Whether history in this form, even when studied in the most accurate and thorough manner, should be called science may be doubted, as it is simply occupied with the discovery and description of the particular and concrete. It is not usual so to designate it in any of its sections. The history of religious beliefs and ideas may be as purely and properly history as that of external institu­tions and transactions. It deals, however, not only with what is internal and spiritual but also with what is abstract and general, and hence it is at least more akin to science than is common history, and its sections are often called sciences. These sections are three in number, and correspond to the sections of the ordi­nary history. They are known as comparative theology, Biblical theology, and the history of Christian doctrine. To the last of these, symbolics may fairly claim to be a necessary supplement. They are quite distinct from a conceivably attainable knowledge of the laws of religious history, such as might be with strict propriety designated science of religious history, a department of science of history. Of historical science in this last sense there is as yet extremely little.

Religion is a spiritual process, and its history continuously implies the affections and operations of mind. The historical treatment of religion, therefore, necessarily leads to its psycholog­ical treatment. The history alike of religious events and actions and of religious ideas and beliefs can only be explained through a knowledge of the religious powers and processes, i.e., of the psychological factors and states which condition and determine its development. The psychological study of religion, although it has been greatly neglected, should reach over a very large depart­ment of theology. The department may be distributed into three disciplines—the general, comparative, and special psychology of religion. The first should treat of the general religious nature of man ; the second should discover and compare the psychical peculi­arities to be found in the various religions ; and the third should exhibit elaborately the psychology of a particular religion, as, e.g., Biblical and Christian psychology.

The historical and psychological sciences of religion deal with religion merely as an historical and psychological phenomenon. They do not imply its truth, and can be cultivated by those who regard it as a delusion equally with those who acknowledge it to be a certainty. It is the office of apologetics to determine whether or not it is true and how far it is true. If it end not in a negative result, in agnosticism or atheism, it must prove that God reveals himself to man, and that man apprehends God. In other words, apologetics treats of the media of revelation—alike the objective and subjective, Divine and human media—and so is the science, on the one hand, of revelation, and, on the other hand, of religious certitude. It is divisible into general and special, or, in equivalent terms, into theological and Christian apologetics, —the former being the scientific exhibition of the grounds of natural religion, and the latter of the grounds of the Christian religion. They are some­times combined, inasmuch as both are needed in order to establish the truth of Christianity. In Germany it has become not uncom­mon to fuse them into one under the name of fundamental theology, described as the science which treats of the foundation of Chris­tianity. And, undoubtedly, it is not only expedient but even necessary to treat of both as introductory and preparatory to the construction of Christian science. But the distinction between them must not, therefore, be forgotten or ignored. Theological apologetics might be irresistible although Christian apologetics were futile. Theological apologetics derives its validity from its relation to natural theology, which has an absolute value of its own, wholly independent of any other science, of Christianity, or of anything else. The alliance of theological and of Christian apologetics is perfectly legitimate ; the attempt to combine them into a single science, into a single homogeneous discipline, is decidedly the reverse.

The highest stage of theological science is the methodical educa­tion and exhibition of the truth involved in religion, either as con­tents of faith or elements of life. When conversant with the faith it is dogmatics, when with the life ethics; but, of course, here again distinction is not to be confounded with separation. True faith is living faith, and true life is the life of faith. Dogmatics and ethics are so intimately related that it is not surprising that they should have been long left undifferentiated, or that a few eminent theologians should still deny that they can be properly treated apart. Theology at this stage is commonly designated systematic, although the term is not a good one, and others, little if any better perhaps, as didactic, theoretical, positive, thetic, &c., have been suggested as substitutes. Systematic theology, like historical, psychological, and apologetic theology, is divisible into general and special, the former including natural theology and theological ethics, and the latter Christian dogmatics and Christian ethics. The identification, so common in Britain, of systematic theology with Christian dogmatics is, of course, solely due to the survival among us of prescientific thought and language in theology.

The historical and psychological sciences of religion may be con­joined under the designation of empirical, or phenomenological, or historical (in the widest sense); the apologetic and systematic sciences under that of didactic, thetic, speculative, or systematic (in a loose sense). This twofold division of them is the one gene­rally adopted. And as it rests on an obvious and important dis­tinction it is fully entitled to acceptance, provided it be so received as not to hide or extrude the fourfold division founded on the real moments or stages of the process of theological investigation.

