

Hans Madueme: "On a better historiography." An email circular, December 13, 2003.

One of my peripheral interests has been the subject of historiography, specifically the contours of its best expression *sub specie aeternitatis*, and especially as the issue has (and continues to) played itself out in the academy. The debate, classically, turns in part on the legitimacy (or not) of an implicit, guild-sanctified methodological secularization instead of the older (and some would say naive or impossible) "providential" historiography.

Some may recall the fascinating debate between Iain Murray and Harry Stout after the publication of the latter's "The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism." George Marsden, Mark Noll, and others from a more neo-Calvinist orientation have also written on similar themes. A recent, critical-sympathetic musing on this in *Books and Culture* (May/June, 1999) was offered by Doug Sweeney, "Taking a Shot at Redemption: A Lutheran Considers the Calvin School of Historiography"

[<http://www.ctlibrary.com/bc/1999/mayjun/9b3043.html>] Over time, I have accumulated different articles that have attempted, in their own fashion, to tame this beast, but none (at least in my recent recollection) as penetrating and suggestive as:

Bradley N. Seeman, "Evangelical Historiography Beyond the "Outward Clash": A Case Study on the Alternation Approach" *CSR* (Fall 2003) 95-124. This thoughtful article is in the latest *Christian Scholar's Review*.