Spirit. The illuminating work of the Holy Spirit is defined here as providing wisdom and understanding not just when the text of Scripture is consulted, but in life’s situations in general, including the acts of God in history.¹⁷

This pneumatological activity – the indwelling and baptism along with the illuminating work of God the Holy Spirit – underpins the conviction that an evangelical historian indeed has some capacity to detect the active, purposeful hand of

God in the history of his Church. The inception of the Church was the result of the baptising work of the Holy Spirit, as recorded in Acts 2; this event bound the early believers and then subsequent believers into one body. Nonetheless, evangelical historians cannot claim free access to the mysteries of the actions of God in his Church; they are still sinners post-justification and they still suffer corruption of their faculties as a result (Rom 7). As Barth well wrote,

As man’s baptism with the Holy Spirit, the beginning of the new Christian life is and remains a real beginning. It is not perfect. It is not self-sufficient, definitive, or complete. It is a commencement which points forward to the future. It is a take-off for the leap towards what is not yet present. It is a start which involves looking to and stretching for a future. . . . For those baptized with the Holy Ghost, the old has passed away and the new is already coming. Nevertheless, this carries with it a Forward. It intimates a work which goes further.¹⁸

4. Practice

If the above premises are accepted, how might this work in practice? What are ways in which the evangelical historian should approach a study of the history of the Church?

First, the evangelical historian should not approach the interpretation of Church history with a triumphalist attitude. Academic arrogance which pits one part of Christianity against another is neither helpful nor productive. While theological distinctions are and should be held in accordance with one’s convictions, the interpretation of God’s hand in Church history is less open to a definitive interpretation. Exactly why or how God has acted in the post-apostolic era is a much less precise issue than, for example, interpreting the biblical record concerning Paul’s reason for leaving Titus on Crete (Tit 1:5). Accordingly, one’s interpretation of God’s actions should not be used as a cudgel with which to smash others or as a trump card flung on the table to end debate. The evangelical historian should not be guilty of the practice described in the mid-twentieth century by Cambridge professor Herbert Butterfield who wrote,

It was often noted in the earlier decades of the present century how greatly it had become the habit of Protestants to hold some German

scholar up their sleeve – a different one every few years but always preferably the latest one – and at the appropriate moments strike the unwary Philistine on the head with this secret weapon, the German scholar having decided in a final manner whatever point might have been at issue in a controversy.¹⁹

Second, the evangelical historian needs to be aware how his theological and other assumptions might affect his historiography. In a methodological primer on the study of Church history, James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller write of the concerns of Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, a man called the father of modern Church history:

Mosheim was acutely aware of the characteristic dangers that face the historian such as anachronism, undue reverence for authority, and bias.²⁰

However, Bradley and Muller also note that many of Mosheim's contemporaries, having benefitted from his observations, overreacted and went on to develop a contempt for the past as the result of their own methodological 'enlightenment'.²¹ Perhaps a prominent example of the negative effects of theological assumptions might be the outlook of the prodigious Church historian, Kenneth Scott Latourette. While many applaud the valuable contributions Latourette made to the study of Church history in the twentieth century, some are less complimentary of his historiographical assumptions. As John Hannah wrote at the end of a lengthy critique of Latourette's work,

[H]is theory of history stands upon contested foundations. His defence of a visually victorious, moral church is without historic, theological validation; his progressivism reflects nineteenth-century historicism; and his Christianity is a veiled pietistic moralism.²²

Thus, the evangelical historian should work to eliminate his 'party prejudices', be aware of 'party preferences' and adopt an attitude akin to that found in Mosheim's introduction to his multivolume work *An Ecclesiastical History*.²³

It would betray an unpardonable assumption in me to imagine, that ... I have never fallen into any mistakes, or let any thing drop from my pen, which stands in need of correction.²⁴

Third, the evangelical historian should be conscious that historians from different parts of Christianity (or even different evangelical historians) may see the active hand of God as causing a particular historical outcome but for very different

reasons. As David Bebbington noted, 'Historians of equal integrity can persist in holding opposite interpretations of what actually happened.'²⁵

