1. Philosophy and Christian Theology. In the history of Christian theology, philosophy has sometimes been seen as a natural complement to theological reflection, whereas at other times practitioners of the two disciplines have regarded each other as mortal enemies.

Page ranges should be limited to one or two pages when possible. You can help improve this article by introducing citations that are more precise. October Learn how and when to remove this template message The concepts of "science" and "religion" are a recent invention: Furthermore, the phrase "religion and science" or "science and religion" emerged in the 19th century, not before, due to the reification of both concepts. It was in the 17th century that the concept of "religion" received its modern shape despite the fact that ancient texts like the Bible, the Quran, and other sacred texts did not have a concept of religion in the original languages and neither did the people or the cultures in which these sacred texts were written. Throughout classical South Asia, the study of law consisted of concepts such as penance through piety and ceremonial as well as practical traditions. Medieval Japan at first had a similar union between "imperial law" and universal or "Buddha law", but these later became independent sources of power. Christianity accepted reason within the ambit of faith. In Christendom, reason was considered subordinate to revelation, which contained the ultimate truth and this truth could not be challenged. Even though the medieval Christian had the urge to use their reason, they had little on which to exercise it. In medieval universities, the faculty for natural philosophy and theology were separate, and discussions pertaining to theological issues were often not allowed to be undertaken by the faculty of philosophy. It was an independent field, separated from theology, which enjoyed a good deal of intellectual freedom as long as it was restricted to the natural world. In general, there was religious support for natural science by the late Middle Ages and a recognition that it was an important element of learning. With significant developments taking place in science, mathematics, medicine and philosophy, the relationship between science and religion became one of curiosity and questioning. Renaissance humanism looked to classical Greek and Roman texts to change contemporary thought, allowing for a new mindset after the Middle Ages. Renaissance humanism was an "ethical theory and practice that emphasized reason, scientific inquiry and human fulfillment in the natural world," said Abernethy. With the sheer success of science and the steady advance of rationalism, the individual scientist gained prestige. This allowed more people to read and learn from the scripture, leading to the Evangelical movement. The people who spread this message, concentrated more on individual agency rather than the structures of the Church. It teaches people to be satisfied with trivial, supernatural non-explanations and blinds them to the wonderful real explanations that we have within our grasp. It teaches them to accept authority, revelation and faith instead of always insisting on evidence. Because of this both are incompatible as currently practiced and the debate of compatibility or incompatibility will be eternal. Carroll, since religion makes claims that are not compatible with science, such as supernatural events, therefore both are incompatible. According to Dawkins, religion "subverts science and saps the intellect". Ellis, Kenneth R. Miller, Katharine Hayhoe, George Coyne and Simon Conway Morris argue for compatibility since they do not agree that science is incompatible with religion and vice versa. They argue that science provides many opportunities to look for and find God in nature and to reflect on their beliefs. What he finds particularly odd and unjustified is in how atheists often come to invoke scientific authority on their non-scientific philosophical conclusions like there being no point or no meaning to the universe as the only viable option when the scientific method and science never have had any way of addressing questions of meaning or God in the first place. Furthermore, he notes that since evolution made the brain and since the brain can handle both religion and science, there is no natural incompatibility between the concepts at the biological level. He argues that leaders in science sometimes trump older scientific baggage and that leaders in theology do the same, so once theological intellectuals are taken into account, people who represent extreme positions like Ken Ham and Eugenie Scott will become irrelevant. It was in the 19th century that relationship
between science and religion became an actual formal topic of discourse, while before this no one had pitted science against religion or vice versa, though occasional complex interactions had been expressed before the 19th century. If Galileo and the Scopes trial come to mind as examples of conflict, they were the exceptions rather than the rule. Galileo was found "vehemently suspect of heresy", namely of having held the opinions that the Sun lies motionless at the center of the universe, that the Earth is not at its centre and moves. He was required to "abjure, curse and detest" those opinions. The Church had merely sided with the scientific consensus of the time. Only the latter was fulfilled by Galileo. Although the preface of his book claims that the character is named after a famous Aristotelian philosopher Simplicius in Latin, Simplicio in Italian, the name "Simplicio" in Italian also has the connotation of "simpleton". Most historians agree Galileo did not act out of malice and felt blindsided by the reaction to his book. Galileo had alienated one of his biggest and most powerful supporters, the Pope, and was called to Rome to defend his writings. Grayling, still believes there is competition between science and religions and point to the origin of the universe, the nature of human beings and the possibility of miracles [65] Independence[ edit ] A modern view, described by Stephen Jay Gould as "non-overlapping magisteria" NOMA, is that science and religion deal with fundamentally separate aspects of human experience and so, when each stays within its own domain, they co-exist peacefully. Stace viewed independence from the perspective of the philosophy of religion. Stace felt that science and religion, when each is viewed in its own domain, are both consistent and complete. In science, explanations must be based on evidence drawn from examining the natural world. Scientifically based observations or experiments that conflict with an explanation eventually must lead to modification or even abandonment of that explanation. Religious faith, in contrast, does not depend on empirical evidence, is not necessarily modified in the face of conflicting evidence, and typically involves supernatural forces or entities. Because they are not a part of nature, supernatural entities cannot be investigated by science. In this sense, science and religion are separate and address aspects of human understanding in different ways. Attempts to put science and religion against each other create controversy where none needs to exist. He views science as descriptive and religion as prescriptive. He stated that if science and mathematics concentrate on what the world ought to be, in the way that religion does, it may lead to improperly ascribing properties to the natural world as happened among the followers of Pythagoras in the sixth century B.C. Habgood also stated that he believed that the reverse situation, where religion attempts to be descriptive, can also lead to inappropriately assigning properties to the natural world. A notable example is the now defunct belief in the Ptolemaic geocentric planetary model that held sway until changes in scientific and religious thinking were brought about by Galileo and proponents of his views. Kuhn asserted that science is made up of paradigms that arise from cultural traditions, which is similar to the secular perspective on religion. Polanyi further asserted that all knowledge is personal and therefore the scientist must be performing a very personal if not necessarily subjective role when doing science. Coulson and Harold K. Schilling, both claimed that "the methods of science and religion have much in common. Dialogue[ edit ] Clerks studying astronomy and geometry France, early 15th century. The religion and science community consists of those scholars who involve themselves with what has been called the "religion-and-science dialogue" or the "religion-and-science field. Journals addressing the relationship between science and religion include Theology and Science and Zygon. Eugenie Scott has written that the "science and religion" movement is, overall, composed mainly of theists who have a healthy respect for science and may be beneficial to the public understanding of science. She contends that the "Christian scholarship" movement is not a problem for science, but that the "Theistic science" movement, which proposes abandoning methodological materialism, does cause problems in understanding of the nature of science. This annual series continues and has included William James, John Dewey, Carl Sagan, and many other professors from various fields. Science, Religion, and Naturalism, heavily contests the linkage of naturalism with science, as conceived by Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett and like-minded thinkers; while Daniel Dennett thinks that Plantinga stretches science to an unacceptable extent. Scientific and theological perspectives often coexist peacefully. Christians and some non-Christian religions have historically integrated
well with scientific ideas, as in the ancient Egyptian technological mastery applied to monotheistic ends, the flourishing of logic and mathematics under Hinduism and Buddhism, and the scientific advances made by Muslim scholars during the Ottoman empire. Even many 19th-century Christian communities welcomed scientists who claimed that science was not at all concerned with discovering the ultimate nature of reality. Principe, the Johns Hopkins University Drew Professor of the Humanities, from a historical perspective this points out that much of the current-day clashes occur between limited extremists' both religious and scientistic fundamentalists' over a very few topics, and that the movement of ideas back and forth between scientific and theological thought has been more usual. He also admonished that true religion must conform to the conclusions of science. Buddhism and science Buddhism and science have been regarded as compatible by numerous authors. For example, Buddhism encourages the impartial investigation of nature an activity referred to as Dhamma-Vicaya in the Pali Canon the principal object of study being oneself. Buddhism and science both show a strong emphasis on causality. In his book The Universe in a Single Atom he wrote, "My confidence in venturing into science lies in my basic belief that as in science, so in Buddhism, understanding the nature of reality is pursued by means of critical investigation. Christianity and science Science and Religion are portrayed to be in harmony in the Tiffany window Education Francis Collins, a scientist who happens to be a Christian, is the current director of the National Institutes of Health. Among early Christian teachers, Tertullian c. These ideas were significantly countered by later findings of universal patterns of biological cooperation. According to John Habgood, all man really knows here is that the universe seems to be a mix of good and evil, beauty and pain, and that suffering may somehow be part of the process of creation. Habgood holds that Christians should not be surprised that suffering may be used creatively by God, given their faith in the symbol of the Cross. The "Handmaiden" tradition, which saw secular studies of the universe as a very important and helpful part of arriving at a better understanding of scripture, was adopted throughout Christian history from early on. Heilbron, [99] Alistair Cameron Crombie, David Lindberg, Edward Grant, Thomas Goldstein, and Ted Davis have reviewed the popular notion that medieval Christianity was a negative influence in the development of civilization and science. In their views, not only did the monks save and cultivate the remnants of ancient civilization during the barbarian invasions, but the medieval church promoted learning and science through its sponsorship of many universities which, under its leadership, grew rapidly in Europe in the 11th and 12th centuries, St. He was not unlike other medieval theologians who sought out reason in the effort to defend his faith. Lindberg states that the widespread popular belief that the Middle Ages was a time of ignorance and superstition due to the Christian church is a "caricature". According to Lindberg, while there are some portions of the classical tradition which suggest this view, these were exceptional cases. It was common to tolerate and encourage critical thinking about the nature of the world. The relation between Christianity and science is complex and cannot be simplified to either harmony or conflict, according to Lindberg. There was no warfare between science and the church. A degree of concord between science and religion can be seen in religious belief and empirical science. The belief that God created the world and therefore humans, can lead to the view that he arranged for humans to know the world. This is underwritten by the doctrine of imago dei. In the words of Thomas Aquinas, "Since human beings are said to be in the image of God in virtue of their having a nature that includes an intellect, such a nature is most in the image of God in virtue of being most able to imitate God". As science advanced, acceptance of a literal version of the Bible became "increasingly untenable" and some in that period presented ways of interpreting scripture according to its spirit on its authority and truth. Later that year, a similar law was passed in Mississippi, and likewise, Arkansas in, these "anti-monkey" laws were struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States as unconstitutional, "because they established a religious doctrine violating both the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution. In, the United States Supreme Court ruled that creationism is religion, not science, and cannot be advocated in public school classrooms. It includes a range of beliefs, including views described as evolutionary creationism, which accepts some findings of modern science but also upholds classical religious teachings about God and creation in Christian
context. Bowler argues that in contrast to the conflicts between science and religion in the U. These attempts at reconciliation fell apart in the s due to increased social tensions, moves towards neo-orthodox theology and the acceptance of the modern evolutionary synthesis.
Chapter 2: berbagi dengan saya: The Relationship between Theology and Philosophy

