

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

Dogmatism and Rationalism as methods of religious philosophy — meaning of these terms — errors of the respective systems denoted by each; the one forcing reason into agreement with revelation, the other forcing revelation into agreement with reason. — Both methods may be regarded as attempts, from opposite sides, to produce exact coincidence between belief and thought. — Instances of each exhibited and examined. — Human conceptions are unavoidable in Theology; but there is need of some principle to determine their proper place in it. — Such a principle can only be gained by an investigation of the Limits of Human Thought. — The proper object of criticism is not religion, but the human mind in its relation to religion. — A direct criticism of religion as a representation of God can only be accomplished by the construction of a Philosophy of the Infinite. — It is therefore necessary to inquire whether such a philosophy is possible; and this can only be ascertained by an examination of the laws of human thought in general, which will determine those of religious thought in particular. — Analogous difficulties may be expected in philosophy and in religion, arising from the limitations of thought common to both. — Contrast between two opposite statements of the extent of human knowledge, in the words of St. Paul and of Hegel. — Purpose of the following Lectures, as an Examination of the Limits of Religious Thought .. Page 1

LECTURE II.

Statement of the two opposite methods by which a Philosophy of Religion may be attempted; the Objective or Metaphysical, based on a supposed knowledge of the nature of God, and the Subjective or Psychological, based on a knowledge of the mental faculties of man. — Relation of these methods respectively to the Criticism

d 2

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

lii

CONTENTS.

of Revelation—dependence of the former method upon the latter.—Further examination of the Objective or Metaphysical method.—Two different modes in which man may be supposed to be capable of attaining to a knowledge of God—specimen of each—insufficiency of both to found a Rational Theology.—Examination of the fundamental ideas of Rational Theology,—the Absolute—the Infinite—the First Cause—mutual contradictions involved in these three ideas—conception of an eternal Causation incompatible with the Absolute—conception of a temporal Causation incompatible with the Infinite.—The Absolute cannot be conceived as a necessary and unconscious cause,—nor as a voluntary and conscious cause,—nor as possessing consciousness at all,—nor as containing within itself any kind of relation,—nor as one and simple, out of all relation.—Effect of these counter impossibilities on the conceptions of Theology—apparent contradictions in the conception of the Divine Attributes as absolute and infinite.—Further contradictions involved in the coexistence of the Relative with the Absolute, and of the Finite with the Infinite. Pantheism avoids these contradictions by denying the existence of the Finite and Relative—this solution untenable—self-contradictions of the Pantheistic hypothesis.—Alternative of Atheism, which denies the existence of the Infinite and Absolute—contradictions involved in this hypothesis.—Summary of conclusions.—Necessary failure of all attempts to construct a Metaphysical Theology—alternative necessitated by this failure.—Practical result of the above inquiry Page 23

LECTURE III.

Recapitulation of the results of the last Lecture.—Necessity of examining the Philosophy of Religion from the Subjective or Psychological side, as dependent upon a knowledge of the laws of the human mind.—General conditions of all human Consciousness.—*First condition of Consciousness, Distinction between one Object and another*—such a distinction necessarily implies Limitation—consequent impossibility of conceiving the Infinite.—Explanation of the contradictions involved in the idea of the Infinite—this idea inadmissible as the basis of a scientific Theology.—*Second condition of Consciousness, Relation between Subject and Object*—consequent impossibility of conceiving the Absolute.—Explanation of the contradictions involved in the idea of the

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

liii

Absolute. — Impossibility of a partial knowledge of the Infinite and Absolute. — *Third condition of Consciousness, Succession and Duration in Time* — hence all objects are conceived as finite — consequent impossibility of conceiving Creation, and counter impossibility of conceiving finite existence as uncreated. — Attempt to evade this limitation in Theology by the hypothesis of the existence of God out of Time — this hypothesis unavailable for any distinct philosophical conception. — *Fourth condition of Consciousness, Personality* — Personality a limitation and a relation, and hence inadequate to represent the Infinite. — Theological consequences of this condition. — Personality the source and type of our conception of Reality, and therefore the only fitting representation of God. — Necessity of thinking of God as personal, and yet of believing in Him as infinite — apparent contradiction between these representations — hence Thought cannot be the measure of Belief. — Consequent impossibility of constructing a Rational Theology. — Attempt to avoid the above conclusions by placing the Philosophy of the Infinite in a point beyond Consciousness — necessary failure of this attempt. — Summary of conclusions. — Practical lesson from the above inquiry Page 47

LECTURE IV.