A contemporaneous record of responses of the participants in the Battle of the Boyne provides an illustration of this principle. Just prior to the formation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707, Britain had her Glorious Revolution of 1688. The Glorious Revolution was Parliament's overthrow of the Roman Catholic King James II and his replacement by his Protestant daughter, Mary, and her Dutch husband, William of Orange.²⁶ King James II fled the country for France but returned two years later in an attempt to regain his throne on the battlefield. His attempt culminated with the Battle of the Boyne in 1690, a battle fought near the River Boyne in eastern Ireland just north of Drogheda.²⁷ Both Roman Catholics and Protestants implored God for his hand of blessing as the battle was joined. The outcome was the victory of the Protestant forces of William over the Roman Catholic forces of James II. The Protestants were jubilant; as victorious William rode into Dublin, they 'ran about shouting and embracing one another and blessing God for his wonderful deliverance as if they had been alive from the dead'.²⁸ Further, William went to Dublin's St. Patrick's Cathedral and heard a sermon preached by the Dean of the Cathedral, Dr William King, 'on the great deliverance which God had wrought for the Church'.²⁹ How did the Roman Catholic Church respond? *Te deums* were offered in the Roman Catholic cathedrals of Vienna and throughout the realm of the Holy Roman Emperor at his behest.³⁰ Pope Alexander VIII is alleged to have held a special mass in Rome thanking God for his hand in the good outcome and 'had St. Peter's outlined in a blaze of celebratory candles!'³¹ How can this be? Why would the Roman Catholic Church thank God for the victory of the Protestant King William? The Catholic leaders thanked God that the French allied forces under James II had lost, because this was a 'final triumph of Louis's [XIV] European enemies.'³² The pope did not want a further spread of Gallican ideas such as found in the Declaration of Gallican Liberties of 1682 or for Louis XIV to be able to threaten the Papal States militarily, as he had threatened the lands of other members of the League of Augsburg.³³ Perhaps the pope also did not want a return to the days when the papacy was controlled by the French as it had been in the days of Avignon Papacy; he did not want a return to

what was called the Babylonian Captivity of the Church. Likewise, the Holy Roman Emperor was glad to see off one of his most significant political-military rivals. Thus, both Protestant and Roman Catholic interpreters noted God's hand as the one who raises up and brings down kings and kingdoms (Dan 2:21). Both were on much shakier ground, however, as they saw the victory of William over James either as God's certain stamp of approval for Britain's brand of Protestantism or as God's condemnation of France's attempts to subjugate Roman Catholicism. Nonetheless, we can agree with Ronald Wells that

[The Battle of the Boyne] ranks along with Tours, where, in 732 Christian forces under Charles Martel had stopped the advance of Islam into Europe. It is possible that Catholicism might have been restored universally and Protestantism marginalized had events turned out differently in central Ireland in the spring and summer of 1690.³⁴

Even lacking certainty, however, an evangelical historian is correct to look for the active hand of God in the history of his Church, and thus to inquire about the purpose of these actions. To ask why God has purposed or allowed something to happen should be the question of any evangelical Christian in every realm. The study of Church history is not a domain which lies beyond this question because evangelical Christians should always ask this type of question for the purpose of understanding God and being conformed to his image (cf. 1 Cor 2:10–13).

When in the process should the evangelical historian look for God's purposeful hand, however? This is best accomplished at the end of a particular historical inquiry. The 'what' needs to be addressed before the 'so what'. Good historians, evangelical or not, do not and should not approach an investigation with a front-loaded determination of outcome or purpose. This does not ignore the fact that an evangelical historian's choice of topic, questions posed, and theories of academic inquiry will be affected by his evangelicalism in the same manner as other historians are affected by their perspective or interest.³⁵ Nonetheless, the evangelical historian must still gather and evaluate the data. In an absolute sense, history never changes; what has happened cannot be undone or redone. The discovery of what actually happened, however, is in constant flux as more information is made available. Consequently, the examiner should be

willing to collect additional empirical data and to revisit its interpretation.³⁶ Thus, a healthy dose of humility is in order for the evangelical historian in the interpretive process. This reminder should be considered periodically because academic hubris can invade the pages of historical writing. As Butterfield wrote, 'There exists in historical writing ... an appearance of definitiveness and finality which is an optical illusion.'³⁷ Going further, George Marsden says,

My ideal for Christian scholarship is one that not only looks for the bearing of one's Christian convictions on one's academic thought, but also reflects some Christian attitudes that shape the tone of one's scholarship.³⁸

5. Conclusion

This essay began with Moses making the request to see God's glory. The Lord responded,

I will make all my goodness pass before you and will proclaim before you my name 'The Lord.' And I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. But, he said, you cannot see my face, for man shall not see me and live. (Ex 33:19–20)

So Moses got a glimpse of the Lord God as he passed by, a glimpse which caused him to bow his head and worship (Ex 34:8). His request to see God was met with success, albeit only partial as he never sees the face of God. In a similar fashion, the evangelical historian should seek to see the active work of God in the history of his Church, and like Moses, almost certainly will get only a glimpse of this activity. That glimpse seen, the evangelical historian should bow his head in worship as he tries to enunciate to others this glimpse of God's purposeful acts in the history of his Church.

