

the rashness that never doubts and the timidity that is never sure. But just what is the criterion of that middle course? It is the absence of further relevant questions. There are matters with which we have long-standing familiarity and, in that case, there is little difficulty in brushing aside further questions that are beside the point at hand. There are other matters with which our acquaintance is limited, and then we consult others whom we respect and whose experience in that area is greater than our own. Belief is an essential part, in fact the greater part, in everyone's knowledge. If eighteenth-century individual<sup>h</sup> urged people to believe nothing, modern sociologists of knowledge<sup>ists</sup> that constructions of reality and so of horizons are the work of communities (Berger and Luckmann; Lonergan 1974: 87). Besides questions for intelligence and questions for reflection, there are questions for responsibility. Once we know what is, we may have to ask what should we do about it. Such are the questions that arise in their clearest form when we are concerned to settle, not just what is most to our own advantage, not just what legality demands and enforces, but what is really worth while (Conn 1978; Morelli). Finally, there are the overarching orientations that begin spontaneously but align us radically and deliberately in commitment or hostility to our family, our civil community, our religion or our secularism.

Now this multileveled process occurs between or at the extremes of tacit and explicit knowing and deciding. It is fully explicit when we can say it; it is at an intermediate stage when we cannot say it but can do it for others to inspect; it is simply tacit when it occurs but is neither explicitly said or openly performed.

Explicit statement of human interiority supposes a great development of language. Bruno Snell has charted the Greek discovery of mind. The Homeric simile drew attention to human character and its diversity; a lion never retreats; so Hector was a lion. Greek lyric gave voice to<sup>the</sup> variety and the degrees of intensity of human feeling. Greek tragedy depicted human situations, the decisions they call for, the consequences of making up one's mind. Greek rhetoric, a tool of persuasion, made community decisions a reasonable possibility or again the origin of passionate error and eventual disaster. Sophists

Palestinian and Hellenistic Horizons

The nineteenth-century development of the notion and science of history included the history of religions and gave rise to the great scandal of the transposition of the gospel from the religious soil of Palestine to the philosophic systems of the Hellenistic world. That scandal is still with us and it puts a strong emphasis of an issue that is prior, not only in time but also in logic, to the issue we have just discussed. Why bother about medieval thought? What else can it be but a prolongation of the earlier error of migrating from Palestine to Greece.

Let me begin by noting that to treat such a question we have to begin with ourselves. The natural sciences begin from the data of sense, but the human sciences can be properly human only from beginning from our own inner experience. These first principles are not propositions but people; they are not people in general, or people of another place and time; they are each one of us and we can communicate all the more fruitfully by first attending to ourselves, to our own natures in our own intimate experience.

Every nature has been described as an immanent principle of movement and rest. Besides the extrinsic principles that move us, there also are the immanent principles that respond. The basic response is the spontaneity of our sensitivity: our perceptions of others, our feelings of fear or desire, our memories and our anticipations. Such spontaneity is the most conspicuous element in our consciousness, but it is not the whole it. Beyond the spontaneous reactions of sensitivity, there is a process that is objectified in terms of questions and answers. We ask what, why, what for, how, how often. Intelligence is an immanent principle of movement. But ~~gradually becomes a principle of rest~~, as one aspect of the puzzle after another finds its solution, ~~and~~ when further questions cease, we are at rest. Still such rest is not complete. There is a further level of questioning. We want to be certain; we seek the security of making sure. Is our understanding of the issue correct? Might there not be some oversight? Here we have to steer a middle course between