

The Oxford Summer School of Theology.

By E. M. HIGHFIELD, S.Th.

THE idea of a Summer School of Theology on undenominational lines originated in Manchester College about four years ago, and, through the generous guarantee of the Hibbert Trustees, an experimental meeting was held in Balliol Hall in September, 1909. The experiment succeeded so well that it has been repeated this summer with equal success, the second meeting having taken place in the Hall of Trinity College from July 22 to August 2. The work of the school has been comprehensive, and the programme was arranged so that students could attend an average of five lectures every day. The syllabus fell into five sections: Philosophy of Religion, Old Testament, New Testament, the Early Church, and Comparative Religion.

As Church people, we do well to use all the opportunities which present themselves for widening our theological outlook, and for breaking through the prejudices which are so often attributed to us by others, even if we do not feel them ourselves. The more we come to realize that the basis of our corporate life within the Church is a common religion, but not necessarily a common theology, the more we shall widen our sympathies, not only with those outside our communion, but also with those within.

WHAT IS A SOUL?—This is a question which baffled our childish imaginations, and to which, even in our maturer years, many of us are unable to formulate an expression which can give an adequate reply. Mr. R. R. Marett, approaching the subject from the anthropologist's standpoint, worked out some very interesting conclusions.

From the standpoint of the anthropologist, we have nothing to do with validity; our business is simply with the history of belief—we leave it to the theologian to assign values. For the present

purpose, however, we may put our modern theory of values in a nutshell: the doctrine that every man has a soul to save means that every man is ultimately responsible for himself before God. But we cannot leave it there; the theologian is driven to ask the question, "What does our neighbour think?" and here the anthropologist can help the theologian.

We shall begin by asking the theologian to try to regard the savage as his neighbour—not, may we say, in the too common modern missionary sense, but even for intellectual purposes. With regard to the fundamental facts of life—being born, growing up, falling in love, falling sick, dying—the experience of the savage is just as wide as our own, but the question is, Does it go as deep? Now, whether or not the experience of the savage is more shallow than our own, everyone agrees that it is a different one. Where does the difference lie? The answer is, In being felt and expressed more simply and more naïvely than our own. It is the main function of the anthropologist to enable a sophisticated generation to recover naïvete, and become as little children.

Then, to return to our question, What is a soul? Provisionally the soul may be termed as the inner man, or self—perceived and conceived as independent. Now let us first see what the savage thinks about the soul as experienced in presence. Every savage believes in an independent soul as a matter of course, but argument from consent is worth very little; we must ask why the savage believes this. What is the primary datum which causes the savage to feel something here and now which he comes to know as his soul? In answering this question, we must allow for the fact that the savage habitually looks outwards, not inwards; and yet his consciousness of objects is always bound up with a consciousness of self—he feels himself to be a plus quantity; he knows himself to be a free agent by direct experience. Now the savage ascribes supreme value to initiative as displayed by animals; he observes, for example, that a dog "knows" when he is after a rabbit; or when the dog wags his tail, he perceives that it is the dog who wags the tail, and not the tail which wags him. And so, eventually, the savage comes to erect upon such

primary data the conception of having a soul. His conclusions are simply the result of analysis—the word “reflection” tells its own story; we need a mirror to see ourselves, and the mirror is formed out of exterior objects. It is the old Aristotelian theory: the good man needs another to see his virtues in. The savage learnt the value of initiative; he saw that those who struck first won. The bravery of the lion, the cunning of the fox, became starting-points of a philosophy.

What the average man notes, admires, and imitates, is the power of initiative. So it is with the savage. His magico-religious interpretation of the world is largely based on a notion of a struggle between powers that are essentially powers displaying initiative each in its own degree. His whole philosophy of life centres in his experience of power; he sees all things engaged in a constant struggle for existence, and over all a higher power. And it is when he comes to recognize this higher power that he lays down his *orenda*, or, in other words, “he prays.”

