

ment has taken the lead. The most cruel symbol of Poland's humiliation is the flaunting Orthodox Cathedral planted in the chief public square of Warsaw.'

Austria-Hungary, the 'ramshackle empire,' has been unable, perhaps it has been unwilling, to take the place of prime oppressor. Its true policy has been to become a 'happy family,' in which various nationalities should live and let live side by side. And the Poles have had exceptional favour. 'In 1869 the province of Galicia, Austria's share in the Polish spoils, was granted a far-reaching measure of Home Rule, and Polish was declared the normal language of its administration and higher education.'

These concessions have made the Austrian Poles the most loyal citizens of the Empire. The Polish members of the Austrian Reichsrath are looked upon as the 'government party.' On them the ministry can always rely for the voting of supplies and the passing of army bills. When the Russians invaded Galicia the Polish population rose *en masse* against them. They have certainly

not abandoned the hope of national reunion, but they look for it not within the Russian, but within the Austrian Empire.

But Germany has to be reckoned with. And the Germans have treated the Poles within their borders so badly that if to a reunited Poland the alternative were offered of Russia or Austro-Germany, they would undoubtedly say Russia. The Poles love not Russia, but they love Germany less. Now they already see that in the present alliance between Germany and Austria the predominant partner is Germany. If Germany and Austria win the war, it will be Germany's and not Austria's policy that will be imposed on Europe in general and on Poland in particular. The Poles shudder to think what that will mean. In the progress of the war Poles and Russians are being fused together in feeling by the fire of a common hate. Mr. TOYNBEE firmly believes that when we and our Allies win, the erection of a reunited Poland within the Russian Empire is almost assured. The Polish subjects of Germany will vote to a man for liberation from her dominion, and they will carry the Austrian Poles with them.

The Study of Theology.

By ALBAN G. WIDGERY, M.A.(CAMB.), UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

A CAREFUL study of the history of particular sciences such as mathematics, physics, biology, and history leads to the conclusion that, apart from any consideration of the ease or difficulty of the research in any case, those sciences have made the greatest and most rapid progress which have been prosecuted by appropriate methods and untrammelled by external authority. The liberty of the student is not to be confused with caprice, although at the inception of every science many hypotheses have been in the highest degree arbitrary. The demand for liberty, which is now satisfied in almost every branch of research, is simply to follow reason and experience wherever they may lead. Freedom soon becomes distinguished from caprice in that individuals recognize

the necessity of co-operation and of the advantage of working according to methods especially appropriate to the subject under investigation. Freedom modified by method, and method made more or less elastic through freedom, have enabled advance which would otherwise have been impossible. Freedom is an attitude of mind, positive in relation to reason, negative in relation to any external power. Method is the mode of scientific procedure dependent upon the nature of the data which are being considered and the aim to be realized.

In the Western world research in all its branches was for long under the control of the ecclesiastical powers. This may be admitted without the necessity of denying what the Church did for

educational progress within its own limits. Except for the individual efforts of a few thinkers, such as Galileo and Bruno, the demand for freedom first arose in the sphere of religion itself. In the Protestant Reformation this demand met with a certain degree of satisfaction. At that time, however, there was no clear notion of scientific and progressive methods of study, and the deposed authority of the Church was soon replaced by that of the letter of the Scriptures. The freedom attained was more real and continuous in those branches of research which acquired definite methods of procedure, as did the investigation of nature under the guidance of Bacon, Newton, and Kepler. Little by little the spirit of freedom has become predominant in all regions of profane knowledge, and to it we owe in great measure the results which have been obtained.

