

Theology 965 / METHOD OF THEOLOGY  
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION / 13 November 1980

- (1) In presenting the material in the first part of the chapter on Dialectic on November 6, you made a verbal addition. The first sentence on p 242 went as follows: "It [i.e. moral conversion] promotes the subject from cognitional, intentional to moral self-transcendence." Could you explain the addition of the word intentional? Should it be thought that moral self-transcendence is something different from "intentional self-transcendence"? Are intentional and cognitional synonymous in this context? (The same introduction of the word intentional was also made in discussing the second sentence of the first full paragraph on p 241.)
- (2) On page 238 you state that the "criteria of objectivity are not just the criteria of ocular vision; they are the compounded criteria of experiencing<sup>of</sup>, understanding, of judging, and of believing. The reality known ... [is] posited by judgment and belief." Would you comment on the objectivity of believing? That is:
- a.) Is one and the same reality ever known by judgment and belief together?
  - b.) Are there different areas to which judging completes the operations of understanding and experiencigg, as contrasted with areas where believing rather than judging is involved?
  - c.) In what sense is an act of believing an act of self-transcendence, as reaching a virtually unconditioned (judging) is such an act?
- (3) At the end of Chapter 9, "History and Historians," the convention is proposed that science be applied to knowledge contained in verifiable principles and laws, while scholarship pertains to grasping commonsensically the commonsense of others (pp 233-234). The distinction reappears in Chapter 11, "Foundations," where it is discussed in terms of distinct differentiations of consciousness. Here it is stated that "universal principles and laws" are the goal of the "generalizing human sciences" (p 274). Presumably history is not a "generalizing human science," but ought properly to be called scholarship. Is there any sense in which theology, or some aspect of theology, is such a science? Are theological foundations to be classed as "verifiable principles"? Are there any doctrines that are "universal laws"?