Now every man and every living thing has a little *orenda* of his own, and when the worshipper prays, or lays down his *orenda*, he puts himself into the hands of a higher power, but he does not forego his free-will; on the contrary, it is of his own free-will that he comes to ask at all. Experience has taught the savage that this is the path to spiritual force; the man who has courage to wrestle with a spiritual adversary is the man who wins.

Then what shall we say of a soul in terms of the definition from which we started—the inner man, or self, perceived and conceived as independent? We think that the savage has taught us that this is a true definition of the soul as experienced in presence, and it is really what we call “personality.” Readers who want to know how the ascetic savage makes the most of his personality, or the soul which he feels within him, are recommended to consult Dr. Frazer’s latest edition of “The Golden Bough” (Taboo; or, The Perils of the Soul).

Then there is the other side—the soul as conceived in absence. What can we know about the souls of the dead? The “ghost-soul” is the peg on which we are going to hang

our knowledge of the subjective; it is a term which covers all the meanings of a dead man—he is dead, therefore absent. Memory is all we have now to depend on for determining what he is—a “memory image.” But when memory has to supply all the being of the absent one, unless replenished, those memory impressions will gradually vanish away. How comes it, then, that the living retain a memory of the dead? Again, let us try to recover our naïvete through the savage. Through analogy with the savage we can get at the impression produced on the naïve mind by a dead man. One element in it would be the uncanniness. Ghost-seeing is another source of fear attaching to the dead as viewed merely in their objective aspect. Then there is the aspect which is the result of “introjection”—that is to say, trying to enter into the inner feelings which an object may be supposed to have.

Now there are two theories with regard to the soul-life of the dead: (1) The *esoteric* theory—that the sphere of dead souls is here on earth; (2) the *exoteric* theory—that their sphere is away from the earth. Savages seem to be capable of acting on both systems. Now, if the esoteric theory be recognized, certain limitations are imposed on the living; the consideration which they show for the dead is apt to take a material form, and there is little disposition left to try to imagine what the experience of the dead is like on its own account. On the other hand, if the exoteric theory be accepted, since the dead are conceived as existing in some remote region, a more speculative attitude prevails. When death takes place, it is natural to feel that something has gone—there has been a “passing,” or, in the phraseology of Socrates, “a change of dwelling”; the disinterested, sympathetic view predominates, and tends to make one conceive of a soul as one’s own soul. Most of the stories that have been analyzed concerning soul-land belong to the exoteric tradition of savages, although it is, in the main, the esoteric mysteries which give us an insight into the real views of the savage. The keynote of their mysteries is the notion of regeneration—the dead have died to live again. The un-

progressive savage usually imagines a cycle of reincarnations ; he is predominated by a desire to bring back the dead to a second life. But it is also possible for the more progressive savage to conceive of a spiritual regeneration—an evolution of the soul proceeding continually onwards and upwards. It is with this more progressive belief of the savage that we can bring our own beliefs into line. Man's hope of a continued higher existence does not centre in the hope of another human life, but in his indwelling sense of the human will which dominates his whole being, and which forces him to believe that, if only he will try hard enough, there must be attainable for him a spiritual regeneration.

THE RELATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION IN THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH was the subject of the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed's course of lectures.

Variety is always pleasing, and even students bent on stern theological work can appreciate a touch of lightness here and there. Mr. Wicksteed began his first lecture, which was general and introductory, with a novel suggestion for the encouragement of what he called the "pernicious habit" of note-taking. Begin at the bottom of the page and write A.D. 1900, Self ; 1800, Napoleon ; 1700, Newton ; 1600, Shakespeare—and so on, until at the top of the page we were landed at 600 B.C.—Thales, Sappho, and the Prophet Jeremiah. In less than five minutes the paper presented a panoramic view of the most important person, so far as we were concerned, for each of twenty-five centuries, and the student was thus provided with an ingenious system of stepping-stones on which to follow the lecturer.

In the second lecture Mr. Wicksteed dealt with Thomas Aquinas, "Religion as Treated by a Philosopher," and in the third with Dante, "Religion as Treated by a Poet."