Theology alone is still fettered by the limitations imposed upon it by an authority external to itself. Theology alone still suffers from absolute uncertainty and poverty of method. For in the Christian world Theology has been and is almost entirely dogmatic, starting with certain quite arbitrary assumptions and arguing to certain foregone conclusions. The chief assumptions are the truth of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, among Catholics, the validity of the claim of the Church to interpret them. The foregone conclusions may be summarized as the traditional creeds. At times philosophers have independently discussed theological problems, but no free scientific Theology has yet been established. In this region of research, the greatest need of to-day is perfect liberty to seek and proclaim the truth, unconcerned by the acquiescence or denial of the dignitaries of any ecclesiastical organization whatever. That granted, a clear understanding of the aim, scope, and methods of Theology is essential. Progress is much more rapid, results are much more accurate, and labour is reduced, if this latter demand is satisfied as fully as possible at the outset.

Every science is made up of propositions which are either directly descriptive or inferential. The former refer to immediate experiences; the latter are arrived at by a process of reasoning from the former. A science is thus a body of knowledge of such propositions, capable of growth by an increase in their number or their comprehension. The process of growth leading to differentiation and

greater complexity, the field of research ultimately becomes too large to be adequately investigated by any single individual, and special regions must be marked off for separate treatment. But this division of labour, although it leads to progress with reference to matters of detail, is likely to be detrimental to our understanding of experience unless it is supplemented by a careful consideration of the relation of the various studies to one another. The lack of a general consideration is one of the most marked features of present theological study. Yet all sciences should be systems more or less complete and consistent. Dependent upon experienced fact and the processes of reason their validity and value must be judged by experience and reason; and in this respect no difference is to be found between Theology and any other science.

The evolution of knowledge depends upon the relation of the individual to society and to history. A science is a social and a historical product: it challenges the individual's acceptance. In comparison with the results already embodied in the traditional systems the effort and achievement of any one man appear insignificant; over against his very limited experience they stand for the experience and reflexion of ages. Nevertheless, small as the contribution of the individual may be, it is only by his challenging past theory in the light of his own life and thought that knowledge progresses. By the patient work of individuals, cooperating with one another, the whole of organized science has been built up. To be a real possession this knowledge must be appropriated by the definite and conscious activity of the individual. Conflict arises and is generally most keen against tradition in matters of Theology, in which the interests of the religious society are concerned. To the individual it is personal conviction that counts: however much weight must be allowed to tradition it is for him to decide whether he will accept it unmodified or modified, or reject it entirely.

II.

A survey of Theology as a science will start with the question: What are the data of Theology? To this question no absolute and complete answer can be given. Like all other sciences it depends for its data upon experience, and as that for us is under the form of time, we are never justified in assuming that we may not meet in future with

data of greater importance than any yet known. To appreciate fully the significance of this truth is of particular importance in Theology, because many have contended that absolute and complete knowledge in this sphere is already possible of recognition. The existence of eternally valid truths, some of which may be already known to man, cannot be denied; but it must be insisted that such truths become known to men at particular points in time, and further, that no science is purely formal, but all depend to some extent upon the data of immediate experience. The data of Theology are obtained from religious experience, by which expression at the outset must be implied what is generally and popularly meant by religion. In the course of scientific investigation the use of the term should become more precise; but to give precision to the term is not one of the objects of the present paper.

What is the aim of Theology? In this, as in almost all studies, there is a search for a purely intellectual satisfaction which should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, the man who studies Theology merely as an intellectual pursuit arouses in us the feeling of insufficiency and poverty. The essential purpose of Theology is to gain an understanding of the religious life and its implications, and to raise it to higher levels through the purifying influence of critical reflexion. The most fruitful study of the subject starts out with the hope of making men more conscious of what religion means; it is not a mere intellectual curiosity, but a broadening of the outlook on life and a deepening of the feelings. The objection is sometimes raised, that if a man has the interests of religion at heart he will be prejudiced in his judgments as to the truth of religious doctrines. To such an objection many replies may be made. An opponent of religion would be just as liable to be prejudiced in his judgments. And, whatever an individual may think to the contrary, it is extremely difficult, if not entirely impossible, to be completely indifferent to the religious attitude. In his actual way of life, if not in his expressed conviction, every man is sympathetic or antagonistic to it: in religion it is true that he who is not with us is against us. To require that the man who studies Theology shall be conscious of its practical significance and shall be sympathetic towards the attitude with which his study is concerned is quite rational and justifiable. It would hardly be too

much to say that only the man who has religious experience of his own can really understand the subject-matter and the aim of Theology. Ask a blind man for an adequate treatment of colours and the science of light would be ludicrous. But all this is no reason for the student of Theology not to strive with all his power and with utmost sincerity to find the truth. The search for truth and its admission when found are, in fact, of the deepest essence of religion. But by religion is not to be understood the formal acquiescence in any specific body of doctrines.