Yes, it is the handmaiden of theology. Theology sets the “ground rules” for philosophy. For example, the Trinity. Theology tells us that this is in fact the case, and philosophy can then attempt to explicate it as much as it can. Now if it can’t then philosophy must just say, “I can only do so much.”

What are science and religion, and how do they interrelate? Science and religion is a recognized field of study with dedicated journals e. Journal of Religion and Science, academic chairs e. Most of its authors are either theologians e. The systematic study of science and religion started in the s, with authors such as Ian Barbour and Thomas F. Torrance who challenged the prevailing view that science and religion were either at war or indifferent to each other. Zygon, the first specialist journal on science and religion, was also founded in While the early study of science and religion focused on methodological issues, authors from the late s to the s developed contextual approaches, including detailed historical examinations of the relationship between science and religion e. Peter Harrison challenged the warfare model by arguing that Protestant theological conceptions of nature and humanity helped to give rise to science in the seventeenth century. Peter Bowler e. drew attention to a broad movement of liberal Christians and evolutionists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who aimed to reconcile evolutionary theory with religious belief. It had contributors from philosophy and theology e. The aim of these conferences was to understand divine action in the light of contemporary sciences. Each of the five conferences, and each edited volume that arose from it, was devoted to an area of natural science and its interaction with religion, including quantum cosmology e. Russell et al. See also Russell et al. The legal battles e. However, even if one were to focus on the reception of evolutionary theory, the relationship between religion and science is complex. For instance, in the United Kingdom, scientists, clergy, and popular writers, sought to reconcile science and religion during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, whereas the United States saw the rise of a fundamentalist opposition to evolutionary thinking, exemplified by the Scopes trial in Bowler e. In recent decades, Church leaders have issued conciliatory public statements on evolutionary theory. Pope John Paul II affirmed evolutionary theory in his message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, but rejected it for the human soul, which he saw as the result of a separate, special creation. The Church of England publicly endorsed evolutionary theory e. Brown e. including an apology to Charles Darwin for its initial rejection of his theory. For the past fifty years, science and religion has been de facto Western science and Christianity®“to what extent can Christian beliefs be brought in line with the results of western science? The field of science and religion has only recently turned to an examination of non-Christian traditions, such as Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, providing a richer picture of interaction. In order to understand the scope of science and religion and what interactions there are between them, we must at least get a rough sense of what science and religion are. Indeed, they are terms that were coined recently, with meanings that vary across times and cultures. Tylor e. who systematically used the term for religions across the world. Philosophers of science have attempted to demarcate science from other knowledge-seeking endeavors, in particular religion. For instance, Karl Popper claimed that scientific hypotheses unlike religious ones are in principle falsifiable. They disagree, however, on how to precisely and across times and cultures demarcate the two domains. One way to distinguish between science and religion is the claim that science concerns the natural world, whereas religion concerns both the natural and the supernatural. Scientific explanations do not appeal to supernatural entities such as gods or angels fallen or not, or to non-natural forces like miracles, karma, or Qi. For example, neuroscientists typically explain our thoughts in terms of brain states, not by reference to an immaterial soul or spirit. Naturalists draw a distinction between methodological naturalism, an epistemological principle that limits scientific inquiry to natural entities and laws, and ontological or philosophical naturalism, a metaphysical principle that rejects the supernatural Forrest Since methodological naturalism is concerned with the practice of science in particular, with the kinds of entities and processes that are invoked, it does not make any statements about whether or
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not supernatural entities exist. They might exist, but lie outside of the scope of scientific investigation. However, these stronger conclusions are controversial. The view that science can be demarcated from religion in its methodological naturalism is more commonly accepted. For instance, in the Kitzmiller versus Dover trial, the philosopher of science Robert Pennock was called to testify by the plaintiffs on whether Intelligent Design was a form of creationism, and therefore religion. Building on earlier work e. Still, overall there was a tendency to favor naturalistic explanations in natural philosophy. This preference for naturalistic causes may have been encouraged by past successes of naturalistic explanations, leading authors such as Paul Draper to argue that the success of methodological naturalism could be evidence for ontological naturalism. Explicit methodological naturalism arose in the nineteenth century with the X-club, a lobby group for the professionalization of science founded in by Thomas Huxley and friends, which aimed to promote a science that would be free from religious dogmas. The X-club may have been in part motivated by the desire to remove competition by amateur-clergymen scientists in the field of science, and thus to open up the field to full-time professionals Garwood For example, Kelly Clark argues that we can only sensibly inquire into the relationship between a widely accepted claim of science such as quantum mechanics or findings in neuroscience and a specific claim of a particular religion such as Islamic understandings of divine providence or Buddhist views of the no-self. For example, Mikael Stenmark distinguishes between three views: Subsequent authors, as well as Barbour himself, have refined and amended this taxonomy. For one thing, it focuses on the cognitive content of religions at the expense of other aspects, such as rituals and social structures. Moreover, there is no clear definition of what conflict means evidential or logical. Nevertheless, because of its enduring influence, it is still worthwhile to discuss this taxonomy in detail. The conflict model, which holds that science and religion are in perpetual and principal conflict, relies heavily on two historical narratives: The conflict model was developed and defended in the nineteenth century by the following two publications: Both authors argued that science and religion inevitably conflict as they essentially discuss the same domain. The vast majority of authors in the science and religion field is critical of the conflict model and believes it is based on a shallow and partisan reading of the historical record. Ironically, two views that otherwise have little in common, scientific materialism and extreme biblical literalism, both assume a conflict model: While the conflict model is at present a minority position, some have used philosophical argumentation e. Alvin Plantinga has argued that the conflict is not between science and religion, but between science and naturalism. The independence model holds that science and religion explore separate domains that ask distinct questions. The lack of conflict between science and religion arises from a lack of overlap between their respective domains of professional expertise. NOMA is both descriptive and normative: Gould held that there might be interactions at the borders of each magisterium, such as our responsibility toward other creatures. One obvious problem with the independence model is that if religion were barred from making any statement of fact it would be difficult to justify the claims of value and ethics, e. Moreover, religions do seem to make empirical claims, for example, that Jesus appeared after his death or that the early Hebrews passed through the parted waters of the Red Sea. The dialogue model proposes a mutualistic relationship between religion and science. Unlike independence, dialogue assumes that there is common ground between both fields, perhaps in their presuppositions, methods, and concepts. For example, the Christian doctrine of creation may have encouraged science by assuming that creation being the product of a designer is both intelligible and orderly, so one can expect there are laws that can be discovered. According to Barbour , both scientific and theological inquiry are theory-dependent or at least model-dependent, e. In dialogue, the fields remain separate but they talk to each other, using common methods, concepts, and presuppositions. Wentzel van Huyssteen has argued for a dialogue position, proposing that science and religion can be in a graceful duet, based on their epistemological overlaps. The integration model is more extensive in its unification of science and theology. Barbour identifies three forms of integration. The first is natural theology, which formulates arguments for the existence and attributes of God. It uses results of the natural sciences as premises in its arguments. For instance, the supposition that the universe has a temporal origin features in contemporary cosmological
arguments for the existence of God, and the fact that the cosmological constants and laws of nature are life-permitting whereas many other combinations of constants and laws would not permit life is used in contemporary fine-tuning arguments. The second, theology of nature, starts not from science but from a religious framework, and examines how this can enrich or even revise findings of the sciences. For example, McGrath developed a Christian theology of nature, examining how nature and scientific findings can be regarded through a Christian lens. While integration seems attractive especially to theologians, it is difficult to do justice to both the science and religion aspects of a given domain, especially given their complexities. For example, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who was both knowledgeable in paleoanthropology and theology, ended up with an unconventional view of evolution as teleological which brought him into trouble with the scientific establishment, and with an unorthodox theology with an unconventional interpretation of original sin that brought him into trouble with the Roman Catholic Church. Theological heterodoxy, by itself, is no reason to doubt a model, but it points to difficulties for the integration model in becoming successful in the broader community of theologians and philosophers. Moreover, integration seems skewed towards theism as Barbour described arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate theism, but failed to discuss arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate the denial of theism. Natural historians attempted to provide naturalistic explanations for human behavior and culture, for domains such as religion, emotions, and morality. People often assert supernatural explanations when they lack an understanding of the natural causes underlying extraordinary events: It traces the origins of polytheism—which Hume thought was the earliest form of religious belief—to ignorance about natural causes combined with fear and apprehension about the environment. By deifying aspects of the environment, early humans tried to persuade or bribe the gods, thereby gaining a sense of control. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, authors from newly emerging scientific disciplines, such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology, examined the purported naturalistic roots of religious belief. They did so with a broad brush, trying to explain what unifies diverse religious beliefs across cultures, rather than accounting for cultural variations. In anthropology, the idea that all cultures evolve and progress along the same lines cultural evolutionism was widespread. Cultures with differing religious views were explained as being in an early stage of development. For example, Tylor regarded animism, the belief that spirits animate the world, as the earliest form of religious belief. Comte proposed that all societies, in their attempts to make sense of the world, go through the same stages of development: The psychologist Sigmund Freud saw religious belief as an illusion, a childlike yearning for a fatherly figure. The full story Freud offers is quite bizarre: The sons felt guilty and started to idolize their murdered father. This, together with taboos on cannibalism and incest, generated the first religion. Authors such as Durkheim and Freud, together with social theorists such as Karl Marx and Max Weber, proposed versions of the secularization thesis, the view that religion would decline in the face of modern technology, science, and culture. Philosopher and psychologist William James was interested in the psychological roots and the phenomenology of religious experiences, which he believed were the ultimate source of institutional religions. From the s onward, the scientific study of religion became less concerned with grand unifying narratives, and focused more on particular religious traditions and beliefs. Their ethnographies indicated that cultural evolutionism was mistaken and that religious beliefs were more diverse than was previously assumed. They argued that religious beliefs were not the result of ignorance of naturalistic mechanisms; for instance, Evans-Pritchard noted that the Azande were well aware that houses could collapse because termites ate away at their foundations, but they still appealed to witchcraft to explain why a particular house had collapsed. More recently, Cristine Legare et al.
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An important application of this relationship between nature and grace can be perceived in St. Thomas Aquinas' moral theology, which is extremely relevant today.

