



### The Problem

~~The problem of method in contemporary Catholic theology~~

Contemporary Catholic theology is undergoing a momentous change. It is breaking away from its involvement in classicist culture and in Greek notions of science and philosophy. It is

The Sea Trilogy "Mariano Rodriguez"

Comp: 1690 to 1740

Begriffen

Einzelteile und

disputatio  
disputatio scholastica  
fundamentale

unord 1c  
ascelic - mystic

classical (narrow) part latin, with Greek, and Hebrew = written world

2° stati with anachronism = archaism

philosophical

3° exegesis finding the right meaning - Bas or a difficulty

apologetic

= antidote

Schulmeinungen

4° notion of sc: deductivist + loci theologicæ

science as empirical: unnecessary yet correct interpretation

as historical interpretation

5° Begrifflichkeit derived from St phil  
pp  
medieval 99°

limits of seeing the text 179 - exegesis and philosophy

concentration on fixed ideals

medieval enthusiasm for Aristotle or for a classist

to  
contemporary culture is not inclined either to a

contemporary culture bears little trace of

concentration on fixed ideals

devotion to immutable laws and ideals

medieval enthusiasm for Aristotle and classist

Transition

## The Problem

Theology has always been not only discourse about God and refashioning a religious outlook upon the world but also a ~~renewal~~ of the symbols and ideas, the judgements and values, of a cultural and social milieu. It follows that theology varies not only in accord with the inner law of its own development but also in response to the changes that transform societies and cultures. So in the thirteenth century the advent of Aristotle in the West was <sup>met</sup> followed by an Aristotelianizing of theology. So in the sixteenth century the rebirth of rhetoric called forth Melchior Cano's De locis theologicis. So too in the twentieth century an older theology has been uprooted and tossed aside and, ~~perhaps~~ sooner or later, a new one will arise to take its place.

The rejection of the older theology did not bother about the formalities of any theological debate. It happened that the old classical culture withered away.

Cano's De locis theologicis. So in the twentieth century the long struggle to keep Aristotle alive and classical culture

### The Problem

Theology has always been not only discourse about God and refashioning a religious outlook upon the world but also a ~~renewal~~ ~~renewal~~ of the symbols and ideas, the judgements and values, of a cultural and social milieu. It follows that theology varies not only in accord with the inner law of its own development but also in response to the changes that transform societies and cultures. So in the thirteenth century the advent of Aristotle in the West was <sup>met</sup> followed by an Aristotelianizing of theology. So in the sixteenth century the rebirth of rhetoric called forth Melchior Cano's De locis theologicis. So too in the twentieth century an older theology has been uprooted and tossed aside and, perhaps sooner or later, a new one will arise to take its place.

The rejection of the older theology did not bother about the formalities of any theological debate. It happened that the old classical culture withered away.

Cano's De locis theologicis. So in the twentieth century the long struggle to keep Aristotle alive and classical culture

## Chapter I

The New Context

The large and palpable changes going forward in Catholic  
are to be  
theology ~~manvbe~~ understood only by going beyond their immediate  
religious grounds and attending to quite external factors that  
have long existed but only gradually have been transforming  
the context in which theological thinking occurs

## Chapter I

The New Context

The development of theology occurs in response not only to inner exigence but also to external factors. So the patristic period was infiltrated by Stoic and Platonist thought. The mediaeval took over Arabic adaptations of Aristotle. Our own age has been witnessing an unprecedented devotion to positive research.

If inner exigence may be expected to lead to permanent fruits, external factors are subject to change, so that the demands of one age will be opposed to those of another, and a contemporary development can come to maturity only through the liquidation of earlier adjustments and adaptations. It was only through the upheaval, known as the Aristotelian-Augustinian controversy, that mediaeval theology effected some reconciliation or compromise between the old and the new. Nor is it difficult to discern an analogous upheaval in contemporary Catholic theology. On the one hand, its heritage comes to it formulated in the categories of an Aristotelianism that had no stomach for the contingency and particularity of history. On the other, historical method sits in peaceful possession of the Scriptures and the Fathers, of ~~ecst~~ concilia<sup>r</sup> and papal pronouncements, of theological developments and aberrations, and keeps ever pronouncing a further quiet ~~and~~ but decisive word on their interpretation.