Dr T. J. Marinello is Professor of Systematic and Historical Theology at Tyndale Theological Seminary, Badhoevedorp, Netherlands.

Endnotes

- 1 For a purpose of the plagues and destruction of Pharaoh's army, see David Livingston, 'The Plagues and the Exodus', *Bible and Spade* 4.1 (1991) 6-14; William McRae, 'The Finger of God: An Exposition of Exodus 7-10', *The Emmaus Journal* 4.2 (1995) 162-167.
- 2 Scripture quotations are from *The Holy Bible*,

- English Standard Version (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2001).
- 3 Throughout the article, for ‘he’ and ‘his’ also read ‘she’ and ‘her’.
 - 4 For an examination and analysis of various schemes of historiography from an evangelical perspective, see David Bebbington, *Patterns in History: A Christian Perspective on Historical Thought* with new preface and afterword (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990). For the possibility of an evangelical perspective to the study of history, see generally George M. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997) and more specifically Ronald A. Wells (ed.), *History and the Christian Historian* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). For the application of this perspective, cf. Ronald A. Wells, *History Through the Eyes of Faith* (New York: HarperCollins, 1989), a usually measured work at one end within this perspective, and Peter Marshall and David Marshall, *The Light and the Glory* (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1977), a work at the other end within this perspective which strongly advocates the active, purposeful role of God’s hand of blessing in the details of the founding and forming of the United States – a ‘providential history’.
 - 5 David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 3.
 - 6 Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, ‘IV: Unicity and Unity of the Church’ in ‘Declaration “*Dominus Iesus*” on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church,’ Vatican, 06 August 2000, http://212.77.1.247/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html (accessed 2 March 2014).
 - 7 Filofei of Pskov, ‘Moscow the Third Rome (excerpts),’ letter to Tsar Vassili 3, Durham University, accessed 31 December 2013, <http://www.dur.ac.uk/a.k.harrington/3rdrome.html>. Cf. ‘ПОСЛАНИЯ СТАРЦА ФИЛОФЕЯ: Подготовкатекста, перевод и комментарии В. В. Колесова’, Электронныепубликации, accessed 31 December 2013, <http://www.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=5105>.
 - 8 Cf. Timothy C. F. Stunt, *From Awakening to Secession: Radical Evangelicals in Switzerland and Britain 1815-35* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000) 208.
 - 9 For a discussion of the Inquisition’s condemnation of Galileo and his subsequent recantations, see John D. Woodbridge and Frank A. James III, *Church History Volume 2: From Pre-Reformation to the Present Day* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013) 339-341. For a summary of views of the crusades over the years, see Thomas Madden, ‘The Legacy of the Crusades’ in *The New Concise History of the Crusades*, updated ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005) 213-222. For a discussion of the Byzantine church-state relationship and a critique of one of its main characterizers, see John A. McGuckin, ‘The Legacy of the 13th Apostle: Origins of the East Christian Conceptions of Church and State Relation’, *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 47.3-4 (2003) 251-288.
 - 10 These quotes come in the midst of Barth’s discussion of history and “non-historical” history” (or ‘prehistory’) with respect to the creation. He goes on to emphasize and explain the importance of God’s role with respect to history subsequent to the creation. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. 3.1, *The Doctrine of Creation*, ed. by G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance (1958; repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010) 78-80.
 - 11 Augustine, *The City of God* 11.6. For a summary of this idea, cf. Wayne Grudem, ‘Chapter 11: Incommunicable Attributes of God, 3. Eternity’ in *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994) 168-173.
 - 12 Timothy George, ‘St. Augustine and the Mystery of Time’ (lecture, Dallas Theological Seminary, 3 February 2005).
 - 13 For a discussion of the Christian belief in the purposeful linearity of history due to God’s intervention in history, cf. Bebbington, ‘Christian History’, in *Patterns in History*, 43-67.
 - 14 Franz Delitzsch, *Isaiah, Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch ([1866-91]; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 157. For a more complete discussion, cf. Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, 157-174.
 - 15 Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969) 85; cf. Geoffrey W. Grogan, ‘Isaiah’ in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 6, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986) 251.
 - 16 J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993) 315-316. For a more extended discussion, see Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah vol. 3: Chapters 40 through 66* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 95-100.
 - 17 Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 645. Cf. Dan. 2:20-22.
 - 18 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. 4.4, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation (fragment)*, eds. G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance (1969; repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010) 38.
 - 19 Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (London: Bell and Sons, 1950) 9. Note the irony of this statement in light of the German authors cited at key points in this essay, albeit not the latest ones.
 - 20 James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, *Church*