What is the specific note which differentiates the philosophy—or, shall we say, the religion—of Aquinas and Dante ? It is this : Dante believed in Hell, Purgatory, Heaven, as significant ; Aquinas also believed in them as significant, with the addition

of a ghastly representation of Hell as something which the sinner deserves, and which is essential to the bliss of Heaven. "Aquinas," says Mr. Wicksteed, "explains Hell, and therefore pollutes Heaven." But this ghastly conception of Hell is wholly absent in Dante. Hell is not essential—it is not what the sinner deserves ; it is what the sinner chooses.

"Dismal we were in the dim air,
Nursing in our hearts the sluggish fumes."

If anyone really knows what it is to sulk for a day, he knows that there is a possibility of deliberately choosing Hell, and the choice is the more awful because it is a free one. But, on the other hand, this very recognition of free choice tells him that Hell cannot be essential. If to-day we ever think of Hell at all, is it not the Hell of Dante of which we think, not the Hell of Aquinas ?

In the New Testament section, Professor Kirsopp Lake's lectures deserve special mention, although an attempt to report them would spoil the spontaneous freshness which was one of their chief charms.

We read our New Testaments now in a different way from the way in which we read them thirty or even twenty years ago, and the reason why we do so is perhaps not so much because criticism has thrown new light on the old passages, but because we ourselves are different from what we were twenty years ago. We read and study and hear lectures not in order to find new truths, but to find new light on the old truths ; the central truths of religion which are fundamental cannot really change, but the light in which we see them must change. To maintain that revealed truth in any aspect is final is to go clean contrary to the evolutionary principles which govern the laws of Nature ; we are bound to recognize that there are momentous problems which lie behind the words of the New Testament which as yet have no final solution. Dr. Carlyle found a very happy expression in summing up the work of the School. Referring directly to the lectures of Professor Lake, but also including all the lecturers, he said : " They have let us see the workings of their

own minds." This is the kind of lecturer that we want, and it adds a more than ever practical zest to the student when the lecturer urges him to employ the working of his own mind to help to solve the momentous problems which lie before us all, and which should not be regarded as the exclusive work of the specialist. We are grateful to Professor Lake for his work as a pioneer of reconstructive criticism of the New Testament, and we are more than ever grateful to him for having given us such an insight into his work in his lucid lectures on "St. Paul and his Converts." He has shown us the value of reconstructive criticism, which must not, let it be remembered, be confused with what is called "destructive criticism." We must go to the Epistles of St. Paul to try to find out what St. Paul really meant, and we shall never do this if we treat them as the earliest theological treatises; we must treat them as what they were—that is to say, the earliest practical letters to members of the Christian Church. Treating them in this way, we are bound, in the first place, to distinguish between what is central and fundamental, and what is local and temporal. With regard to the latter, in many instances, it is impossible for us now to know what St. Paul meant then, for the simple reason that his readers knew what he meant, and it was unnecessary for him to explain the circumstances. Professor Lake's valuable book, "The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," has been in the hands of students since the end of last year, and readers may be interested to know that a second volume on "The Later Epistles" is already in preparation.

THE HISTORIC SETTING OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.—Although the work of modern scholars on the New Testament has tended within the last few years to assert the genuineness of most of the Pauline Epistles, students of the Summer School who were not already acquainted with Dr. Vernon Bartlet's views, were, perhaps, a little astonished to meet with such a warm supporter of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. How does Dr. Bartlet maintain his position? "The real abiding difficulty in acceding their genuineness," he