Khyouchi Veino

Introduction

This paper is an attempt made to draw out the relationship between theology and ethics from a Christian perspective. The paper first deals with the important definitions surrounding Christian theology and Christian Ethics, then the paper deals with a brief survey of theology and ethics, after which it goes on to define what Christian Ethics actually is and how it is rooted with theology. After establishing the root of Christian ethics, the paper deals with the relationship between theology and Christian Ethics, an evaluation with two examples and conclusion of the writer is given in the end. Definition

Christian theology is understood by various scholars in different ways. The usage of these terms therefore needs to be clarified by defining the terms in order to make this paper a much clearer writing. It is also known as the science of God. Lewis Sperry Chafer defines theology as the collecting, scientifically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of all facts and every source concerning God and His work. In doing theology, Millard Erickson proposes that certain steps need to be followed as to be true to Christian faith they are, it should use time tested tools for biblical interpretation. Dallas Seminary.

With these two definitions one can say that, theology is the putting together of facts and sources concerning God and His works where time tested tools, coherent systematic scriptural base, culturally relevant, trend and issue oriented, and life oriented approach is used. Thus anything which contributes to the study of God and the Scripture based on the above criteria is known as theology. Christian Ethics

Christian ethics is a branch of Christian theology that defines concepts of right virtuous and wrong sinful behavior from a Christian perspective. Various sources inform Christian ethics but "comprehensive Christian ethical writings use four distinguishable sources: Bakers, Stephen, Introducing Christian Ethics, Delhi: ISPCK,

Duke University Press, Theological doctrines support ethical prescriptions, human values and ends. Christian understanding of Ethics A brief survey Ethics is not something new which had been created outside the scripture and church traditions; in fact ethics has been the primary concern of the scripture since the fall of humankind. This portion shall deal with a brief study on how ethics played a role in the scripture and church tradition. Marvin Halverson and Arthur A. Press, SCM Press, Bible and Ethics Since the Old Testament period the Bible had been dealing with ethical concerns, the Law decalogue is the key to it and they had deontological and teleological thrust, namely duty and end. Jesus Ethics is therefore aimed to free the bonds of human cruelty as declared in the Nazareth Manifesto, Pauline ethical approach followed this trend and he acknowledged the indispensable condition for being under the authority of the Spirit is what Paul calls the freedom in the Spirit. Relationship between Ethics and theology

Views of Scholars Regarding the relationship between theology and Ethics, we must know that theology is not the same with faith and so is ethics not the same with deeds, the old argument brought about characterization of some of the different positions which Christians have today. Stephen, Introducing Christian Ethicsâ€¦ Moody Press, Karl Barth and Ethics Barth was of the view that theology and ethics must not be separated. To him if the dogmatics and ethics are separated it is dubious even from the point of view of ethics as in doing so one will see a change in focus, wherein a dangerous exchange of the subjects God and man takes place. This human centered ethical approach according to Barth is fatal as the motive behind Christian Ethics which is to glorify God shifts to the glorification of human.