## Chapter I

The New Context

The development of theology occurs in response not only to inner exigence but also to external factors. The patristic period drew upon Stoic and Platonist thought. As mediaeval culture was being infiltrated by Arabic adaptations of Aristotle, mediaeval theology proceeded to baptize the philosopher and thereby ~~was~~ brought about the upheaval known as the Augustinian-Aristotelian controversy.

period drew upon Stoic and Platonist thought. The mediaeval and purified Our own age has been took over Arabic adaptations of Aristotle. Today we are witnessing an unprecedented devotion to positive research enormous with its results tabled by the bibliographies in Biblica, in Altaner's Patrologie, in the Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, and in Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses.

If it may be contended that developments from inner exigence are permanent, the same cannot be said about the response to external factors. Only through the upheaval known as the Augustinian-Aristotelian controversy did mediaeval theology effect some reconciliation or compromise between the old and the new. A similar challenge ~~now~~ confronts us today, when a traditional Aristotelianism has no stomach for the contingency and particularity of history, yet historical method ~~has~~ pronounces a decisive word on the interpretation of the Scriptures and the Fathers, of conciliar and papal pronouncements, of theological developments and aberrations.

## Chapter I

The New Context

Theological activity does not occur in a vacuum. If its main concern is to make thematic a religious tradition, still it must do so at a given time and place and within a given cultural milieu. As theologians are children of their age, so too are their readers, and still more so are those whose opinions



## Chapter I

The New Context

For Prof. Herbert Butterfield the characteristically modern period begins, not with the Renaissance or the Reformation, but with the emergence of modern science. This event he places in the final decades of the seventeenth century. He is fully aware, of course, that new discoveries had been accumulating from the beginning of the fourteenth century. But in the earlier period there was still dominant the all-embracing Aristotelian system, so that even opponents of Aristotle would differ from him on specific issues while tacitly presupposing or even expressly accepting his larger principles and views. For the new discoveries to break loose from the Aristotelian context and reach an independent formulation of their own, there had to be developed a new context that was comparable to its predecessor in its comprehensiveness and its relative autonomy. Until that was achieved, the old garment was being patched with new cloth, the old bottles filled with new wine. But once the new context was attained, a confused accumulation was transformed into a coherent and impressive whole. It is the emergence of that coherence and unity that Prof. Butterfield refers to as the origin of modern science and places somewhere in the vicinity of the year 1680.

Curiously enough, it was the ~~same~~ year, 1680, that Paul Hazard chose as the beginning of the thirty-five year period which he described in La crise de la conscience européenne, 1680-1715. [Paris 1935

## Chapter I

The New Context

For Professor Herbert Butterfield the characteristically modern period begins with the emergence of modern science. This he places in the final decades of the seventeenth century. He agrees, of course, that fresh and permanently valid discoveries were accumulating from the beginning of the fourteenth century. But in that earlier period there was still dominant the all-embracing Aristotelian system, and even opponents of Aristotle differed from him on specific issues while tacitly supposing or even explicitly accepting his larger principles and views. Only when the new discoveries become numerous enough and their formulation sufficiently radical for them to coalesce into a more or less comprehensive and autonomous unity, did it become possible for the new views to break loose from the Aristotelian context. For the new views to break from the Aristotelian context and reach an independent formulation

## Chapter I

The New Context

placed  
Herbert Butterfield has dated the origins of modern science<sup>d</sup>  
in the final decades of the seventeenth century. He agrees, of  
course, that ~~many~~ modern discoveries were accumulating from the  
beginning of the fourteenth century. But he ~~has~~ pointed out  
that in the earlier period there was still dominant the all-embracing  
Aristotelian system and that even opponents of Aristotle differed  
tacitly  
from him on specific issues while presupposing or even explicitly  
accepting his larger principles and views. Only when modern  
discoveries became numerous and radical enough to coalesce into  
a large and relatively autonomous unity, did there emerge the  
suppositions, viewpoints, attitudes, procedures that together make  
up the modern scientific spirit. It is this emergence that Professor  
Butterfield takes as the origin of modern science, and the date  
he assigns for it is somewhere in the vicinity of 1680.