Analysis of the religious Consciousness, reflective and intuitive. — Relation of the reflective Consciousness to Theology; its reasonings sufficient to correct our conception of a Supreme Being, but not to originate it — examination of some current theories on this point — statement of the value of the reflective faculties within their proper limits. — Reflection, as well as intuition, necessary to distinct consciousness; but intuition is first in the order of nature, though not in that of time. — Two principal modes of religious intuition — the Feeling of Dependence and the Conviction of Moral Obligation, giving rise respectively to Prayer and Expiation. — Examination of these two modes of Consciousness. — Dependence implies a Personal Superior; hence our conviction of the Power of God — Moral Obligation implies a Moral Lawgiver; hence our conviction of the Goodness of God. — Limits of the Religious Consciousness — Sense of Dependence not a consciousness of the Absolute and Infinite — opposite theory of Schleiermacher on this point — objections to his view. — Sense of Moral Obligation not a consciousness of the Absolute and Infinite.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

liv

CONTENTS.

—Yet the Infinite is indirectly implied by the religious consciousness, though not apprehended as such; for the consciousness of limitation carries with it an indirect conviction of the existence of the Infinite beyond consciousness. — Result of the above analysis — our knowledge of God relative and not absolute — the Infinite an object of belief, but not of thought or knowledge; hence we may know *that* an Infinite God exists, but not *what* He is as infinite. — Further results of an examination of the religious consciousness — God known as a *Person* through the consciousness of ourselves as *Persons* — this consciousness indispensable to Theism; for the denial of our own Personality, whether in the form of Materialism or of Pantheism, logically leads to Atheism. — Summary of conclusions — our religious knowledge is *regulative*, but not *speculative* — importance of this distinction in theological reasoning — conception of the Infinite inadmissible in Theology. — Office of religious philosophy, as limited to finite conceptions. — Practical benefits of this limitation. — Conclusion.

Page 73

LECTURE V.

Distinction between Speculative and Regulative Truth further pursued. — In Philosophy, as well as in Religion, our highest principles of thought are regulative and not speculative — Instances in the Ideas of Liberty and Necessity; Unity and Plurality as implied in the conception of any object; Commerce between Soul and Body; Extension, as implied in external perception; and Succession, as implied in the entire consciousness. — Illustration thus afforded for determining the limits of thought — distinction between legitimate and illegitimate thought, as determined by their relation to the *inexplicable* and the *self-contradictory* respectively. — Conclusion to be drawn as regards the manner of the mind's operation — all Consciousness implies a relation between Subject and Object, dependent on their mutual action and reaction; and thus no principle of thought can be regarded as absolute and simple, as an ultimate and highest truth. — Analogy in this respect between Philosophy and Natural Religion which apprehends the Infinite under finite forms — corresponding difficulties to be expected in each. — Provinces of Reason and Faith — Analogy extended to Revealed Religion — testimony of Revelation plain and intelligible when regarded as regulative, but ultimately incomprehensible to speculation — corresponding errors

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

lv

in Philosophy and Religion, illustrating this analogy. — Regulative conceptions not therefore untrue. — The above principles confirmed by the teaching of Scripture. — Revelation expressly adapted to the limits of human thought. — Relation of the Infinite to the Personal in the representations of God in the Old Testament. — Further confirmation from the New Testament. — Doctrine of the Incarnation; its practical position in Theology as a regulative truth; its perversion by modern philosophy, in the attempt to exhibit it as a speculative truth. — Instances in Hegel, Marheineke, and Strauss. — Conclusion Page 95

LECTURE VI.

Result of the previous inquiries—religious ideas contain two elements, a Form, common to them with all other ideas, as being human thoughts; and a Matter, peculiar to themselves, as thoughts about religious objects—hence there may exist two possible kinds of difficulties; the one formal, arising from the universal laws of human thought; the other material, arising from the peculiar nature of religious evidence. — The principal objections suggested by Rationalism are of the former kind; common to all human thinking as such, and therefore to Rationalism itself. — Proof of this position by the exhibition of parallel difficulties in Theology and Philosophy. — Our ignorance of the nature of God compared with our ignorance of the nature of Causation. — Doctrine of the Trinity compared with the philosophical conception of the Infinite and the Absolute, as One and yet as Many. — Doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son compared with the relation of an Infinite Substance to its Attributes. — Purpose of such comparisons, not to prove the doctrines, but to shew the weakness of human reason with regard to them—true evidence of the doctrines to be found, not in Reason, but in Revelation. — Further parallels. — Doctrine of the twofold nature of Christ compared with the philosophical conception of the Infinite as co-existing with the Finite. — Reason thus shewn not to be the supreme judge of religious truth; for Religion must begin with that which is above Reason. — Extension of the same argument to our conceptions of Divine Providence. — Representations of General Law and Special Interposition—supposed difficulty in the conception of the latter shewn to be really common to all human conceptions of the Infinite. — Both representations equally