Wolfhart Pannenberg and Ethics Pannenberg states that Christian ethics is Eschatological in nature and that every human situation such as love, justice, good and peace are linked with future goal. Pannenberg does not isolate Ethics from theology and argues that all our ethical actions must be in line with the eschatological rule of God. Jurgen Moltmann and Ethics Moltmann is of the view that theology must talk about God as who frees man. He also does not separate theology from ethics and states that in future Christian Theology will be more pragmatic and political. This he argues that will bridge the gap between laity and clergy, and the church and
the world. Thus taking note of these views on relationship between Ethics and Theology, one can conclude that scholars did not differentiate Ethics and theology and they prefer to club 18 Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. This portion shall deal with the various relationships theology and ethics share in terms of approach and reflection. Theological approaches and Ethics The differences in theological approaches contribute to how one sees the relationship between theology and Ethics. In this, the emphasis was given towards the already existing or previous generation orthodox beliefs. Therefore theology today is not just confined to the traditional beliefs but it is spreading towards the social realms where theology is more praxis oriented. And Christian Ethics is one such enquiry made regarding right and wrong, good and bad. Ethical reflection and theology Christian Ethics as defined earlier is a systematic approach to reason for moral right or good. John Drury Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Book, . Likewise, Ethical reflection using different theological materials will end up bringing out different ethical conclusion. Gustafson proposes that though the ethical reflection may vary there are three common trends which all the ethical reflection follows, i The nature and location of the good or value, ii the nature of man as a moral agent in the world, iii the criteria of judgment needed for the determination of conduct. And all three are interrelated having theological dimension, and have implications for ethical reflection at the same time. Stephen identifies three modes of relationship between Ethics and Theology, they are dualistic, dialectic and integrationist. This portion shall deal with the three modes of relationship. Dualistic relationship According to this view, it holds the traditional view that Ethics and theology are different, traditional ethics deals with more practical aspects and theology deals with doctrinal aspects. This makes them to conclude that God-questions are theological and not at all ethical. Doing so Ethics is reduced to just the moral concerns. Hafner, , Press, , Thus, the dualistic view that Ethics and Theology are separate from each other is no more applicable as Ethics is now understood by ethicists as a serious theological reflection on human moral conduct. Dialectical relationship This view holds that theology and ethics are in mutual response and responsibility to each other, Bonhoeffer is of the view that ethics consults theology and they share a dialectical relationship. Thus, even though theology and ethics keep a different identity, they are interwoven where they correct each other. Thus the traditional understanding of dualistic view on theology and Ethics is proven wrong and that the two is in constant dialogue with each other. Integrational relationship According to this view, it holds that not just theology is related to ethics but it is integrated and cannot be separated. This view is a new development where ethics and theology is made to be clubbed under one single understanding. The argument is that all ethical and theological questions cannot be differentiated. This is due to the development of political theology where God is seen as a liberator both in Ethics and 30 Hunter P Mabry, Christian Ethics[1]. Rather an integrated union of the two is proposed. Understanding of Ethics and Theology in India Indian Christian Theology is also a liberation theology which seeks to do away with the western imposition of philosophy and teachings which are alien to Indian Christians. Here we see that Sadhu made at attempt to bring about the doctrine of right action ethics in a theological approach where he taught that, the action of our sinful actions, can cast us into hell, unless we avail ourselves of the salvation offered in Christ. Therefore he did not separate Ethics and Theology in his approach but rather clubbed it together. Thomas rejected the conservative evangelical tendency to limit Christian mission to just preaching and church growth. He was of the view that Christian mission is to reach out in a pragmatic approach towards politics, history and human 33 M. ISPCK, . Taking note of the approaches of these two Indian Christian theologians, we can conclude that for the Indian Christians, what is ethical is theological as their root to doing ethics is based on the theology they attempt to achieve. The Christian traditional view that Ethics and theology are separate endeavor is therefore rejected in this sense as Indian Christian Theologians attempt to bring about an integrated approach towards doing theology in a liberative or rather an ethical approach towards human value and concerns. If truth and values are free-floating, disconnected from God, people can create truth and values for preservation and self-promotion. Therefore one need to always connect Ethics with theology. Evaluation The Traditionalist may hold that Christian Ethics and Theology are separate endeavors as their understanding of Ethics is equated with their
understanding of morality. This view is no more relevant today as the focus of Theology which was only vertical is now shifted to a more inclusive approach were both horizontal and vertical relationship is given importance. Thus, in order to do Ethics one needs to deal with both horizontal and vertical approach which is the theological trend of the present era. Therefore one cannot separate the aspect of ethical concerns from theological concerns in this regard. One is the study of God, and the other is the system that tells us how we should act. Ethics can be a field of study, but most commonly it is thought of as a practical guide to right living. Most often theology is thought to be a study of 37 R. Crossway, . But the truth is that theology is a much more practical study than it appears on the surface, and it has a much deeper relationship with ethics than most people would think. Whether we like it or not, we cannot avoid dealing with Ethics while doing theology and at the same time we cannot avoid doing theology while doing ethics. Even in a non-Christian aspect like Islam and Hinduism, the theological perspective of such religion is the basis for doing ethics. Thus, the question of right and wrong is always related with the ideas about God conceived in human mind. Caste System According to Hinduism caste system plays a vital role in deciding the status of an individual and this is practiced strictly. Christians would not agree to it and speak of equality as God has made everyone equal. In order to decide whether Caste system is right or wrong, one takes its theological stand on it. Hindu finds it necessary, for the caste role plays a vital role in their understanding of Hindu doctrines and practices and thus would say caste system is right. Christians would not agree saying it is wrong as their theological doctrine is rooted on equality of all humankind. Thus our decision making on ethics is deeply rooted to our theological affirmation. The idea behind Hindu fundamentalist is that Hindu 39 Looting of Hindu women 11 women are forcefully taken or lured to marriage and then later they are forcefully converted into Islam. Muslims on the other hand would say it is out of love one gets married and not through force. Here, to decide right and wrong. Hindu would have no problem in terms of people of other faith like in the case of Aligarh re-conversion of 77 valmikis. The same case will be with the Muslims and any other religious fundamentalist. But, the Christians will be more liberal, as Feminism is on the rise and the idea of free-will is already incorporated in Christian doctrine. Christians would say a woman is free to marry man from other religion, but when it comes to conversion, once again it will be the same with any other religious fundamentalist, and it will overshadow the concept of free will and women rights to take a strong theo-centric ethical standpoint.
In religion and philosophy, there are three subjects, there are religion is the main object of philosophy, the understanding of religion philosophy and the differences between theological and philosophical approaches, these three discussion influent to the relationship between philosophy and theology in fact.

Dear brothers and sisters, Today I would like to continue a presentation of St. Thomas the patron of Catholic schools and universities. The main reason for this appreciation lies not only in the content of his teaching, but also in the method he used, above all his new synthesis and distinction between philosophy and theology. The Fathers of the Church had found themselves faced with different philosophies of a Platonic type, in which a complete vision of the world and of life was presented, including the question of God and of religion. In confronting these philosophies, they themselves elaborated a complete vision of reality, starting from the faith and using elements of Platonism, to respond to the essential questions of man. Thomas the encounter with the pre-Christian philosophy of Aristotle who died around B. Aristotelian philosophy was, obviously, a philosophy elaborated without knowledge of the Old and the New Testament, an explanation of the world without Revelation, by reason alone. And this consistent rationality was convincing. The relationship between philosophy and theology, between faith and reason, had to be thought out again. The pressing question was this: Are the world of rationality, philosophy thought out without Christ, and the world of faith compatible? Or do they exclude one another? There was no lack of elements that affirmed the incompatibility between the two worlds, but St. Thomas was firmly convinced of their compatibility — more than that, that a philosophy elaborated without the knowledge of Christ almost awaited the light of Jesus to be complete. Thomas, which determined his path as a thinker. To show this independence of philosophy and theology and, at the same time, their reciprocal rationality was the historic mission of the great teacher. And thus we can understand why, in the 19th century, when an incompatibility between modern reason and faith was forcefully declared, Pope Leo XIII indicated St. Thomas as the guide in the dialogue between the one and the other. In his theological work, St. Thomas presupposes and makes concrete this rationality. Faith consolidates, integrates and enlightens the patrimony of truth that human reason acquires. The trust that St. Thomas accords to these two instruments of knowledge â€” faith and reason â€” can lead back to the conviction that both proceed from the one source of all truth, the divine Logos, which operates both in the realm of creation as well as in that of redemption. Together with the agreement between reason and faith, it must be acknowledged that they make use of different cognitive procedures. Reason accepts a truth on the strength of its intrinsic evidence, indirect or immediate; faith, instead, accepts a truth based on the authority of the Word of God who reveals himself. At the beginning of his Summa Theologiae St. This distinction ensures the autonomy both of human sciences as well as of the theological sciences. However, this is not the equivalent of separation, but implies rather a reciprocal and advantageous collaboration. Faith, in fact, protects reason from every temptation to mistrust its own capacities, it stimulates it to open to ever more vast horizons, it keeps alive in it the search for foundations and, when reason itself applies itself to the supernatural sphere of the relationship between God and man, it enriches its work. Thomas, for example, human reason can without a doubt attain to the affirmation of the existence of one God, but only faith, which receives divine Revelation, is able to attain to the mystery of the Love of God, One and Triune. On the other hand, it is not only faith that helps reason. Reason also, with its means, can do something important for faith, rendering it a threefold service that St. The whole history of theology is, fundamentally, the exercise of this effort from the intelligence, which shows the intelligibility of faith, its internal articulation and harmony, its reasonableness and its capacity to promote the good of man. The correction of theological reasoning and its real cognitive meaning is based on the value of theological language, which is, according to St. Thomas, primarily an analogical language. The distance between God, the Creator, and the being of his creatures is infinite; the dissimilarity is always greater than the similarity cf. Despite this, in all the difference between Creator and creature, there is an analogy between
created being and the being of the Creator, which enables us to speak with human words about God. Thomas based the doctrine of analogy, as well as his exquisitely philosophical arguments, also on the fact that with Revelation, God himself has spoken to us and has, therefore, authorized us to speak of him. I consider it important to recall this doctrine. In fact, it helps us to surmount some objections of contemporary atheism, which denies that religious language is equipped with an objective meaning, and maintains instead that it has only a subjective or simply emotional value. This objection results from the fact that positivist thought is convinced that man does not know being, but only the functions of reality that are experienced. Thomas and with the great philosophical tradition, we are convinced that, in reality, man does not only know the functions, object of the natural sciences, but he knows something of being itself "because we touch being as an arrow directed toward the reality it signifies. Human nature, in fact, even after sin, is not completely corrupt, but wounded and weakened. Grace, lavished by God and communicated through the Mystery of the Incarnate Word, is an absolutely free gift with which nature is healed, strengthened and aided in the pursuit of happiness, the innate desire in the heart of every man and every woman. All the faculties of the human being are purified, transformed and elevated by divine grace. An important application of this relation between nature and grace is recognized in the moral theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, which is very timely. At the center of his teaching in this field, he puts the new law, which is the law of the Holy Spirit. With a profoundly evangelical focus, he insists on the fact that this law is the grace of the Holy Spirit given to all those who believe in Christ. To such grace is joined the written and oral teaching of the doctrinal and moral truths, transmitted by the Church. In other words, the virtues of man, theological and moral, are rooted in human nature. Divine grace supports, sustains and drives the ethical commitment but, on their own, according to St. Thomas, all men, believers and non-believers, are called to recognize the exigencies of human nature expressed in natural law and to be inspired in it in the formulation of positive laws, that is, those issuing from the civil and political authorities to regulate human coexistence. When the natural law and the responsibility it implies are denied, the way is opened dramatically to ethical relativism on the individual plane and to the totalitarianism of the state on the political plane. Is not the natural law precisely this foundation, with the non-negotiable values that it indicates? In conclusion, Thomas proposes to us a broad and trustworthy concept of human reason: Thomas Aquinas, who had a very lofty concept of the human creature. The profundity of St. In English, he said: Faith sheds fuller light on the truths which reason is naturally capable of knowing, while drawing from revelation a supernatural knowledge of the divine mysteries and the Triune God himself. Saint Thomas is the patron of Catholic schools and universities; let us ask him to obtain for all of us the wisdom and understanding born of a deep and living Christian faith! Dear young people always draw from Christ present in the Eucharist the spiritual food to advance along the way of sanctity; for you, dear sick people, may Christ be the support and comfort in your trial and suffering; and for you, dear newlyweds, may the sacrament which has rooted you in Christ be the source that nourishes your daily love.
The relationship between theology and philosophy has been long-debated and discussed with the Christian tradition. Tertullian, an influential early Christian theologian and apologist, believed that philosophy has little to do with theology, arguing that the use of philosophy often corrupted theology, leading to unorthodox beliefs that were not.

