

4 on duplicated sheet
B. Lonergan Method in Theology

In the process of self-appropriation,
what do you see as the role of the
Teacher? What sort of a person
should the Teacher be?

role of teacher

a. becoming ^{more} authentic thru self-appropriation

b. helping others to become authentic

but not keeps changing thru ^{independence} ^{of} ^{individuals} ^{themselves}

Questions for 1 Nov 79 - Method in Theol.

#1
on
duplicated
sheet

"... a historical fact ... will have the stubbornness of what has been grasped as (approximating the) virtually unconditioned and so as something (probably) independent of the knowing subject."

Method, p. 202.

What is the meaning of the two parenthetical qualifications in this excerpt? Do they indicate:

- (1) that historical knowing doesn't quite measure up to the precision of knowing in mathematical and (natural) scientific inquiry?
- (2) that historical facts — either about the reliability of witnesses or about what was going forward haven't the clarity and distinctness of facts about, say, the boiling point of water at a given atmospheric pressure?

If (1), is there a rebuttal to the (counter-?) position which holds that historians' work is always imperfect, so that even with the cooperation and mutual criticism of many historians, it is always relativistic? It would seem that even when the "crucial experiment" — in the chapter on Dialectic — is added, historical knowledge is relative; relative, that is, to the community of the converted.

relativity
you can
dissect
on level
of what
it is not
or

relativity
no truth
possible

If (2), are we as theologians faced with the problem Kierkegaard (among others) raises, namely that

Jub 44+
12 32

it is folly to base eternal salvation on the (unclear and indistinct) knowledge of historical events — Christian revelation being bound in some sense to a historical person ?

* * * *

#2
104
duplicated
sheet

It has been said of Schleiermacher's methodology (with which Method, perhaps unwisely, has been compared) that it moves "from text to sermon" — roughly, from Research to Communications. But Schleiermacher has nothing like Method's concern for History (in the sense of a functional specialty). He calmly passes from the New Testament to categories based on a psychology of religious experience, and ends up with preaching.

distinction of
believer
single
and
theologian

It can be inferred from the plan of Method that something is missing in Schleiermacher's procedure — perhaps lots of things, but certainly history as a way of knowing. But if the New Testament is accepted as revelation, it seems reasonable enough prima facie to "translate" its message without bothering about the reliability of witnesses or "what was going forward."

Is there a counterposition lurking in this assumption? Where?

ADVOCATUS DIABOLI

Jonathan Parsons

Questions for November 1

#3 on 1.) Why is History the only functional specialty to receive two
dup. sheet chapters in Part Two of Method?

#5 on 2.) On pages 434-437 of Insight you distinguish conjugate form from
dup. sheet central form and the distinction rests upon the differences in
the acts of understanding needed to grasp them. Would you illustrate
the difference between conjugate form and central form with an
example from the functional specialty History?

Fr. Lonergan:

The joint annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion
and the Society for Biblical Literature will be held in New York
City November 15-18. I would like very much to attend - Paul Ricoeur
will speak on Thursday evening, there will be a seminar examining
Bob Doran's Subject and Psyche on Friday morning, etc.

Would you consider this a sufficiently valid reason for my
not being in class on the 15th? I will check with you on Thursday
about this.

Sincerely,

Jan Puseas

3,

History as science is known
by historians

not scientifically | analysis
but essentially | constructed

chap ^{VI} is analysis + construction

chap IX relates analysis

to judgments of historians and history
in historical investigations