says, "is simply that attempts to place them in the period covered by the Acts have not yet been satisfied." This is not an insurmountable difficulty, if we allow that the Pastoral Epistles were written in the early years of St. Paul's Roman captivity. If we accede that the Epistles to Philemon and the Philippians were written when he was expecting his coming release, why not the Pastorals also? Why should not this expectation have been in his mind at the very beginning of his stay in Rome, when, but for having appealed to Cæsar, he might have been set free? This is more than probable, especially with Nero and Poppea already in Rome. 1 Timothy is the earliest of all, written just after St. Paul's arrival in Rome, say A.D. 60; Titus and 2 Timothy are a little later; Philemon and Colossians date still in the first year; Philemon rather later. There is no difficulty in placing them all with Ephesians in this period as genuine Pauline letters. In support of this theory, Dr. Bartlet maintains an open conviction that St. Paul never was released from his first imprisonment, but was beheaded as the result of his appeal to Cæsar. It was altogether to St. Luke's purpose to show, so he argues, that the release did take place if he knew of it, but no evidence of this can be brought forward. Moreover, St. Peter and St. Paul were dead before the Neronian horrors took place (so Dr. Peake).

Now the crux of the whole matter is 1 Timothy. In recognition of the difficulty, Dr. Bartlet referred students to Dr. Moffatt's "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament" for a statement of the other side. "1 Timothy was the first to arouse the suspicion of critics, and it is assigned to a post-Pauline date even by some who incline to accept 2 Timothy. Were it not for 1 Timothy, it might be plausible to seek room for the other two within the lifetime of St. Paul; but all three hang together, and they hang outside the career of the Apostle" (Moffatt, Introduction, p. 398). It is very difficult, in the face of Dr. Moffatt's detailed study, and statement of the consensus of modern scholars in assigning a post-Pauline date to the Pastorals, to take an opposite view. Dr. Moffatt, basing his *terminus ad*

quem on the familiarity of Ignatius and Polycarp with the Pastorals, takes a date between A.D. 90 and 115 (120). His *terminus a quo* is the death of St. Paul. Yet Dr. Bartlet very ably defended his position, and gave evidence of the careful research and laborious work which he had spent on the problem. To his mind most of the stylistic difficulties disappear when we regard the Epistles, not as private letters, but as open letters which were intended to be read before the Church. "The best and only specific proof that they are genuine is that they are written naturally and for their own sake. The newer and truer light in which St. Paul is coming to be viewed is that which sees in him the missionary rather than the professor, the evangelist and pastor, with the larger outlook of the religious statesman."

In our opinion Dr. Bartlet seems to be biassed by the feeling of a religious advantage—which feeling we do not share, because we believe that the claim of religion is superior to any such test of values—in assigning the authorship of the Pastorals to the Apostle Paul. To Dr. Bartlet the value of the Pastorals is, above all, that they have in view the great end of the formation of a Christ-like character. They are letters dealing with the organization of Christian life on a social basis rather than letters of personal order. They show St. Paul, not the doctrinaire-theologian, but rather the ideal missionary—the disciple of Jesus Christ, in whom he saw God Incarnate, willing to condescend to those of low estate.

IS CHRISTIANITY SYNCRETISTIC?—Not very many years ago the question might have caused a disturbing element in some religious circles. It is now, however, widely recognized that the serious student of religion must be a student of religions, and we agree with Dr. J. Hope Moulton, who, viewing the matter from a sympathetic missionary standpoint, thinks that if Christianity can be shown to be a syncretistic religion through the fuller light which the papyri discoveries are able to bring, rather than causing a disturbing element, it will be a heightening of interest, if, when we approach the matter from a purely scientific outlook, we are able to claim our inheritance as

evolved out of the germ of a common religion far back in the revenue of the ages. The subject, however, waits further investigation; a connection is not yet proved because like answers to like.