Definitions[ edit ] Mortimer J. Adler distinguishes philosophical theology from natural theology. While the former is, according to him, theology done by non-Christian philosophers, the latter is done by those who are already Christians and are actually trying to find rational proofs for their faith. Philosophy and theology[ edit ] The relationship between theology and philosophy has been long-debated and discussed with the Christian tradition. Tertullian, an influential early Christian theologian and apologist, believed that philosophy has little to do with theology, arguing that the use of philosophy often corrupted theology, leading to unorthodox beliefs that were not grounded in the early Christian tradition. Athens symbolized the philosophical approach because of its role as a leading center of Hellenistic philosophy, while Jerusalem represented Christianity because of its role as an important location and intellectual centre in the early church. Other leaders, however, saw a closer relationship between philosophy and theology. Justin Martyr looked at people like Heraclitus and Socrates as possessing the divine light of revelation and believed them to be true philosophers. Justin saw Christianity as the True Philosophy and argued for Christianity using philosophical methods and terminology. Augustine, who became one of the most influential theologians in history and whose works laid the foundation for much of Western philosophy as well as much of Western theology, espoused a more middle-of-the-road, moderate approach, arguing that philosophy and theology often complement each other while at the same time cautioning that philosophy should not always be used in theological discourse. Instead, he argued, one should make sure that a philosophical approach toward a particular issue was grounded in prior Christian commitments. Philosophy played a key role in the formation of Western theology. Thomas Aquinas, one of the most influential philosophers and theologians in history, for instance, borrowed much of his concepts from Aristotle. Scholasticism dominated both the philosophical and theological landscape in the Middle Ages, with theologians such as Aquinas, Anselm of Canterbury, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, Peter Abelard, Bonaventure, and Albertus Magnus playing key role in both philosophy and theology. In modern times, Anthony Thiselton has shown in his Fusion of Horizons the role that philosophy has played in the interpretation of scriptures, i. Philosophy provides interpretive grids for apprehension of revelation. There are others, like Sadhu Sundar Singh, for instance, who believed that it is the illumination of the Holy Spirit that gives the truest meaning of revelation. Foundations of modern philosophical theology[ edit ] During the 18th, 19th centuries, and 20th centuries many theologians reacted against the modernist, Enlightenment, and positivist attacks on Christian theology. Some existentialistic or neo-orthodox Protestant intellectuals like the Swiss Reformed theologian Karl Barth turned away from philosophy called fideism and argued that faith should be based strictly upon divine revelation. Many other philosophers and theologians, however, disagree with this perspective and provide alternative views. Many other theologians have turned to continental philosophy, analytic philosophy, and postmodern philosophy in attempts to analyze and reframe the Christian theology in contemporary contexts. Philosophical theology[ edit ] While philosophical theology can denote an approach to theology which is philosophical in nature, it can also denote a specific area of theology in which philosophical methods and terminology are used to analyze theological concepts. One task of philosophical theologians is to attempt to reconcile certain aspects of Christian doctrine with developments in philosophy. One question concerns how to prove the existence and nature of God. The knowledge of God is dealt with in the epistemology of religion. There are many different perspectives with philosophical theology on such questions. In modern times process theology, open theism and Christian panentheism have tried to look at God as the Being who is not only the Source and Ground of all being but also influenced by the people and processes of the world which he created and to which he belongsâ€”rejecting or at least amending the classical
medieval doctrine of impassibility. Christology[edit] Within Christology, a number of philosophical questions have been raised, such as how the divine can incarnate as a human, how the eternal can enter the temporal, and how the divine and the human can be united in one yet remain distinct. Such questions led to earlier heresies like Arianism, Sabellianism, Docetism, etc. There is, for instance, sometimes a clash between those who want to emphasize the rational foundation for theology and those who want to emphasize the empirical foundation for theology. There has also been a contrast made between Christology from above and Christology from below. The former emphasizes the divine side of Christ; the latter, the human side. The human side obviously tends to look at it more empirically. The Scriptures call the Incarnation as a mystery of godliness. Yet, philosophical theologians argue that it is also important to find a philosophical ground for asserting both the divinity and humanity of Christ. Others theologians, however, like Rudolph Bultmann, ventured to remove any myths from the Bible, a hermeneutical approach they called demythology. They have therefore looked at the New Testament Christology as greatly tampered with and in need of being demythologized. There has been a separation made between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith see also the Quest for the Historical Jesus.
The Relationship Between Philosophy And Theology In The Postmodern Age

When I was a student at a Catholic high school in Queens, New York, I was taught that although philosophy is the mother of the sciences, she is also the handmaid of theology.

God who is controlling the world and a belief in life after that. Philosophy of religion is concerned with much the same issues, but where Theology uses religious works, like the Bible, as its authority, philosophy likes to use reason as the ultimate authority. It is a strong faith in supernatural spirit or God. Several thinkers defined religion via various definitions and according to their tradition. Some definitions are given below: Religion is nothing but morality touched with emotions. Religion is the recognition of all our duties as divine commandments. The inmost essence of religion is the search for God and finding the God. Religion is the feelings, acts and experiences of individual men in their solitude. We can say that religion is a belief in a power not ourselves which makes for righteousness and a desire to come into harmonious relation. Religion emphasizes the pursuit of some higher values which cannot be explained with the help of natural laws. There are following characteristics of a religion: Every religion gets its start from the teachings of a particular prophet. Every relation has its own scripture which is the sacred book for its followers who regards every part of its text as final authority. Every religion propagates a special mode of worship, fixes up a place of worship and sets up an order of priests for management of religious affairs. Every religion preaches a definite way of life and outlook based on a special philosophy of life which is different from one religion to another. Religion of basis of confidence and morality. Religion is based on emotions and beliefs. Religion is the basis of virtues. Religion is an inspiration of happiness and peace. Relationship between Philosophy and Religion Both religion and philosophy are normative in nature. Religion and philosophy are complementary. Philosophy is helpful in the development of religion. Philosophy interprets assumptions of religion. Religion broads the scope of philosophy. Both make man optimistic. Philosophy and Religion are related as theory and Practice. Philosophy renders Religion more intelligible by explaining it. Religion provides religious data to Philosophy. Religion can complete the philosophical explanation of life. Difference between Philosophy and Religion When we discuss the difference between philosophy and religion, the following points should be noted: The aim of Philosophy and Religion are different. The problems of Philosophy are different from those of Religion. The attitudes of Philosophy are different from that of Religion. The methods of Philosophy and Religion are different. The activities of Philosophy and Religion are different. The nature of conclusion obtained from Philosophy and Religion are different. The effect of philosophy and religion on the individual and society is different. It is sometimes said that the study of philosophy being critical is likely to disturb our religious beliefs. This should not lead us into forgetting the intimate relation of philosophy and religion. Philosophy may be disturbing especially if the religious creed is narrow. But if it is broad and simple, philosophy strengthens it. Indeed, philosophy should help us to our fundamental religious beliefs on a solid intellectual foundation and so relieves us of much perplexity and doubt.
For Reformed theologians it can be rather difficult to articulate the relationship between philosophy and theology. Is philosophy simply theology asking different questions? Is it a distinct discipline that can be differentiated from theological inquiry? Bob LaRocca drives a discussion pertaining to.