Attention may now be turned to the consideration of the scope and methods of theological study. The first task is the description of the nature and the contents of the religious experience. This investigation is mainly analytical, and will refer to the individual and the social aspects of religious life: it may be appropriately called *The Psychology of Religion*. A survey of the religious life of the past, a simple indication from the standpoint of the theory of evolution of the stages through which individuals and societies have come to their religious beliefs and attitudes towards life, is the subject of *The History of Religion*. Allied with these two branches of research is that of *The Comparative Study of Religions*, the purpose of which is to differentiate the aspects of similarity and of difference in the various historical religions. All these sections of Theology are purely empirical, descriptive, and analytic: their task is simply to state what they find; it is not for them to enter upon critical comment as to the worth of the ideas and practices they describe. Hypotheses and theories as to the relationships between religious rites and beliefs, of different religions to one another and to experience in general, may indeed find a place here, but no question is raised as to the truth of the doctrines or the validity of the value-judgments contained in the religious consciousness. To this division of Theology might therefore be applied the term *The Empirical Study of Religion*.

The data thus obtained and systematized must then be submitted to critical examination, with the object of determining the truth and the value of the contents of the religious experience. Such critical examination is not an end in itself, but preparatory to constructive effort. Starting from the descriptive and inferential propositions which are judged valid among those obtained in the

Empirical Study of Religion, the constructive theologian must endeavour to formulate a consistent and comprehensive ideal of the religious life and of its implications. To this critical and synthetical study we give the name of *The Philosophy of Religion*. As such a realm of thought cannot be kept separate from our view of the world in general, the Philosophy of Religion must always bear a close relationship to Philosophy in its widest sense.

Some form of corporate activity and public worship appears to be an inseparable element of religion as found in history, and for the administration and organization of these forms of social expression there has usually been a definite religious ministry. The work of ministering to religious needs and endeavouring to raise men to higher stages of religious life forms a more or less distinct subject of study under the name of *Pastoral Theology*. Concerned with the psychological consideration of religious needs and their most appropriate and justifiable satisfaction, and with the forms most suitable for the expression and cultivation of the religious attitude and experience, it partakes of the nature of an applied science. In so far as it aims at the realization of the highest conception of religion expressed in the Philosophy of Religion, it forms a link between the Empirical Study and the Philosophy of Religion, between the religious life as it now is and what one strives to make it. On the other hand, the experience of pastors in their ministerial functions should lead to contributions to the Psychology of Religion.

The scope of Theology may therefore be outlined as follows :

THEOLOGY.

I. THE EMPIRICAL STUDY OF RELIGION.

- a. The Psychology of Religion (Analytic).
- b. The History of Religion (Genetic).
- c. The Comparative Study of Religions.

II. THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

- a. Critical (Examination of Empirical Data).
- b. Constructive (Formulation of Ideal System).

III. PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

III.