## Chapter I

### The New Context

For Prof. Herbert Butterfield the Renaissance and the Reformation were not too important events in mediaeval history

For Prof. Butterfield the Renaissance and the Reformation pertain to mediaeval history and are of minor importance when compared with the emergence of modern science

The New Context

In his Origins of Modern Science, 1300 - 1800, Herbert Butterfield has described how the discoveries that had been made from the fourteenth century on Butterfield pointed out that the discoveries, accumulating from the fourteenth century on, willy nilly found themselves in an all-embracing Aristotelian context and that it was only towards the end of the seventeenth century that they attained the sweep and depth needed for them to break loose from their earlier suppositions and to ~~form~~ coalesce into a relatively autonomous body of doctrine.

## Chapter I

### The New Context

The old context was provided by Aristotle

It is always easy to overlook the context that kniw  
knits together different disciplines, makes them parts in a  
total view of nature, man, and God, impresses upon each a  
common vocabulary and style

## Chapter I

The New Context

The second Vatican council and its aftermath leave no doubt that there exists and ~~fix~~ flourishes a new theology. No one, perhaps, would attempt to define it for it is still in process and proceeds on a great variety of topics here with breathtaking daring and there with quiet caution. But quite apart from the views that are expressed, three characteristics may be mentioned: it respects history; it drops <sup>much if not all of</sup> the conceptual framework that ~~the~~ mediaeval theologians borrowed from Aristotle; it does its thinking in a modern context.

It respects history. Turn to the books and articles listed in the bibliographies of Biblica, of Altaner's Patrologie, of the Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, of Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses. Not merely is the quantity vast, not merely is ~~the~~ by far the greater part of the work concerned with historical questions, but more and more the writer's primary concern is not apologetic, not to buttress this or that <sup>doctrinal</sup> ~~dogmatic~~ position, but to ascertain just what was done, what was said, what was meant.

It drops much if not all of the conceptual framework that mediaeval theologians borrowed from Aristotle. It is ~~this departure that led to the need for Karl Rahner's Kleines theologisches Wörterbuch (Freiburg 1961) and for the two volumes edited by Heinrich Fries as a Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe (München 1962 and 1963).~~

## Chapter I

## The New Context

The origins of the new context are twofold: first, there is enormous outpouring of positive studies on the scriptures, the Fathers, the mediaeval and later theologians;<sup>1</sup> secondly, there is the shift from Aristotelian categories to those of phenomenologists, psychologists, personalists, existentialists, and historical theorists.<sup>2</sup>

---

1) See the bibliographies in Biblica, in Altaner's Patrologie, in Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiaévale, in Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses.

2) This shift gives rise to the need for such works as the Kleines theologisches Wörterbuch (Freiburg 1961) by Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler and the two-volume Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe (München 1962 and 1963) edited by Heinrich Fries.

---

The prior source of change would seem to be positive studies. They are conducted in the manner of modern empirical science. But implicit in the practice of empirical science is the new modern conception of science itself, a conception not only different from that of the Posterior Analytics but in many ways opposed to it. So we stumble upon one source of the conflict between positive and dogmatic theology: positive theology conforms to modern notions of science



## Chapter I

The New Context

The old context was derived from ~~around~~ the body of writings ascribed to Aristotle. They treated poetry and rhetoric, physics and biology, psychology and logic, ethics and politics, metaphysics and natural theology. They did so with the massive power of informed, precise, ~~x~~ coherent, all-embracing thought. When mediaeval theologians reinterpreted Aristotle and formulated their Christian faith on this basis, they were not merely employing a philosophy as a handmaid of theology but, what is far more important, they were effecting an integration theology, not merely setting up theology as the queen of the sciences ~~x~~ but, what was far more important, effecting an integration of a whole culture. to perfect a theology but, what is far more important, they were <sup>giving</sup> placing theology ~~in~~ a context that extended

## Chapter I

## The New Context

The old context was derived from Aristotle. Writings ascribed to him treated poetry and rhetoric, physics and biology, psychology and logic, ethics and politics, metaphysics and natural theology. They did so with the massive power of informed, precise, coherent, all-embracing thought. They had the depth and the range that might integrate a whole culture and so, when mediaeval theologians reinterpreted Aristotle and formulated their Christian faith on that basis, they were not merely using a philosophy to perfect a theology but, what is far more important, placing their theology in a context that let it reach into all departments of life and thought.

