Theology 965 / Method in Theology

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION / 16 October 1980

1. Could you explicate the statement on page 119 of Method: "the word of religious expression is not just the objectification of the gift of God's love; in a privileged area it is also specific meaning, the word of God himself."?

   (a) Is it possible to specify the "privileged area"? Or does that come later?

   (b) Would it be fair to say that the position that makes the "outer word" the objectification of religious experience, and nothing more, is characteristic of Roman Catholic modernism?

   (c) Does the statement on page 119 mean that "the narrative of religious origins," which is "the narrative of God's encounter with his people" (also page 119) is more than a narrative about people who have found themselves to be unrestrictedly in love?

2. Is the shift towards system, *die Wendung zur Idee* (Method, pp 139, 144) the same as the shift to theory, analogous to the shift from Plato's dialogues to Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics and the other shifts outlined on pp 82-83? If there is a difference, is it a difference that depends on the differentiation of a realm of transcendence as well as a realm of theory (see esp. p 86)?

3. This question concerns the relation between the ontogeny and the phylogeny of differentiated consciousness. On page 84 there are listed four phases in the development of consciousness: undifferentiated, classical, troubled, and differentiated consciousness. Phylogenetically, it seems, we have reached the stage of troubled consciousness. To what extent is "the contemporary crisis of culture" due to (or related to) this?

1) 119 a cf ibid + 149 last line + 150

b true of R.C. modernism; I have been various opinions re primitive meaning, etc

c if the encounter involves a mission

2) shift to inquiring about ἀρχή (Thales etc.) preparation

Socrates Plato: shift was conscious, deliberate, articulate

difference arises when shift to transcendence is added to shift to system

" " " "