The position indicated in the above outline of the aim, scope, and method of Theology may become more clear by a consideration of some probable objections and questions which it may

call forth. Could such a view find a place for Mysticism? One would suppose that what is truly mystical is as such inexplicable, even inexpressible, in theoretical terms. Intellectual expression implies a certain degree of rational comprehension, and challenges critical examination. The mystical element in life cannot be denied: in some form it is real in the experience of every one; but it baffles explanation and theoretical description. Ultimate experiences must be admitted as such: unintelligible sentences do not aid us in realizing any deeper truth in them. How ideas first originate in men's minds is a mystery, and some may come in the experiences of mystics; but it has not yet been shown that the truth or the validity of an idea is at all affected by the nature of its origin. All conceptions which claim a place in Theology must be submitted to critical examination. To argue, as some writers have recently done, that man needs the mystical, and then to label certain doctrines mystical, is not a valid method of removing them from the test of truth. The *raison d'être* of theological creeds is that they give a meaning to and indicate a value in life which otherwise it would not appear to have; it is just in so far as they make man's existence more intelligible than it would be without them that they are of importance. The truly mystical commences where thought is inadequate—in a realm beyond ideas and theoretical expression. What passes as Mysticism is often nothing else but the ordinary theological doctrines expressed with fervour and strong religious emotion. The writings of the mystics will provide a considerable amount of material for psychological investigation and philosophical reflexion, but apart from their intrinsic religious worth thus found, they cannot rightly be regarded as possessing any especially authoritative character of their own. As a stimulus to the feelings, in private and public worship, the importance of mystical and devotional literature cannot be overestimated.

The proposed scheme of Theology omits specific reference to several studies which are usually regarded as falling within its sphere. These are in the main concerned with philological questions and must be carried on in accordance with the general principles and methods of philology. The study of the books of the Old and the New Testaments in the original must conform to the same standards as the study of any other writings

'sacred' or 'profane.' This is now generally admitted amongst scholars, but in practice these philological researches are far too often influenced by previously formed theological views, and the possible bearing of the philological conclusion upon Theology is allowed to determine the attitude to important questions. For the Empirical Study of Religion it is necessary to find the real significance of the Scriptures, but there is no adequate reason that our religious beliefs shall be identical with those therein contained. Philological questions are the task of philological scholars: theological students should seek essentially to understand the nature and the requirements of the religious life.

Comment may be made in more conservative circles upon the fact that we have not recognized the distinction usually made between Natural and Revealed Religion, a distinction often thought to be fundamental for Theology. To the thought of to-day, as contrasted with that of the eighteenth century, this distinction is really little more than a verbal one. All knowledge is in some sense natural and all in some sense revealed. The object known, whether material or spiritual, human or divine, is known only because it stands in an active relationship with the mind that knows. The mind never experiences a purely passive object: it knows only because its activity meets with some resistance. In thought which is true, man does not think just what he wishes but what he must; what the nature of reality compels him to think. It is the same with regard to the knowledge of the spiritual as it is of that of the material world. All religious experience, if valid, and not simply transitory subjective feeling, is in the end a relationship between active beings. God revealing Himself to men is God in active relation with men. Religious knowledge from the side of man is natural, and from the side of God is revealed. This revelation takes many forms—through the religious feelings which Nature arouses in us, and more especially through the history and the moral and the religious consciousness of humanity. Religion is now admitted as a normal characteristic of human life, and whatever its apparent immediate source, all genuine religion is ultimately a fellowship between the individual in his social condition and the divine; so that all Theology is in this sense natural.

In the place of the above discussed distinction

modern thought insists upon that between the knowledge of God obtained through external nature on the one hand, and that obtained through the moral and spiritual life of man on the other. And, as in earlier times Revealed Religion was thought of as superior to Natural Religion, so now the knowledge of God which comes through human moral and religious experience is held to transcend that derived from the world of nature. For Revealed Religion the central point was the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and modern Theology still finds itself forced to admit that He is the greatest religious personality of the race, and that in His life and teaching He is supreme in the revelation of the divine amongst men.

It may also be asked in what manner the term 'Christian Theology' might be used. Christian Theology is a definite portion of Theology. For data it has the religious experience of Christians, and in this, most especially, all that has been felt and thought of Jesus Christ. It will trace the history of Christianity, and will critically examine its doctrines and practices in the endeavour to present in its best form the religious outlook of the Christian faith. Scientific Theology cannot admit *a priori* any superiority of worth in the Christian view of life: examination may show that it has truth and value not to be found in any other religion; but this may not be assumed at the outset. As a religion and as an implicated Theology, Christianity must establish its precedence before the bar of rational reflexion and the moral and religious consciousness. But it cannot be adequately understood and appreciated apart from the general History of Religion, and Theology cannot consider it as other than a distinct type of religious life, and therefore as a subject of examination under all the sections of the proposed scheme.