That Aristotelian context possessed extraordinary vitality,<sup>1</sup> but today it is powerless

If that Aristotelian context possessed extraordinary vitality,<sup>1</sup> today it cannot be invoked as a principle of integration. There is a symbolic logic that contrasts with Aristotelian logic. Modern science does not conform to the ideas set forth in the Posterior Analytics. Modern history is a science in a field Aristotle emphatically left to mere opinion. A modern philosophy has to integrate contemporary logic, science, and history.

## Chapter I

The New Context

It is always easy to overlook the context that gives different disciplines a common vocabulary and style, that moulds them by a common outlook, that knits them together in a coherent view of nature, man, and God. But if context itself is an impalpable affair, change of context is baffling. Then everything is manifestly slipping out of place and or toppling over. Yet it seems impossible to say just what is going on.

Such a change of context, I suggest, is the main element in the current renewal of Catholic theology. From the Middle Ages ~~through the present day~~ to well into this century the body of writings ascribed to Aristotle provided theologians with an ordered universe. Poetry and rhetoric, physics and biology, psychology and logic, ethics and politics, metaphysics and natural theology, all were once cared for with the massive and enduring power of informed, ~~precise~~ precise, coherent, all-embracing thought. The vast edifice, of course, did not remain unchanged. Commentators interpreted and reinterpreted. The learned added corrections. Thinkers distinguished, adjusted, reconciled. Innovators denied and rejected. But these many and divergent activities all occurred within a common context, which Aristotle supplied; and the simplest way to establish an opinion or to dispose of an adversary was to appeal to Aristotle's text.

## Chapter I

The New Context

It is common in Catholic circles to think of Aristotle as a philosopher and of his philosophy as supplying theology with its handmaid

As the new context is only in process of formation, it had best be approached through the old context which

thought  
no longer possible to settle what technical terms mean by  
looking up Bonitz' Index aristotelicus or by studying Aquinas'  
usage.

There we find a good deal more occurring than the eclipse of Aristotle and the triumph of natural science.

The strength of the Aristotelian context has recently been illustrated by Professor Butterfield. Writing on the The Origins of Modern Science, 1300-1800, he ~~granted~~ fully granted that from the beginning of the fourteenth century there were gradually accumulating scientific discoveries of the modern type. Still it was one thing to make a discovery; it was quite another to find a satisfactory formulation for it. A discovery can be a simple act of understanding. But a formulation has presuppositions and implications. It has to be able to withstand objections and criticism. In brief, it has to fit into a context and, for almost four centuries, the context was Aristotelian. It was only in the final decades of the seventeenth century that the new discoveries coalesced into a unified whole, formed a context of their own of the seventeenth century that there emerged a new <sup>scientific</sup> context comparable in scope to the old and, as Professor Butterfield contended, it is only from that time that there has existed what today we mean by modern science.

common context, which Aristotle supplied; they rested on familiar assumptions, which had an Aristotelian source; and even opposition to Aristotle, unless it <sup>somehow</sup> equalled the range and scope of his thought, could be no more than a partial opposition in conflict with ~~its own partial acceptance.~~<sup>1</sup>

- 1) Professor Butterfield in his Origins of Modern Science, 1300 - 1800,

has enlarged upon this point. The new scientific discoveries that were accumulating from the beginning of the fourteenth century were powerless to break out of the dominant Aristotelian context. Only towards the end of the seventeenth century did modern science reach the point where it could begin to construct a context of its own and thereby succeed in coherently formulating, grounding, developing its own discoveries.

It is now long since Aristotle ceased to play a dominant role in western ~~mind~~ culture. Humanists abhorred his technical language, Protestants his pagan learning, empirical scientists his verbalism, historians his identification of science with the universal and the necessary. But it is only within recent decades that he has become irrelevant in Catholic theology. Here the ~~promavman~~ the movement seems to have been initiated by positive studies, by the flood of books and articles listed in the bibliographies of ~~Biblia~~ Altaner's Biblica, of ~~Altaner's~~ Patrologie, of the Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, of the Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses. For these studies took over the whole range of sources and privileged areas in theology. They did so from a viewpoint of history distinct from that of apologists and dogmatists.



no longer sufficient to look up Aquinas' definitions to find out what terms mean, or to understand his system if one wishes to grasp what contemporary theologians are presupposing. And so manifest has become the need for some ~~xxx~~ guidance<sup>in these matters</sup> that Karl Rahner has given us his Kleines theologisches Wörterbuch (Freiburg 1961) and Heinrich Fries has edited a two-volume Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe (München 1962 and 1963).