The two main forms of the relationship between church and state that have been predominant and decisive through the centuries and in which the structural difference between the Roman Catholic Church and Eastern Orthodoxy becomes most evident can best be explained by comparing the way Nature of theology The concept of theology that is applicable as a science in all religions and that is therefore neutral is difficult to distill and determine. The problem lies in the fact that, whereas theology as a concept had its origins in the tradition of the ancient Greeks, it obtained its content and method only within Christianity. Thus, theology, because of its peculiarly Christian profile, is not readily transferable in its narrow sense to any other religion. In its broader thematic concerns, however, theology as a subject matter is germane to other religions. The Greek philosopher Plato, with whom the concept emerges for the first time, associated with the term theology a polemical intention—as did his pupil Aristotle. For Plato, theology described the mythical, which he allowed may have a temporary pedagogical significance that is beneficial to the state but is to be cleansed from all offensive and abstruse elements with the help of political legislation. This identification of theology and mythology also remained customary in later Greek thought. In spite of all the contradictions and nuances that were to emerge in the understanding of this concept in various Christian confessions and schools of thought, a formal criterion remains constant: Here, then, the above indicated difficulty becomes apparent. In this sense it is not neutral and is not attempted from the perspective of removed observation in contrast to a general history of religions. The implication derived from the religious approach is that it does not provide a formal and indifferent scheme devoid of presuppositions within which all religions could be subsumed. In the second place, theology is influenced by its origins in the Greek and Christian traditions, with the implication that the transmutation of this concept to other religions is endangered by the very circumstances of origination. If one nonetheless speaks of theology in religions other than Christianity or Greek religion, one implies in formal analogy to what has been observed above the way in which representatives of other religions understand themselves. The normative element in these religions arises simply out of the authority of a divine teacher or out of a revelation. The academic study of religion, which encompasses also religious psychology, religious sociology, and the history and phenomenology of religion as well as the philosophy of religion, has emancipated itself from the normative aspect in favour of a purely empirical analysis. This empirical aspect, which corresponds to the modern conception of science, can be applied only if it functions on the basis of objectifiable empirically verifiable entities. Revelation of the kind of event that would have to be characterized as transcendent, however, can never be understood as such an objectifiable entity. Only those forms of religious life that are positive and arise out of experience can be objectified. Wherever such forms are given, the religious person is taken as the source of the religious phenomena that are to be interpreted. Understood in this manner, the study of religion represents a necessary step in the process of secularization. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that theology and the history of religions only contradict one another. In this regard, then, there are not only analytical but also theological statements concerning religious phenomena, particularly in regard to the manner in which such statements are encountered in specific primitive or high religions. Thus, the objects of the history of religions and those of theology cannot be clearly separated. They are merely approached with different categories and criteria. If the history of religions does not surrender its neutrality since such a surrender would thereby reduce the discipline to anthropology in an ideological sense. Relationship to philosophy The relationship of theology to philosophy is much more difficult to determine, because it is much more complicated. The problems can here only be mentioned. If one understands philosophy as the discipline that attempts to explicate the totality of being, the difference between
philosophy and theology becomes apparent. If theology is responsible to an authority that initiates its thinking, speaking, and witnessing, philosophy and theology becomes apparent. If theology is responsible to an authority that initiates its thinking, speaking, and witnessing—e. Since, on the other hand, theology also uses reason and systematically develops its tenets, however much its critical reflections are based on religious convictions, there are many common areas that have partly complementary significance but that partly also lead to polemical tensions. The significance of theology The religious significance of theology Just as in the case of religions themselves, so also their theological reflections are not limited to a special religious sphere, separated from common life. Whoever speaks of God and the gods speaks at the same time of humanity and of the meaning of existence. He makes therewith statements about the world, its conditions of being created, its estrangement from the purpose of creation. Out of these statements result normative directives for life in the world, not only for the purpose of gaining salvation but also for concrete ethical behaviour in the context of the I-Thou or person to person relationship, of the clan, of the nation, and of society. In ancient times, all aspects of life. The primeval or mythical time to which the tribe traces its own origins is also the time of salvation and fulfillment. Therefore, primitive religions primarily concern themselves with the ancestral cult. Involved in tribal concerns in the realm of religious thought are conceptions of mana—spiritual power, or force. In Eastern religions, as in Western religions, this understanding is infinitely refined, developed, and theologically reflected. In regard to the relationship of humanity to the world, many Eastern religions especially Hinduism have a definite skeptically tinged negative view of all reality, which is especially pronounced in contrast to the Christian doctrine of creation. As the Scottish religious scholar and missionary Stephen Neill wrote: To be man implies being cut off from all true reality. Creation should have never happened, and its faults should be eliminated as soon as possible. Not death is to be explained, but rather birth. The cultural importance of theology Since theology does not remain restricted to transcendent statements and to an esoteric and sacred realm, and since it rather encompasses all worldly dimensions—cosmology, anthropology, historiography, and other areas, it has always had important significance for cultural evolution and general intellectual life. Western historians hardly need to be reminded of the fact that the prophetic theology of history in the Hebrew Bible Old Testament. A Hebrew Bible theology of history is based on the understanding of history as a linear process, as directed to a goal. This view of history contrasts with a cyclical understanding of successive events. The fact that university and school were originally initiated by the church as is still very often the case in mission fields is based on the fact that theology has thematized in its various subjects the various dimensions of life nature, history, ethics, and other disciplinary areas. Also, much of modern philosophy has emerged out of theological themes and categories; even in the works of Karl Marx remnants of this fact are still observable. Modern philosophy has, by and large, only gradually emancipated itself from this theological origin, but this emancipation also has taken place in a manner that has retained the dialectical relationship of theology and philosophy. That theological questions in the modern age of secularism are less openly posed than in the time of the Middle Ages does not reduce their lasting significance. They always reemerge, often in disguised form, such as in the quest for the meaning of life and existence or in the nihilistic resignation regarding that quest; furthermore, they reemerge in the quest for the dignity of human existence, the inviolability of life, the determination of human rights, and many other such questions. The German American theologian Paul Tillich investigated specifically the secular realm in view of the relevance of these latent theological questions. Theological themes The themes discussed by theology are of universal dimensions. They encompass the doctrine of God, of humanity, and of the world. The inclusion of the world in theological discussion also implies that behaviour in the world—that is, ethics—is included in theology; in some areas. Ethical conceptions are developed from theological concepts in the broad meaning of theology are developed in contradictory forms: The first form is realized in Buddhism and Hinduism, the second in Confucianism. In Christianity both forms are represented. This path leads, in the various religions, into greatly diverging directions. It can be placed under the exclusive direction of divine grace as in Amida Buddhism and in Protestant Christianity; it can be left to the activity and initiative of humanity as in Confucianism; or it can be characterized by a combination of the two principles as in Zen Buddhism and in the Roman Catholic
combination of grace and merit. Finally, theology also includes among its various themes statements concerning the process and goal of history, especially concerning the relation of secular history and the history of salvation. Functions of theology The vastness of theological interests and aspects implies that theology can master the material with which it is confronted only within a broad spectrum of partial disciplines. Since theology is based on authority, revelation, and since this authority is documented in the scriptures especially in Christianity, it is constrained to engage in philological and historical studies of these sources and, related to these studies, also with hermeneutical critical interpretive questions. This historical task broadens into a concern with the history and tradition of the religion that a particular theology represents. In this concern many difficult and controversial questions arise, including whether and to what extent the canon scriptural standard of the sources of revelation is glossed over and modified by tradition and what normative value the modifying tradition has or should have. These problems play an important part in the relationship between Protestantism and Catholicism, even though the problems are also treated independently by each confession. The question of truth posed by theology requires the constitution of a discipline that specifically concerns itself with fundamental questions systematic theology. Its task can be determined in the following manner: Related to this is the modern-day task of coordinating its doctrine of creation or its doctrine of the revelation of the transcendent. But also, in the last mentioned situation, such a claim is widely modified. The vast dimension of theological themes implies that theology is, with its many disciplines, a microcosmic image of the university. Even though it is a science in which the believers or the adherents of a particular religion explicate and critically analyze the truth that is represented by them, it nevertheless has to remain free within the framework of this commitment, and it has to fulfill the responsibility of its scientific task on the basis of its own autonomy. The opposite of this freedom would arise when an institution... Theology originated with the pre-Socratic philosophers the philosophers of ancient Greece who flourished before the time of Socrates [c. Inspired by the cosmogonic notions of earlier poets such as Hesiod and Homer, the pre-Socratics were preoccupied with questions about the origin and ultimate nature of the universe. For Plato, theology was the study of eternal realities, the realm of what he called forms, or ideas. In that world, the quest for God acquired for many people—a certain urgency, in part because of the recognized inadequacy of the traditional pagan religions and the social and political turmoil of the era. Accordingly, philosophical speculation about the ultimate nature of reality assumed a distinctly religious cast. The understanding of theology as the fruit of sustained ascetic struggle, as the highest exercise of the human mind, and as prayer quickly established itself in Greek Christianity, and this interpretation is still fundamental in Eastern Orthodox theology. Because God is known only through his self-manifestation in the created order, however, the distinction between theologia and oikonomia is easily blurred. Nevertheless, it remains fundamental in Greek theology. Late antiquity and the Middle Ages The development of Christian theology was decisively influenced by an unknown writer of the early 6th century whose works circulated under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, the Athenian disciple of St. Paul the Apostle the writer is therefore often called Pseudo-Dionysius. In the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, God is depicted as revealing himself to the created order through hierarchies of angels and through the hierarchy of the church. Pseudo-Dionysius also introduced a number of distinctions about the nature of theology that were destined to be of profound influence. His short treatise The Mystical Theology discusses affirmative and negative kataphatic and apophatic theologies, symbolic theology, and mystical theology. Pseudo-Dionysius borrowed the kataphatic-apophatic distinction from the great 5th-century Neoplatonist philosopher Proclus: Mystical, or hidden, theology seems to be the experience of the divine reality to which apophatic theology points—the equivalent of theologia in the sense in which Evagrius Ponticus used the term. This identification was made explicit by the 11th-century Byzantine theologian Nicetas Stethatos. With the development in Western theology of increasingly sharp distinctions between nature and grace, the natural and the supernatural, and reason and revelation, theologians became interested in what truths about God could be established by reason alone. Called natural theology
naturalis, as opposed to revealed theology theologia revelata, this discipline became particularly important in arguments between Christians on the one hand and Jews and Muslims on the other, because the arguments of natural theology did not depend on the acceptance of revelation. The systematic presentations that characterized Western theology in the 13th century the age of the Schoolmen, or Scholastics were often prefaced by an account of what could be established by reason about God; usually the first thing to be established was his existence. The most famous set of such arguments is the so-called Five Ways of St. Aquinas claimed to have established the existence of God as the unmoved mover, as the ultimate efficient cause, as the necessary being, as the perfect being, and as the final cause of all beings. This distinction helped sharpen the division between what is necessarily so, which could be explored by reason, and what God has revealed about himself and his relations with humankind. The contrast between reason and revelation was reflected in the continued development of natural theology and revealed theology.
In studying the relationship between theology and philosophy we are faced not with one problem but with two: (1) the relation between theology and philosophy as the handmaid of theology, and (2) the...