There are a considerable number of disciplines not included in the divisions indicated, yet for which the theological encyclopaedist is bound to find appropriate places. The best classification of these is into exegetical and practical. So-called exegetical theology, however, is in all its departments simply instrumental and intro­ductory to historical theology ; and practical theology is in all its departments concerned with the use and application of religious knowledge, not with its acquisition and advancement. The former is not directly occupied with religion but with the records and documents from which its history must be ascertained ; the latter is art and not science.

Considering theology, then, only as science directly engaged on religion, the following are the sciences which belong to general theology:—(1) the history of religions; (2) comparative theology; (3) psychology of religion; (4) theological apologetics; (5) natural theology ; and (6) theological ethics. Those of Christian theology are—(1) Biblical history; (2) ecclesiastical history; (3) Biblical theology; (4) history of Christian doctrine; (5) symbolics; (6) Biblical and Christian psychology ; (7) Christian apologetics ; (8) Christian dogmatics; and (9) Christian ethics. The remainder of this article will be devoted to a brief indication of the nature of such of the above studies as have not already been treated of in separate articles.

The history of religions and comparative theology differ from each other as sacred history and Biblical theology or ecclesiastical history and the history of Christian doctrines differ. That they should rarely be distinguished proves only that the ethnic sacred books have not yet been so closely studied as the Bible, and that the histories of the great ethnic religions are not yet so well known as the history of Christianity. As regards both the history of religions and comparative theology, see Religions.

The general psychology of religion should analyse the religious nature of man and trace the laws of its development. It has to ascertain the principles which guide reason in the search after God ; to determine what subjective religion is, what elements it involves, and through what stages it may pass ; and to show how the under­standing and imagination, the emotions and affections, the qualities and energies of will, operate in religion and influence its character. While general psychology of religion thus treats man as framed and fitted for religion, the comparative psychology of religion treats of the psychological composition and peculiarities of the various concrete and collective manifestations of religion. It is related to the general psychology of religion as comparative psychology to general psychology. It must concern itself with the religions of the rudest peoples. It has to explain what is psycho­logically distinctive of fetichism, animal worship, naturalistic religions like the Vedic, anthropomorphic polytheisms like those of Greece and Rome, and pantheisms like Brahmanism and Bud­dhism. For example, in each of these forms of religion imagination works differently, and the comparative psychology of religion should give a complete view of the operations of imagination in the formation of the religions of humanity. So as regards all the chief intellectual principles and all the chief sentiments.

The psychological study of religion was not, as is often said, be­gun by Kant. Hume—in virtue of his Natural History of Religion, with its clear recognition of the distinction between the causes and the reasons of religion—is much more entitled to be considered initiator in this department, but even his claim may be contested. The department is one of which there is as yet no general survey, and of which many portions have been entirely overlooked. What the ordinary psychologists—e.g., Bain, Sully, Thompson, Rabier, Fortlage, Strümpell, Volkmann, Wundt—say regarding it is very vague and meagre. The only two points which have been closely investigated are those as to the nature of religious cognition and the essence of religion, and as to both speculation has been fre­quently allowed to disturb and pervert psychological analysis. For some of the later literature on these points, see notes on article Theism. Neither the general nor the comparative psychology of religion as yet exists in a separate and appropriate form. What religious psychology there is will be found chiefly in the writings of anthropologists like Bastian and Tylor, of comparative philo­logists like Max Müller and Steinthal, of philosophers like Spencer and Renouvier, of theologians of the school of Schleiermacher, and, above all, in the histories of religions and the philosophies of religion.1

Theological apologetics is not to be confounded with natural

@@@1 Alliott’s *Psychology and Theology,* Newman Smyth’s *Religious Feeling,* Brinton’s *Religious Sentiment,* Happel’s *Anlage des Menschen zur Religion,* Ulrici's *Gott und Mensch,* and Lesbazeille’s “ Bases Psychologiques de la Reli­gion” (two articles in *Rev. Phil.,* vol. xxi., 1886) may be specially mentioned.