It does its thinking in a contemporary context. Renewal used to mean a return to the past, a striving for the austere virtues of olden times, an emulation of the exploits of ancient apostles. Today renewal means updating. What has been handed down is being scrutinized before it is ~~being~~ accepted, lived, passed on. What lies outside the once carefully guarded cultural ghetto of the Catholic, is being examined, adapted, assimilated. So gradually and tentatively there is being formed a new context in which Catholic theological thinking is to occur. ~~And the purpose of the present chapter is to indicate~~

~~In the present chapter we shall attempt to indicate certain basic features of this new context. Not all of these features, of course, are simple matters of fact~~

In the present chapter there will be attempted some account of what this context already is, or is <sup>now</sup> becoming or, we hope, some day will be. Our concern, then, is not with theology itself but with <sup>its context, with the</sup> ~~the~~ external factors that mould it from without. Our interest in such outside influences is restricted to those that are relevant to theological method. Finally, our procedure will be by contrast between this new context and the earlier context in which traditional Catholic theology evolved.

A new context, then, is needed. It is needed if theology is not to remain in a ghetto isolated from the rest of contemporary culture. But it is needed even more if theology is to put its own house in order. For contemporary Catholic theology is rent asunder. Its traditional heritage is under the sign of Aristotle. But the flood of books and articles listed in the bibliographies of Biblica, of Altaner's Patrologie, of the Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, of Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses, owe little indeed to Aristotle and very much to the techniques of interpretation and to the methods of history that rest on modern notions of science and are linked with modern philosophies.

of Aristotle. Its recent developments are under other auspices.  
It is the latter that <sup>are</sup> bound to win  
of Aristotle. Its recent developments are under other auspices.

They claimed a relative autonomy in the name of scientific techniques, unknown to Aristotle, for dealing with the particular and the contingent. They are not going to be dislodged, and so theology is confronted with the arduous task of constructing for itself a new context. In fact, work at that task has already begun with Karl Rahner's Kleines theologisches Wörterbuch and Heinrich Fries' editing of a two-volume Handbuch Wörterbuch (Freiburg 1961) and Heinrich Fries' editing of a two-volume Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe (München 1962 and 1963).

So much for the topic of this chapter. It remains that we attempt to indicate the main directions involved in constructing the new context, and so we shall proceed to say something about transitions from logic to method, from the Posterior Analytics to modern science, from philosophy as a handmaid to transcendental method, and from human nature to human history.

learning, but there cannot be an up-to-date revision on the old model, for the old model itself is out-of-date.

A new context, then, is needed. It is needed if theology is not to remain in a ghetto isolated from the rest of contemporary culture. But it is needed even more if theology is to put its own house in order. There old and new are in conflict. Traditional teaching remains largely within the Aristotelian context. But all the basic areas of theological investigation -- the scriptures and the Fathers, conciliar and pontifical documents, theological writings of all periods -- have been penetrated, taken over, occupied by modern scholarship, modern methods of history, modern notions of science. They are not going to be dislodged. Neither is the Aristotelian context large enough. But teaching and investigation cannot long remain at loggerheads

learning, but there cannot be an up-to-date revision on the old model, for the old model itself is out-of-date.

A new context, then, is needed. Manifestly it is needed if theology is not to remain in a ghetto isolated from the rest of modern culture. But it is needed even more if theology is to put its own house in order. There old and new are in ~~for~~ conflict. Traditional teaching remains largely within the Aristotelian context. But <sup>teaching role or investigation, and</sup> all the basic areas of theological investigation have been penetrated, taken over, occupied by modern scholarship, modern methods of history, ~~modern notions of science. But the new procedures cannot be fitted within the old context, The process has gone much too far for them now to be dislodged.~~

modern notions of science. This process has now gone much too far for the new procedures to be dislodged. On the other hand, these procedures cannot be fitted into the old context. It follows that a new context is the ~~the~~ only way in which investigation and teaching can once more go hand in hand.

