

any way from the most primitive to the most sophisticated.

Moreover, all of them are investigated by cultural anthropologists and historians and, if their success has been more marked in recounting and comparing external few features, the simple acknowledgement of this fact gives ground for hoping that improved methods will be worked out and accepted.

any way from the most primitive to the most sophisticated.  
Moreover, the empirical notion of culture has gone hand in hand  
with the empirical investigation of cultures

heathen.

In contrasting pluralism with classicism and with ~~the~~ the attitudes of Christians in the classicist period, I am not of course implying that pluralism was understood by the French Enlightenment and Revolution or by the various subsequent advocates and organizers of violence

heathen. Similarly, in the political field, the advocates of  
and organizers of violence

heathen. Similarly, finally, in the break-down of classicist  
and Christian culture, the advocates and organizers of  
violence are purely normative in outlook: they are the incarnation  
of righteousness and those they would destroy are the incarnation  
of malice. evil if not malice.

heathen. Similarly, again, the secularists of the Enlightenment were for the removal of the nobility and the clergy, while their successors, ~~the~~ the Marxists, would liquidate the bourgeoisie as well.

heathen.

Pluralism, then, is broader in its interests, richer in its sympathies, more zealous in its efforts to understand. Just as the church in the modern world has its commissions on ecumenism and on non-Christian religions, so a contemporary theology has to be open to comparative religion and cultural history. Two questions arise.

The first question is whether comparative religion and theology are different in kind.

Now there have been students of the history of religions, or comparative religion, or Religionswissenschaft, with the reductionist a priori that there are no specifically religious data and, consequently, that all religions can be explained without residue in terms of general psychological and sociological knowledge. However, there are on the other hand many eminent students of the field that do not accept this a priori and, consequently, the reductionist view, while opposed to theology, opposes to ~~theology~~ theology not comparative religion but a philosophic opinion.

Next, there have been methodologists that have conceived science in naive realist fashion. Science is a matter of seeing what is there to be seen, seeing all of it, and seeing nothing more. Theology, in contrast The history of religions is more,. The history of religions is engaged in science. Theology, in contrast, is a matter of setting forth one's values and beliefs. Its basis is essentially subjective while science is purely objective.

But this is simpliste. Human knowing is not a matter of taking a good look. It is a matter of attending, inquiring, reflecting, deliberating. The very disinterestedness of the