In the immediate future it seems probable that men generally will make a distinction, though not with full consciousness, between Christian Theology and the Theology of Jesus. The Synoptic Gospels give as a general impression a picture of Jesus of Nazareth which still makes a very strong appeal to all sorts and conditions of men. The doctrines which the Church has developed concerning Him often fail to attract even where they do not arouse actual opposition. For a life of religious experience such as that of Jesus, it will be urged that no other Theology than His is

needed. A man may say: The religious attitude of Jesus and His disciples so appeals to me that on the authority of this appeal and the influence of His character, I accept for my own life the fundamental religious doctrines which He held. Some of the traits in the personality and some of the elements in the teaching, as, *e.g.*, the merely eschatological ones, he will put down to temporary and transitory causes, and will discard them. But the essential attitude of Jesus Himself, as distinct from what are obviously the statements of others about Him, he will adopt as his own attitude. The theological student may find difficulties in the position; but to the masses of mankind it will present a simple creed, higher than which they have not been given and sanctified by a personality and a life which never lose their charm or authority.

IV.

Of the many questions that might still be raised two only can be referred to in the present paper. At the outset of this discussion the claim for absolute freedom in theological research was made. Except among a few scholars attached to free religious bodies, such freedom has never existed in the Christian Churches in the past, and it does not exist to-day. Almost all theological students—including most Professors of Divinity—are officially attached to ecclesiastical organizations, to hold any position in which subscription to specific statements of doctrine is demanded. Even where some liberty of interpretation is allowed, prevailing circumstances lead thinkers to turn their attention to subjects less likely to cause discussion, or to express themselves in a manner which hides their position from all but the theological expert. What is required for advance in Theology is the same as has been demanded for other sciences in the past: the main activities of men under no restriction whatever as to the methods of their investigation, the sources of their data, and the statements of their results. If it is not possible that such scholars should be attached officially to definite religious bodies, other provision should be made for them, just as for any other branch of study in a university. Faculties of Theology should be quite free, and in the interest of thought and religion itself no one should be allowed to occupy a Chair of Divinity who holds any position which requires definite adherence to prescribed doctrines. If the

various ecclesiastical bodies desire to give theological instruction on their own peculiar principles, that is essentially a concern of their own, but if—as we believe—it is becoming generally recognized that the possession of religious truth is of at least as much importance as that of ethics, history, and such branches of knowledge, there should be provision for its untrammelled investigation. The cause of religion demands it. Upon liberty of theological thought depends ultimately the question of religious reunion; for truth is one, and will make men free from the errors and trivialities which divide them. It is hardly possible to overestimate the power which a united Christendom—or even a united Protestantism—would have in the world; and yet reunion is directly prevented by the demands made of religious ministers, which hinder their search for and statement of truth.

This subject cannot be left without some reference to the training of candidates for the religious ministry. Assuming in the first place a sound general education, it has never to be lost sight of, that the purpose of the training is not to produce theologians, but to equip men for the particular occupation of *ministering* to the religious life. The theological course therefore should be the widest possible, including the three sections, the Empirical Study of Religion, the Philosophy of Religion, and Pastoral Theology. Far too much time is spent in most of our theological colleges and divinity halls in philological studies, which have not even a secondary value for the ministerial office; and an entirely wrong sense of proportion is thus cultivated at a most important time in the minister's life. Considering the education of its ministers, it says much for the vitality of the Christian religion that it has achieved the success which it has already met with; and if present-day Christians would give themselves up whole-heartedly to the pursuit of truth, the whole world might be won over to it.