A new context, then, is needed. It is needed if theology is not to remain in a ghetto<sup>t</sup> isolated from the rest of contemporary culture. But it is needed even more if theology is to put its own house in order. For its traditional heritage is under the sign of <sup>A</sup> Aristotle. From that imprint it has to be redeemed if it is to ~~unhappily~~ come to terms with modern techniques of interpretation and modern methods of history. For they rest on a notion of science unknown to a Aristotle, ~~yet they have taken over the whole range of positive studies~~ to put its own house in order. For if the conflicts now troubling theology appear in many forms, still they have a common root. Under the name of positive theology, of accurate knowledge of scripture, of the Fathers, of the medieval and later theologians, modern scholarship, modern history, modern science have penetrated all the basic areas of theological investigation. They have taken possession and they are not going to be ~~dislodged~~ dislodged. But besides theological investigation, there is theological teaching. The two must go hand in hand. But the two cannot go hand in hand, if one still thinks in the old context or derived from Aristotle, while the other works in accord with prescriptions that have quite different suppositions and implications. Theology itself stands in need of a new context.

Work towards that new context has already begun with Karl Ranner's Kleines theologisches Wörterbuch (Freiburg 1961) and Heinrich Fries' editing of a two-volume ~~Handbuch~~ Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe (München 1962 and 1963). But our present concern is less detailed. For our purposes we have only to indicate the main directions involved in constructing the ~~new~~ new context, and so we shall be content to point to

~~I do not know that there exist theologians that advocate  
advocate a ghetto theology incapable incapable of reaching out  
into the whole of life and culture. But even if any existed,  
they could not claim that Aristotle might still provide theology  
with an internal principle of inrt integration~~

transitions from logic to method, from the Posterior Analytics  
to the modern notion of science, from philosophy as a handmaid  
to transcendental method, and from an apprehension of man in  
terms of human nature to an apprehension through human history.

with the requirements of a formal logic. Such a realization of the logical ideal is never easy and often impossible. For the logical ideal is withdrawn from time and change. Premises imply conclusions ~~immediately~~ not only necessarily but also immediately; in other words, if the premises are true now, the conclusion must be true now; and if the conclusion is false now, either the premises or the reasoning ~~is~~ must now be false. Again,



with the requirements of a formal logic. Such a realization of the logical ideal is never easy and often impossible. It is never easy. It can be done, for instance, for Euclidean geometry, but only if Euclid's ~~ax~~ Elements are recast by the introduction of new terms, by revising the axioms, and by rewriting a number of the proofs. It is often impossible. For most sciences are in a continuous process of development: the solution of one problem brings to light the existence of another, so that there are always unsolved problems and always the loose ends where clarity, coherence, rigour are not already achieved but only being sought. Then the application of a formal logic may reveal ambiguities, incoherences, unsound inferences, but it cannot remove them; for the solution of a ~~problem~~ scientific problem is a discovery; and a discovery, so far from being deduced from what already is known, brings about a shift in the meaning of terms or even the introduction of new terms; the implications of ~~axioms~~ <sup>principles or laws</sup> change or even the axioms themselves are increased or revised.

with the requirements of a formal logic. This is not easy. It can be done, for example, with Euclidean geometry, but only if the geometry is reorganized, new axioms are introduced, and some proofs are rewritten. Moreover, most sciences are in a continuous process of development. To a greater or less extent, coherence is not something already achieved but something to be strived for. In all such cases a formal logic can only serve to define an ideal plane towards which the developing science is moving and, as the movement usually does as much to bring new problems to light as to solve old ones, the ideal plane is always receding. Finally, later positions of the ideal plane cannot be deduced from earlier positions; for the later positions will depend on intervening discoveries; and discoveries cannot be deduced.