ZOROASTER, and the ZOROASTRIAN DOCTRINE OF THE FUTURE LIFE, was the subject of Dr. Moulton's two lectures. Darmesteter and Meyer have both treated Zarathustra as a purely mythical personage—a figure-head of the official class of the religion, and the Gathas (the oldest portion of the Avesta) as belonging to a period later than Philo. Dr. Moulton (*cf.* also Söderblom) interprets the phenomenon in a different way—it is impossible to read the Gathas without feeling that the personal references are too trivial to be regarded as mythical, and therefore must be definite. But, above all, there is the argument of language—the language of the Gathas is exceedingly primitive; it stands nearer to the Sanskrit of the Rigveda than any other literature. It is impossible to believe that the Gathas could have been written in a dead language, unless there had been a plentiful literature to copy from, which at that time could not have been the case; further, the Gathas betray their antiquity by metrical tests—philological tests of modern science allow them to emerge with unshaken antiquity. As for the date of the call of Zarathustra, this can only be fixed very approximately; he stands at the very beginning of Avestan literature, and the developments in religion to which that literature testifies must have occupied a long period. About 1400 B.C. is usually assigned, but Dr. Moulton inclines to put it rather later.

The theme of the second lecture was a consideration of the main doctrines of Zoroastrianism parallel with the doctrines of Israel in full and complete development, including the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, with syncretisms of later Christianity.

Let us follow some of Dr. Moulton's parallels: The idea of God as omniscient, personified as Wisdom (*cf.* Job xxviii.), has close parallels with the "Wise Lord" in Babylonian nations, and the doctrine is unquestionably maintained by Zarathustra. In Zarathustra's doctrine, as also in Deutero-Isaiah, there is no

room for the dual idea of good and evil; in Isa. xlv. 7 the Lord forms the light and creates evil; so also it is in the hymns of Ahura. The Biblical idea that God is light finds emphatic expression in Perseism—Ahura “clothes himself with the massive heavens.” Further, the Johannine doctrine that God is a Spirit also permeates the Gathic hymns; Ahura is wholly spirit. Again, there is a parallel in the idea of the six spirits which surround the throne of God; in the Gathas these spirits, which are “holy immortal ones,” not detached from God, receive names.

Judaism and Christianity have developed phases of central ideas which can be recognized in the Gathas. For our present purpose, it is not important to know when the doctrine of the Trinity emerged, but a comparison of the developed Christian and Gathic doctrines suggests that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation must have sprung up on virgin soil. There are seven hues in Zarathustra's rainbow—although it is possible to argue for a Trinity in marked detachment from the other four—only three in the Christian; and though there is a Holy Spirit in the Gathic doctrine, he is not a separate person. In the Avestan system, as in the Old Testament, there is a combination of distinctness and identity with regard to the word “spirit”; the root idea of the Greek and Hebrew word “spirit” is “breath,” and that of the Avestan is “think.” There is, on the whole, a general resemblance of the paths by which the two reached monotheism.

ESCHATOLOGICAL DOCTRINE.—The contents of the Gathas are essentially eschatological, and there are both similarities and differences between the Gathic and Christian systems. With regard to a future destiny, Zarathustra concentrates his thought on individuals; it is through their own self-will that they determine their future weal or woe. Throughout the whole Gathas runs the pious hope that the end of the world is not far off; Zarathustra himself hopes to see the dawn of a new and better æon, when the future Deliverer will come. Mazdeism (as developed in the later Gathic system), however, quite contrary to

the Christian conception, fixed a date (A.D. 2341) for the coming of the Deliverer.

As to whether or not Zoroastrianism enters into a period of syncretism with Christianity, we cannot say. Bousset says that it must be struck out of the system. The features, however, which bring its conception nearest to that of the Old Testament prophets are : Religious duties, including the slaying of animals ; sacred formulæ, as most powerful spells ; the idea of immortality ; the elaborate doctrines of angels and spirits. Our evidence for producing comparisons depends primarily on the classic writers and the Talmuds. The Jews brought their doctrines of angelology from Babylon ; an elaborate doctrine of angels and spirits was a later development of Jewish teaching. Contrast the attitude of the Sadducees in entirely rejecting it, and also St. Paul's attitude in his letter to the Colossians. To St. Paul, the one thing that mattered was to be in direct relation with the one Being higher than angels, and if it be maintained that St. Paul and other New Testament writers were stimulated by the knowledge that the Persees held the doctrine of immortality, the path by which they themselves arrived at the doctrine was certainly a different one.

