

The Tasks Of Theology

Since different tasks are to performed in different ways,
an account of method must begin from the different tasks to
be performed and the distinct ends to be achieved

The Tasks of Theology

As other subjects, theology has become a highly specialized field. But if Parkinson's law accounts for the proliferation of divisions and subdivisions, a major problem of method is to discern a way to relate the many parts and restore some sort of unity. To this end we shall distinguish three types of specialization, in coll call on transcendental method to ground

The Tasks of Theology

Different tasks are performed in different ways to attain different ends. A method, then, must distinguish the different ends, specify the different ways in which different tasks are to be performed, and explain how the many ways, tasks, ends come together to form a single whole.

To make a beginning let us say that theology is thematized knowledge of God mediated by the Body of Christ.

Theology is not immediate knowledge of God. It is not knowing God face to face. It is not such as God's knowledge of us (1 Cor 13, 12).

While there is a knowledge of God mediated by nature, while it serves Christian theology both as apologetic and as propaedeutic and may be included within it, still it is far less than Christian theology

The Tasks of Theology

Different tasks are performed in different ways to attain different ends. A method, then, must distinguish the different ends, specify the different ways in which different tasks are to be performed, and explain how the many ways, tasks, ends come together to form a single whole. But, before we can begin, we must have at least some provisional account of what is meant by theology and, while ~~perhaps~~ no definition will please everyone, perhaps everyone will grant that some definition is better than none at all.

Let us say, then, that Christian theology is thematized knowledge of God mediated by the Body of Christ.

Theology is about God, as the name implies. But this is not meant to exclude the traditional view that, while God is the primary object of theology, still there is as well a secondary object, namely, all things as ordered to God. The theologian would ^{so} know God as also to know what God means for the world, for human history, for us.

Theology is not immediate knowledge of God. It is ~~not~~ not knowing God face to face. It is not such as God's knowledge of us (1 Cor 13, 12).

Christian theology is not knowledge of God mediated by nature. Such natural theology, ^{as already explained, can exist} ~~and it can~~ serves Christian theology both as apologetic and as propaedeutic. Indeed, ~~perhaps~~ Christian theology does well to sublate natural theology, to take over its theoretical achievement and include it within a larger and richer whole. But to this point we shall return in due course.

Christian theology is knowledge of God mediated by the Body of Christ. It is, then, knowledge mediated not by things but by persons, not by any human persons but by those that in the past two millenia have ~~human~~ been in Christ Jesus. For God has spoken to us in his Son (Heb 1. 2) and he has poured forth his charity in our hearts through the Holy Spirit that is given to us (Rom 5, 5)

Departmental specialization is the most familiar. For ~~new~~ results of investigations are classified to yield a series of subjects, and these subjects are what is taught by their ~~respective~~ professors in a school.

Functional specialization, finally, is most relevant to a discourse on method. By this, of course, I do not mean that method is in any way opposed to investigators dividing up their field or teachers dividing^{up} their subjects. What I do mean is that, like method, functional specialization is concerned with the process from data to results, that it distinguishes and then separates the successive stages in this process. Above all, it is to be noted that such distinction and separation do not tend to any isolation and independence of the functional specialties. On the contrary, since these are but stages in a single process, the later stages are impossible unless the earlier have been attended to, and the earlier by themselves are pointless unless the later supervene. In functional specialization, ~~then~~, one finds ~~a solution to~~ on the level of method a solution to

Departmental specialization is the most familiar. We have all been to school and followed courses. Courses are on subjects. Subjects are the classified results of investigations.

Functional specialization, finally, is the most relevant to a discourse on method. For method is concerned with the process from data to results, and it is in this very process that functional specialization distinguishes and separates successive stages.

Christian theology is knowledge of God mediated by the Body of Christ. Its source is Christ, the Head of the Body. But it comes to us through those that in the past two millenia have been in Christ Jesus and, generation by generation, have mediated Christ to us. Just how this mediation is to be understood is, of course, a point on which Christians are divided and so a question for theology to investigate.