with the requirements of a formal logic. This means that the logical ideals of clarity, coherence, rigour are realized and, as could be expected, such a realization is neither easy nor always possible. The ideal of clarity demands that all terms be unambiguous, that their meaning be fixed, <sup>ever the same, and so</sup> ~~that their~~ <sup>undergoing</sup> ~~meaning~~ <sup>is</sup> not <sup>in</sup> a process of development. ~~but~~ <sup>the same</sup> Coherence demands that incoherent statements be separated into different universes of discourse and not left to stand side by side as imperfect ~~expressions~~ but complementary expressions of a truth that is yet to be discovered. Rigour demands that conclusions follow from premisses necessarily and therefore at once: ~~immediately~~ if the premisses are true now, the conclusion too must be now true; and if the conclusion is not yet true, so too the premisses are as yet not true. A formalized doctrine may be about changing objects but it itself cannot change; it can only be replaced by a different doctrine; <sup>and so</sup> the realization of the logical ideals is also the realization of immobility.

~~Because logical ideals entail immobility, while most sciences are in a continuous process of development, it is necessary either to put movement into logic or else to go beyond logic and acknowledge method.~~

Now most sciences are in a continuous process of development. The solution of one problem only brings to light the existence of another. There are always the loose ends that make clarity, coherence, rigour not achievements but goals. The logical operations of defining, postulating, inferring are still employed, and the rules governing them are still valid. But, as well, there are many other operations that are to be performed as long as the science keeps developing, and it is method that studies the full set of such operations.

theory strives and strains. But the significance of this striving and straining is not absolute. Logic crystallizes what has been achieved. It facilitates the discovery of shortcomings in that achievement. If by itself it heads for the perfection of immobility, within the context of developing science it is allowed indeed to consolidate what has been achieved but not to block further advance.

For method adds to logical operations such other activities as inquiry, observation, discovery, experimentation, verification. These pull away from the immobility of logic for they yield a process in which terms are still developing, propositions are inadequate, conclusions more or less probable. They reveal that it is such process that is the normal state of affairs, that in the sciences results are not definitive, that the solution of one problem only reveals the existence of other problems, that the advance of theory only broadens the field of data to be apprehended and investigated. Above all, they reveal that the process of coming to know has its own proper norms, that it is idle to expect the process to conform to ideals that imply the perfection of immobility, that the process as process has its own perfection in its cumulative and progressive character.

### 3. Developing Ideals

A distinction has been drawn between a logical ideal and a scientific ideal, <sup>and</sup> a position has been taken that subordinates the former to the latter. The logical ideal ~~represents serves to fix only a moment within an on-going process.~~  
process.

operations in accord with the pattern may be repeated indefinitely.

What differentiates scientific ~~from~~ method from methods in general, is that successive repetitions are cumulative and self-correcting. The opw operations recur, but they are performed in the light of previs previous results; the new result will be added to the old and may correct the old.

Transition

four

In the course of the past ~~xxxx~~ centuries there have emerged a new notion of science, a new apprehension of man, and new perspectives in philosophy. Within recent decades these profound changes in the cultural climate have been exerting an ever fuller and profounder effect on Catholic theology. But if the Aristotelian notion of science has been eclipsed, the new notion has not been formally acknowledged; and in their concrete implications the two notions theology. But this effect is for the most part implicit. Biblical and patristic scholars

theology. But this effect has been more a matter of practice than of theory

theology. Now, perhaps, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ at long last the time has come for the differences between the old and new to be brought out in the open and an explicit ~~xxxxxxx~~ and coherent choice to be made. For a single theology cannot function in the light of two opposed notions of science; it cannot apprehend mankind in two quite different manners; it cannot cast its philosophic prolegomena in contrary perspectives. Unless it chooses one and rejects the other, it will generate

theology

ston of man,

by contemporary notions of science, the contemporary apprehen-  
At theology, in so far as it is contemporary, is affected

T r a n s i t i o n

13 v 64

M T I



The New Theology

Height of Reformed ecclesiology  
Modern SC

The old

1690-19xx dogmatic  
substantive

fundamental

doctrinal  
systematic

notions of essence

analogy of being -

born theological -

placitist: supra temporal dogma tenet sancti intra ecclesiam -

philosophy that filled in

Jarvis  
ordans

The new

historical study - temporal series -

|| ancient  
pastorales

SS PP CC TT

1<sup>o</sup> burst the old bottles  
in numerous ways of ecumenical problems  
2<sup>o</sup> disarray of the theology

development of theology

empirical theology

not a table in one mind

DW

