

1. This question concerns the relations between some of the items in the 'box of tools' that we are in the process of assembling. Following Descartes' precept of dividing the question, I would like help in clarifying these sub-questions:

- (a) Are systematic meaning and theoretical meaning one and the same? If not, what is the distinction?
- (b) Are the distinctions and relations among the eight functional specialties an example of theory?
- (c) On p. 95 of Method, theory "is concerned with what is prior in itself but posterior for us." The context relates this to Aristotle's distinction between science and opinion -- not between "theory and common sense as we understand these terms."

Does this mean that theory, in Method's 'box of tools, is concerned with something besides what is prior in itself?

- (d) The grounds for the division into functional specialties (beginning on p. 133 of Method) is set out, according to discussion on October 8, in an explanatory way, as distinguished from the descriptive approach of the first two sections of the same chapter.

Is the distinction between description and explanation the same as the distinction between what is 'prior for us' and what is 'prior in itself'?

Returning to (b) above, do the functional specialties begin to make theology systematic? Do they begin to make it theoretical? Or both?

- (e) Describing religious expression as it moves through the realms of meaning, Method notes that theology's "technical unfolding is in the realm of theory" (p. 114).

Does this statement refer to theology as it has been undertaken so far, that is, in the 'second stage of meaning'? Or is it also a statement of what Method is proposing that theology should be -- i.e., a technical unfolding in the realm of theory?

- (f) "Christian theology has been conceived as die Wendung zur Idee, the shift towards system . . ." (Method, p 144).

Would it be accurate to say that while this shift itself "makes thematic what is already part of Christian living," what Method does is make explicit and thematic the shift itself?

Returning to (a) above, does functional specialization further a shift towards system that is already going on? Does it introduce a fundamentally new shift, namely towards interiority? Is it in this respect that Method differs from older, metaphysical systems?

Euclid's elements distinguish theorems and problems:
 theorems show why a proposition is true
 problems show how something may be done

theōreō: looking, observing; of the mind; contemplating,
 reflecting on; solving on inspection (?)

theōros; a spectator; an ambassador (official spectator)

b) The eight functional specialities presuppose insight and
 express a resultant insight or set of insights.

c) prior for us: the observed facts; to hoti; why
 prior in itself: the explanation of the facts; to dioti

Eg we know the moon is a sphere because of its phases
 we know the moon has phases because it is a sphere

Eg chemical periodic table: elements vs compounds; periodicity
 of properties in elements;

the fact: Mendeleev; predicted the existence of three
 unknown atoms; they were discovered within sixteen years

the explanation: Niels Bohr; worked from the four
 variables in equations on electron; concluded that the elements
 had ^{to} be periodic in their properties.

System building in theology is confined to systematics;
 the seventh of the functional specialities.

There is knowledge of why in ^{reason} interpretation, history,
 dialectic, foundations, doctrines, communications. But they
 are more a matter of reconstructing than constructing; ie
 understanding someone else's understanding, approach, idea.

d) Met 981a15f: technique knows the universal; empeiria
 knows singulars

Met 981a29f: men of experience know the matter of fact, to
 hoti; but they do not know the reason, to dioti.

The posterior analytics seem to be considered today an
 early work of Aristotle's.

e) p. 114: Its (theology's) technical unfolding is in the
 realm of theory; ie it is in systematics that theology constructs
 its own systems of explanation.

QQ. 10.15.81

f) Read p 144: theology has been conceived as the Wendung zur Idee occurring Xtianity

Turn to p 139: 2nd last #

Georg Simmel, a sociologist, using apparently Hegel ^{aims at} What method is make theology methodical, is get its union card as aⁿ academic enterprise. *f. E. H. v. d. p. p. x. i. x. i. c.*

Its main concern is to proceed from my account of understanding in Insight to a conception of theology^{as} adequately cognitional, as a unity not just a heap or a mixture, as knowing what you are trying to do in doing theology and knowing how to do it

¶ In general Catholic theology while acknowledging the importance of hermeneutics and history and insisting on them in theology

has been content to conceive them as auxiliary sciences

I believe that theology has something to say about hermeneutical and historical issues

The account of interpretation in chapter 7 leaves an opening for a dialectic that corrects interpretations and the account of history ~~xx~~ leaves a similar opening.

Without thinking new ideas of what interpretation is or what history is; method shows how defects can ~~gx~~ occur and how they can be remedied.

Interiority has been a leading idea in modern philosophy Kierkegaard/ Descartes to Kant; the absolute idealists; Blondel Newman Nietzsche Dilthey; the pragmatists, personalists, phenomenologists, psychiatrists,

While Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas were good on cognition, in general the Scholastics have been third rate.

a) There is a shade of difference: theory is closer to insight; system is concerned with the building blocks of explanatory definitions

system, systēma (sun, histēmi) set with; an interlocking set of terms and their relations

constitutes the possibility of a conceptuality all of whose basic terms are products of intelligence; not just verbal means of focussing attention, a substitute for pointing.

contrast Euclid's $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{definition of } \alpha \text{ as circle} \\ \text{" of a straight line} \end{array} \right.$