Yet, however wide the range of theological study, it is in itself inadequate for the training of the pastor, whose task is to endeavour to satisfy spiritual needs. However reverently presented, scientific Theology is still essentially theoretical, and here more is required. The fervour of the religious geniuses of the race must be felt: the spirit of the saints of the past must be entered into by a quiet and regular perusal of the devotional and mystical literature of ages which are gone.

Further, a consideration of the moral and religious problems of contemporary life is, one would suppose, an essential factor in a minister's training; but it is almost universally neglected.

A religious body is primarily a society of persons united to live the religious life. In and for this life ideas and beliefs are necessary. But although individual and often quite opposed religious bodies have made the claim to be especially and uniquely guided by God in their practices and beliefs, there seems to be no reliable evidence to justify the claim. Nevertheless, a Church as a teaching institution must have something definite to teach, and the learner must in the first place receive his

instruction on authority. Dogmatic instruction does not, however, constitute the most important part of education, whether religious or secular; the pupil requires also to learn how to test for himself so-called knowledge, and how to acquire new experience. Of more importance than the acquiescence in certain formulations of religious conceptions is the cultivation of the attitude of honesty and sincerity in the search for religious truth. And if the sheep of the flock are ever to determine their lives on this principle, it must first be conformed to by the shepherds, and by none more than by those who occupy themselves with the scientific study of Theology.

In the Study.

@ Study in Christian Experience.

BY REV. JAMES H. HODSON, B.D., LYTHAM.

'The Spirit and the flesh.'—Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵.

THE central theme of this great passage in the Epistle to the Galatians is the conflict waged in the believer's heart between the Spirit of God and the flesh (v.17). The strife differs from that described in Ro 7, which depicts the experience of St. Paul whilst still 'carnal' (v.14). The former passage refers to the Spirit-led life; the latter to the self-controlled one. It is only as we contrast these two passages that the real meaning and glory of the Christian experience portrayed in Galatians become manifest. Our purpose is to attempt to set forth this contrast in its salient features.

I. THE COMBATANTS.

In Gal 5¹⁶⁻²⁵ these are the 'Spirit,' *i.e.* the Holy Ghost indwelling the regenerate soul, and 'the flesh,' *i.e.* the principle of sin in man's fallen nature. This evil principle sometimes shows its 'works' or 'doings' in sins connected with the body, 'fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, drunkenness, revellings' (vv.19, 21), and as this type of sin is the more obvious it gives the name of 'flesh' to the evil bias. But the sinful inclination is also shown in evils connected with the intellect, as 'idolatry, sorcery, factions, divisions, heresies,' or with the emotions, as 'enmities, strife, jealousies,

wraths, envyings' (vv.20, 21). The 'flesh' is in direct antagonism to the Divine Spirit, as is the 'Spirit' to 'the flesh' (v.17): 'the mind of the flesh is enmity against God' (Ro 8⁷). This duel may go on even in the regenerate nature as is presupposed in the passage before us, for it is addressed to those who are 'sons' of God (4⁶). That this inner strife is a reality God's children know only too well (1 Jn 1⁸): in their new life they find both peace and war.

'In every soul that shall be saved is a Godly Will that never assented to sin, nor ever shall. Right as there is a beastly will in the lower part that may will no good, right so there is a Godly Will in the higher part, which will is so good that it may never will evil, but ever good.'—JULIAN OF NORWICH, *Revelations of Divine Love*, 1373 A.D.

'As to the habitual temper of my mind I find a principle within me opposing and striving against indwelling corruption and sin of all kinds.'—SARAH GILCHRIST in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

'In referring to one of his brother's hymns in which occur the words, "I wrestle not now, but trample on sin," John Wesley remarked, "So says my brother, but not I."—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, March 1913.

In Ro 7 the contending forces in this conflict are different: on one side is 'the inward man' (v.22), or the real self, the 'I' (v.17), or 'the law of my mind' (v.23); and on the other, 'sin which dwelleth in me' (v.17), or 'the law of sin which is in my members' (v.23). Thus the combatants here are the higher nature which links us to God,