- History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 15.
- 21 Bradley and Muller, *Church History*, 15-16.
- 22 John D. Hannah, 'Kenneth Scott Latourette, A Trail Blazer: A Critical Evaluation of Latourette's Theory of Religious History', *Grace Theological Journal* 2.1 (1981) 22.
- 23 Bradley and Muller, *Church History*, 19.
- 24 John L. Mosheim, *An Ecclesiastical History: Ancient and Modern, from the Birth of Christ, to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century* (London: W. Gracie, 1819) 1:xx.
- 25 Bebbington, *Patterns in History*, 13.
- 26 For an entertaining read of the events leading up to, during, and immediately after the Glorious Revolution, see Will Durant and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, vol. 8, *The Age of Louis XIV: A History of the European Civilization in the Period of Pascal, Molière, Cromwell, Milton, Peter the Great, Newton, and Spinoza: 1648-1715* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1963) 276-311.
- 27 J.G. Simms, 'The Restoration and the Jacobite War (1660-91)' in T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin (eds), *The Course of Irish History*, rev. ed. (Cork: Mercier Press, 1984) 212. I am indebted, in part, to Dr. Timothy C.F. Stunt for his input concerning both the facts and interpretation of the facts surrounding the Battle of the Boyne.
- 28 Michael de Laval Landon, *Erin and Britannia: The Historical Background of a Modern Tragedy* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1981) 159.
- 29 Thomas B. Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second* (London: Longman, 1864) 3:643. Cf. Anthony Hewitson, *Diary of Thomas Bellingham: An Officer under William III, with complete transcript and notes, Social Life and National Movements in the 17th Century (1688-89-90)* (Preston: Geo. Toulmin & Sons, 1908) 133-134.
- 30 Simms, 'Restoration and Jacobite War', 213.
- 31 Terence Sheehy, 'The battle that marks the turning point', *Catholic Herald*, 18 July 1986, accessed 14 January 2014, <http://archive.catholicherald.co.uk/article/18th-july-1986/7/the-battle-that-marks-the-turning-point>. Cf. Landon, *Erin and Britannia*, 162 n.12, who disputes the pope's celebratory reaction but gives no sources for his assertion. See also Gerald Warner, 'King Billy on a white horse? Could Ulster's Orangemen at least get their own mythology right?', *The Telegraph*, 14 July 2010, accessed 17 June 2014, <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100047172/king-billy-on-a-white-horse-could-ulsters-orangemen-at-least-get-their-own-mythology-right/>.
- 32 Edmund Curtis, *A History of Ireland*, 5th ed. (London: Methuen, 1945) 271.
- 33 'The Battle of the Boyne', *Grand Orange Lodge of Scotland*, accessed 17 Jun 2014, www.orangeorderscotland.com/The%20Battle%20of%20The%20Boyne.pdf. Antoine Dégert, 'Gallicanism' in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* vol. 6 (New York: Robert Appleton, 1909), accessed 17 Jun 2014, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06351a.htm>.
- 34 Wells, *History Through the Eyes of Faith*, 107.
- 35 George M. Marsden, 'What Difference Might Christian Perspectives Make?' in Wells, *History and the Christian Historian*, 15-16.
- 36 Butterfield has a good rehearsal of many of the issues related to the effects of newly discovered historical material and its consequences for historical interpretation, using the example both of Leopold von Ranke's reappraisal of the Renaissance as well as historical summations constructed after the British Foreign Office opened its document archives for a particular period. Butterfield, *Christianity and History*, 12-15.
- 37 Butterfield, *Christianity and History*, 15.
- 38 Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, 54.