Sometimes the dialogue between philosophy and theology may have seemed to have taken the form of orders given by the theological mistress to her erudite but obedient maid, but that was a long time ago, if ever it was at all. The idea that philosophy should be in service to theology has been rejected in the West by most philosophers, and many theologians, at least since the Enlightenment period of European thought. But instead of bringing about the emancipation of philosophy, the result has been to place philosophy at the service of her children, the natural and human sciences. Scientific realists would determine being itself by the ultimate dictates of science. So, where does this leave the relationship between philosophy and theology? Many see it as forever broken off, and many Christian theologians think that this is to the advantage of theology. As they see it, philosophy was never a very good servant, for it was always raising more problems than it solved. Of course, this attitude is not unknown to Muslim scholars. It is easy to find Muslims who are suspicious of philosophy, especially Islamic philosophy; there are even those, like Ghazali, who would accuse philosophy of blasphemy. Others would be satisfied if philosophy would mind its own business and stay out of the way of theological doctrine. Philosophy, however, refuses to be ignored. It has a way of making itself noticed even by those theologians who wish it would just go away. Philosophy accuses those who neglect her of lacking reason, and since it proclaims that reason is the difference between man and the other animals, this accusation amounts to the charge that those who neglect her are subhuman. So, after the rise and fall of positivism, after philosophy had been declared to be a servant of the natural sciences, assigned to clean up left over questions, philosophy arrives in the new dress of philosophy of religion, coyly proffering her own questions for the theologian. On the surface, most or many of the questions are those that have been familiar to theologians for centuries: How can the existence of God be proved? How can God know what free humans will do? Can God make a stone so large that He Himself cannot lift it? How can the eternal God know the temporal material world? While on the surface, these appear to be the same questions familiar to theologians since reason was first applied to religion, once one becomes familiar with the contemporary discussions of these questions it becomes obvious that the philosophy of religion is not as innocent as she may seem. Her questions are not those of a naive girl seeking to understand her faith as best she can. Philosophy has served the sciences for years, and its servitude to the sciences has required countless compromises with humanism, materialism, physicalism, naturalism, and other ideologies antagonistic to religion. When it raises its questions for the theologian, the arguments of all these ideologies are ready and waiting for whatever response the theologians may offer. If the theologian responds by rehearsing the standard discussions to be found in traditional texts, whether Christian or Islamic, he will be accused of ignorance and irrelevance to contemporary concerns. The philosophy of religion is by no means merely another name for rational theology as traditionally understood, for the very standards of reason which are applied to theological issues have changed. If the theologian is not to be caught off guard, he must be prepared to question these standards, and thus, to adopt an unfamiliar hypercritical stance toward the cannons of reason themselves. The dialogue between philosophy and theology today is not simply an affair between the questioning mind of the philosopher and the pious spirit of the theologian. Every question comes with unspoken expectations of what sort of answer will be considered suitable. Every search for a reason presupposes a standard of explanation. The expectations and presuppositions that inform the philosophy of religion are deeply colored by the entire history of recent Western thought. Since many of those who write and publish in the area of philosophy of religion have been trained in analytic philosophy, the standards of analytic philosophy, which are influenced to a great degree by empiricism, positivism, pragmatism, and naturalism, play an important but subtle role in this field. The situation is complicated by the fact that many philosophers of religion, and even more Christian theologians,
are influenced more by what is often called "continental philosophy" than by analytic philosophy. Most of the important continental philosophers have been from France or Germany, while the majority of analytic philosophers have taught at American or British universities. While philosophy in the U. What is emerging is a "world philosophy", but one from which the Islamic world is largely excluded. The reason for this exclusion is not because of some conspiracy to suppress Islamic thought, but because we Muslims have not seriously attempted to enter the discussion. If we are to enter the discussion, we must beware that it takes place in what is often hostile territory, in the context of expectations, presuppositions and standards of reasoning many of which are quite foreign to those found in the Islamic sciences. What appears to be a dialogue between a philosopher who relies on pure reason alone and a theologian is in reality a complex discussion about philosophy, the sciences, theology and the various ideologies which have influenced these broad areas of intellectual endeavor. Perhaps the attitude of the Muslim scholar to the complexity of the situation will be one of dismissal; the Muslim theologian might come to the conclusion that the philosophy of religion is the product of Western intellectual attitudes toward science and religion and does not apply to the Islamic world. The conversation between philosophy and theology is really a conversation between a Western philosopher and a Christian theologian. However, we ignore the philosophy of religion at our own peril. The ideas and attitudes that inform the philosophy of religion are not confined within the walls of a few universities in distant foreign lands. They are part of the Western cultural atmosphere whose volume is so large that it will find itself invading the Islamic world, or rather has already started invading, whether anyone wants it to or not. The international commerce in ideas-mostly Western ideas-cannot be slowed, let alone stopped. Faced with a trade imbalance, attempts may be made to preserve local markets, but ultimately the only successful policy will be one in which locally manufactured products of export quality are made widely available. Since there are so many different kinds of Western intellectual products on the market, we Muslims cannot hope to gain our market share in all fields any time soon. However, we can hope to compete aggressively in those areas in which Islamic thought has demonstrated its strength in the past, and build on this to expand into other areas. In order to compete in the international market of ideas, Islamic thought must not only answer the doubts raised by various Western thinkers, it must do so in a way that is distinctively Islamic. We cannot simply look at the answers Christians have given and then search for an appropriate hadith to make them seem Islamic. With these points in mind, we can turn to some examples of the sorts of questions raised by the philosophy of religion for the theologian. One of the deepest areas to be surveyed is that of epistemology. This is also an area to which medieval thinkers devoted less attention than our contemporaries. How do we know that God exists? The traditional answer given by Christians as well as Muslims was that we can formulate sound deductive proofs whose premises are self-evident and whose conclusions state the existence of God. The problem with this answer is that many of the premises that seemed self-evident enough in the past have now come to be questioned. Consider, for example, the role of the principle that an actual infinity of causes is impossible. A number of Western philosophers, physicists and mathematicians have come to doubt this principle. In defense of the principle, an important book has been written in which some of the ideas of Muslim philosophers are given attention: The continued discussion of this work in scholarly journals sixteen years after the publication of the book is testimony to its significance. The important point is that what has seemed for centuries to be a self-evident principle is now the topic of vigorous debate. At first glance it seems that what we have here is a case of a principle of reason defended in Islamic philosophy and theology pitted against the modern skeptics of the West. If we look closer, however, we find that the principle has undergone its own evolution within the tradition of Islamic philosophy. The question that needs to be addressed here is how the unqualified principle came to be qualified in Islamic philosophy, for the unqualified principle was also taken by some such as Ghazali to be a self-evident principle of reason, and the version of the principle still defended by Craig is not subject to the qualification of simultaneity! In any case, what we find here is rather typical of the philosophy of religion. Philosophers impressed with the principles employed in the natural sciences or mathematics raise doubts about what had been considered to be self-evident or nearly self-evident principles which had been
used as premises of proofs for the existence of God. The result is an epistemological problem. What was once claimed to be known is now doubted. The doubts raised are not unanswerable, but the formulation of answers requires a fair degree of sophistication, including a certain amount of familiarity with current physics and mathematics. William Lane Craig and Quentin Smith take up the debate about the cosmological argument and the new physics in a more recent book: Theism, Atheism and Big Bang Cosmology. Alvin Plantinga has become famous among philosophers of religion for his defense of what he calls "reformed epistemology". He claims that the founder of the Reformed Church, John Calvin, held a similar view. I suspect that in the long run, the responses of Catholic and Muslim philosophers and theologians will be similar in being diverse.