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

lvi

CONTENTS.

imperfect as speculative truths, and both equally necessary as regulative. — Imperfections in the conceptions of General Law and mechanical action of the universe — this conception is neither philosophically necessary nor empirically universal; and hence it is not entitled to supersede all other representations — it is inapplicable to the phenomena of mind, and only partially available in relation to those of matter. — Conception of Miraculous Agency, as subordinate to that of Special Providence — no sufficient ground, either from philosophy or from experience, for asserting that miracles are impossible. — Comparison between the opposite conceptions of a miracle, as an exception to a law, or as the result of a higher law — both these conceptions are speculatively imperfect, but the former is preferable as a regulative truth. — Summary of conclusions — parallel difficulties must exist in Theology and in Philosophy — true value and province of Reason in relation to both Page 118

LECTURE VII.

Philosophical parallel continued with regard to the supposed moral objections to Christian doctrines. — Error of the moral theory of Kant. — Moral convictions how far necessary and trustworthy, how far contingent and fallible — parallel in this respect between moral and mathematical science, as based on the formal conditions of experience — possibility of corresponding errors in both. — Human morality not absolute, but relative. — The Moral Law cannot be conceived as an absolute principle, apart from its temporal manifestations — Parallel in the idea of Time and its relations. — Morality as conceived by us necessarily contains a human and positive element; and therefore cannot be the measure of the Absolute Nature of God. — Application of the above principles to Christian Theology. — The Atonement — Weakness of the supposed moral objections to this doctrine — such objections equally applicable to any conceivable scheme of Divine Providence. — Predestination and Free Will — Predestination, as a determination of the Absolute Mind, is speculatively inconceivable, and therefore cannot be known to be incompatible with human Freedom — Parallel in this respect between Predestination in Theology and Causation in Philosophy. — Eternal Punishment — rashness and ignorance of rationalist criticisms of this doctrine — the difficulties of the doctrine are not peculiar to Theology,

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

lvii

but common to all Philosophy, and belong to the general problem of the existence of Evil at all, which is itself but a subordinate case of the universal impossibility of conceiving the coexistence of the Infinite with the Finite.— Contrast between illegitimate and legitimate modes of reasoning on evil and its punishment— illustrations to be derived from analogies in the course of nature and in the constitution of the human mind.— Extension of the argument from analogy to other religious doctrines— Original Sin— Justification by Faith— Operation of Divine Grace.— Limits of the Moral Reason.— Conclusion Page 141

LECTURE VIII.

Right use of Reason in religious questions— Reason entitled to judge of a Religion in respect of its evidences, as addressed to men, but not in respect of its correspondence with philosophical conceptions of the Absolute Nature of God.— No one faculty of the human mind is entitled to exclusive preference as the criterion of religious truth— the true criterion is to be found in the general result of many and various Evidences— practical neglect of this rule by different writers.— Comparative value of internal and external evidences of religion, the former as negative, the latter as positive.— Cautions requisite in the use of the negative argument from internal evidence— external and internal evidence can only be estimated in conjunction with each other.— Distinction between the proper and improper use of the Moral Sense in questions of religious evidence.— Application of this distinction to facts recorded in Sacred History.— Analogy between physical and moral laws as regards miraculous interventions.— Probable and partial character of the moral argument; error of supposing it to be demonstrative and complete; possibility of mistakes in its application.— General summary of Christian Evidences— alternative in the case of their rejection— Christ's teaching either wholly divine or wholly human.— Impossibility of an eclectic Christianity.— Value of the *à priori* presumption against miracles— nothing gained in point of probability by a partial rejection of the supernatural.— Christianity regarded as a Revelation must be accepted wholly or not at all.— Speculative difficulties in religion form a part of our probation— analogy between moral and intellectual temptations.— General result of an examination of the Limits of Religious Thought— Theology not a speculative science,

e

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00057-4 - The Limits of Religious Thought Examined in Eight Lectures:
Preached Before the University of Oxford

Henry Longueville Mansel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

lviii

CONTENTS.

nor in the course of progressive development. — Cautions needed in the treatment of religious knowledge as regulative — this view does not solve difficulties, but only shews why they are insoluble. Instance of the neglect of this caution in Archbishop King's rule of Scripture interpretation as regards the Divine Attributes. — No explanation possible of those difficulties which arise from the universal laws of human thought — such difficulties are inherent in our mental constitution, and form part of our training and discipline during this life. — The office of Philosophy is not to give us a knowledge of the absolute nature of God, but to teach us to know ourselves and the limits of our faculties. — Conclusion.

Page 162