Another major figure who has defended the rationality of religious belief without reliance on the traditional proofs for the existence of God is William Alston. Since the beliefs based on sense experience are considered to be rational, the same must be granted of religious beliefs. Other defenders of the Christian faith have argued that the doubts raised by Hume and Kant about the rationality of religious belief can be answered through an examination of the standards of reasoning employed in the natural sciences today, which are far from what Hume and Kant imagined. In many of the discussions of the rationality of religious faith, the concept of religious experience plays a pivotal role. This is especially true of the writings of reformed epistemologists and of William Alston, but of many others as well, including Gary Gutting, 8 Richard Swinburne 9 and John Hick. Even the very term "religious experience" is difficult to translate into Farsi or Arabic. The most commonly accepted translation seems to be tajrobeh-ye dini, but tajrobeh has the odor of the laboratory and a sense of repetition, which is absent from the Western concept. They hold that religious feeling and intuitions, including mystical visions, provide data that convey information about God and His relation to the believer, information that presupposes the existence of God. The focus on religious experience has led some philosophers, such as William Proudfoot, 11 Steven Katz 12 and Nelson Pike, 13 to an epistemological examination of the reports of the mystics. They ask such questions as whether a meaningful distinction can be made between what appears in the heart of the mystic and how he interprets this appearance, whether mystical appearances must be analogous to sensory appearances, whether mystics of various traditions all have the same sorts of experiences, whether training determines the sort of experience the mystic will have and whether the mystics themselves take these experiences to have epistemological significance. Here we find a number of issues about which the philosopher and the theologian can be of mutual service. The theologian provides the philosopher with the doctrinal setting in terms of which reports of mystical experiences are understood, and the philosopher provides a critical analysis of both doctrine and report in order to place mystical experiences within the framework of a broader epistemological theory. It is not only epistemology that serves as a source of the problems posed in the philosophy of religion for theology, virtually all the branches of philosophy have some bearing on the philosophy of religion, and raise questions about theological doctrine. One of the most distinguished areas of philosophy is metaphysics, and metaphysics has long had an intimate relation to theology, especially to Islamic theosophy Al-Hikmah. Muslim, Christian and Jewish theologians have often utilized metaphysical systems based on ancient Greek thought in order to explain theological doctrines. Many religious philosophers have come to prefer other systems of metaphysics; as a result, they find themselves engaged in an attempt to restate religious doctrine in a way that does not use the language of the older metaphysics. Sometimes, however, doctrine becomes so intertwined with the older metaphysics that they are difficult to separate. For example, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity was stated in terms of metaphysics of substances, modes, persons and attributes drawn from Roman as well as Greek philosophy. Many contemporary Christian thinkers are now willing to concede that the traditional statements of the doctrine of the Trinity in these terms have not been successful. But rather than reject the claim that God is to be understood as the Holy Trinity, they have claimed that the doctrine is better explained without the claim that God is three persons but one substance, or with an interpretation of this claim that would have been unthinkable in past centuries. Robert Cummings Neville, the Dean of the Boston Theological Seminary, completely dismisses the claim, and defends the Trinity as three ways or aspects of divinity understood with
reference to the creation. God is the source of creation; He is the end or tools of creation, and He is the very activity of creation itself, according to Neville. Morris uses the methods developed by analytic philosophers to defend a version of Social Trinitarianism from the heretical claim made by some process theologians that God is in need of the world. According to this idea the identity relation is always governed by the category of its terms. Defenders of the Trinity such as Peter Geach and Peter van Inwagen have used the theory of relative identity to defend the proposition that while the persons of the Trinity may be different persons, they may at the same time be the same God. Older than epistemology and at least as ancient as metaphysics is ethics.
And the philosophers looking for the real answer what is the relationship between philosophy and theology through the ultimate goal of a science. Many people found that philosophy brings new problems to the resolution of a problem. Philosophers hoped that philosophy is not eliminated even by the scientists who hope philosophical theology will be lost. The philosophers refused the treatment of theologians because of some reasons that any human problems posed by philosophers concluded emerging as an issue of human reason and a man made the difference between humans and animals are the object of philosophy. Philosophy is a fact that has not complete and still debated. Philosophy presents science for many years, and the presentation of the science needs cooperation with humanism, materialism, physicalism, naturalism, and other ideologies in contrary to religion. Meanwhile theology must be understood that it is not only includes the science of kalam but the ethics of religion jurisprudence and ushul fiqh. From some of the points above, we can see some questions raised by philosophers to the theologians. One of the most important things for review is epistemologi. Because it is the middle part of the thinkers who serve ancient times less attention to the contemporary thinkers. How we know the existence of God? Classic answer posed by the Christians and Muslims that we can formulate deductive proof and the conclusion states the existence of God. The problem of this answer is many premise that embodies at first, but now has been questioned. In fact, the philosophy is the science that uses the methods of human thought is not limited by religious laws while keagaan theological science which explains about the existence of God, religious ethics, jurisprudence, ushul fiqh and others. In religion and philosophy, there are three subjects, there are religion is the main object of philosophy, the understanding of religion philosophy and the differences between theological and philosophical approaches, these three discussion influent to the relationship between philosophy and theology in fact. And as a rational human being must have the desire to prove the truth of religious beliefs from the perspective or logic or free. Thus the discussion of the them will be clarify in this paper. What is the real definition of philosophy and religion itself? Why Religion is referred as the object of Philosophy? How different approaches to the relationship between philosophy and theology? Among the topics in conceptual frame work is the history of the greatest philosophers before Ibn Sina is Al-Farabi, his philosophical analysis is drawn from the Greek language used as Arabic word come from the word philosophia means love of truth. It should be underlined that, although the word philosophy comes from the Greek language and the ancient Greek philosophical tradition has had since BC, it does not mean only those ancient Greeks who had been living philosophy. Whereas if you look up the definition of religion is a protective hard word. There are at least three reasons why religion is said to have a difficult first definition, because religion is a social spiritual experience and subjective subjective and individualistic, second there is no one talks so lively and emotional rather than talk about religion, then the discussion of religion always have strong and emotional conversation, so it is difficult to give meaning about religious sentence, third, because the concept of religion is influenced by the goal of the person who gave the definition of religion. Many scientists claim that the difficulty of defining religion. Its basically every science has two kinds of objects, material and formal object. It said that the material object is something being targeted investigations, as well as the human body is the material object of medical science, while the formal object is a particular perspective about material objects, such as empirical and experimental approaches in medical science. Meanwhile observed from material object of philosophy, religion is an object in the physical and metaphysical dimensions. And if linked on the philosophy of religion is a discussion of the problematic aspects of the eschatology of absolute justice and the will of God, viewed from one side, God is almighty, but he also willing absolute. The solution for a certain class of Gods keep fair because they have an absolute desire, but another group thinks God is unfair because it does not conform with the promises in the
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Bible that God will enter the wicked into hell. Examples of such problems are used as an approximation of the relationship between philosophy and theology. CONCLUSION From the various descriptions of the formula above, we can conclude that there is an issue related to the relationship between philosophy and theology in the postmodern era, including: Religion as the object study of philosophy Philosophy as a systematic and radical process of thinking also has a material object and formal object. Material object of philosophy is all that exists, including the empirical world and non-empirical world. Seems like a metaphysical nature. Some philosophers divide philosophy material objects into three parts, in fact, in mind and that is the possibility. The formal object of philosophy is a holistic point of view, radical and objective, in order to achieve its nature. Religion is a belief system that God has always embraced by human interaction with Him. Subject discussed in religion is the existence of gods, humans and the relationship between man and his god. This is an aspect of metaphysics while human beings and part of the natural objects included in the category of physics. Thus the philosophy of religion discussed in terms of the metaphysical and physical, but the pressure point of philosophy is more focused to the metaphysical aspect than the physical. The physical aspect will be more clearly outlined in the natural sciences such as biology, psychology and anthropology. Understanding Philosophy-Theology Discussed above regarding the definition of philosophy, addition to the understanding of philosophy is very diverse in expression, even Moh. Hatta and Langeveld said that the definition of philosophy not to be given because everyone has their own pressure in the definition. Therefore let everyone examines the philosophy first and then summarize their own perception. There is another definition of religion that most of the scientists also can not give a clear sense of this, but etymologically religion derived from the word Sankskrit. Some argue that the word consists of two words, the first words a means not and gam means go so religion will not go, permanent inherited hereditary. Religion have such properties. While the Arabic word Al-din consist of letters dal, ya and nun, from these letters can be read by dain means the debt, and din means religion and doomsday. Those three meaning show two different parts, the first part higher, more powerful, feared and respected by second parts. In the religion of God, the first is higher than humans. In debts, lend is richer than is owed, as well as doomsday, God decides the doomstay, God is the owner of human and they must submit to the owner. Theological and philosophical differences in approach Karen theological science is discuss about the principal of religion, as an issue of faith and the oneness of god, this science is called Ushululddin. It also called tauhid Review from subject aspects and object of theology and philosophy turned out some similarities. Subjects were discussing in theology and philosophy is the same discuss human. Object of theology and philosophy is divinity. Theology approach is more deductive, while philosophy is more inductive. The implications of these two approaches are different. God in theological discussion accentuate gods who has personified personal God, while the god in philosophy does not accentuate personal god. In addition the same forms of philosophy and theology mentioned above include: Philosophy and theology equally never finished discussing the existence of god 2. The discussion object of philosophy and theology is the same, it is about existence of God as the One of the most perfect and eternal. Philosophy and theology gives rational argument about God. Due to the presence of thoughts on philosophy and theology, reason will affect the perspective of someone who believed the truth of his argument. Because philosophy intends to assert the truth of a particular religion or untruth basic fundamentals. Harun Nasution, islam ditinjau dari berbagai aspeknya, Jakarta: Saifuddin Anshari Endang MA. Ilmu Filsafat Dan Agama.