~~Christian theology, finally, is thematized knowledge. It is not the knowledge that is present and functioning in any human act.~~

Christian theology, finally, is not the unformulated knowledge that is present and functioning in Christian living and doing but, on the contrary, the formulation that takes specifically Christian knowledge as its theme, ~~and~~ makes it explore and unifies all its parts and aspects, explicit, ~~and~~ relates or contrasts it with the rest of its cultural context. In brief, not all Christians are Christian theologians, and not every instance of explicit Christian knowledge is a complete theology. As human movements generally, so also Christianity began from an individual, spread out from a small group and, as it increased, more and more was under the necessity of advancing to fuller self-consciousness by defining its own meaning and aims and by contrasting them with those of other, distinct or opposed movements.

Now if Christian theology is ~~mediated~~ thematized knowledge of God mediated by the Body of Christ, it follows that in theology there are two main tasks. First, there is to be acquired the mediating knowledge of ~~Christ and~~ the Body of Christ. From this, in the second place, there is to be derived the mediated knowledge of God ~~and~~ and of all things ~~as~~ as ordered to God.

1. An Eightfold Division

In theology we propose to distinguish eight functional specialties, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, (8) communications.

This division rests on two principles, of which the first is derived from the four levels of human conscious and intentional operations. It will be recalled that these four may be briefly referred to as (1) experiencing, (2) understanding, (3) judging, and (4) deciding. Now a functional specialization has been defined as a stage in the process from data to results, and so the four successive levels of conc conscious and intentional operations suggest four stages. It is to be noted, however,

1. An Eightfold Division

Our conscious and intentional operations, it will be recalled, occur on four distinct levels, and these four may be briefly referred to as (1) experiencing, (2) understanding, (3) judging, and (4) deciding.

Now in everyday ~~experience~~ performance we experience to understand, understand to judge, judge to decide. But functional specialization uses all four levels to attain the end proper to each of the four. Thus, one may experience, understand, judge, and decide, (1) to make all relevant data available, or (2) to reach a thorough understanding of all the relevant data, or (3) to pass judgement on the various theories that have been put forward to account for the data, or (4) to decide what is the appropriate method to be employed in a given science or on a given problem. The very structure, then, of our conscious and intentional operations leads to the distinction and separation of four successive stages in the process from data to results.

But theological operations occur ~~in~~ in two basic phases. These may be contrasted as listening and speaking, or as lectio and quaestio, or as assimilating tradition and passing it on, or as encountering the past and taking one's stand towards the future, or as attending to the moving object of Christ and his Church or tending to the final object of God and all things in their relation to God, or as learning theology and doing theology, or again as learning history and making history, or as theology in oratione obliqua which tells what Paul and John, Augustine and Aquinas, or anyone else had to say about God and the economy of salvation and, on the other hand,

1. An Eightfold Division

In theology we propose to distinguish eight functional specialties, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

This division rests on two principles. The first is ~~the fourfold division of~~ derived from the four levels of ~~human~~ our conscious and intentional operations. These four, it will be recalled, may be briefly referred to as (1) experiencing, (2) understanding, (3) judging, and (4) deciding. Now a functional specialization is not the simple-minded matter of merely experiencing, or merely understanding, or merely judging, or merely deciding. Each functional specialization operates on all four levels, but it does so in a peculiar fashion, for it uses all four to obtain the end proper to some one level.

For example, the experimental and the theoretical physicist may operate with respect to the same data and to determine the same result. The difference between them, then, is not a difference of field or of department but of function. They operate differently with respect to the same data. Their different operations are successive stages in the same process from data to results, and so their different modes of operation combine to yield a single set of results. So it is that the theoretical physicist cannot manipulate the cyclotron; only the experimental physicist has the knowledge and skills for that; still, the theoretical physicist ~~is~~ is not superfluous, for only he can tell which experiments would be worth trying and, when they have been performed, what their results signify.

1. Principles of Division

In theology we propose to distinguish eight functional specializations, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, (8) communications.

This distinction rests on two principles of division. The first of these accounts for the difference between the first four and the last four. The second accounts for the differences when the first four are compared with one another and, again, it accounts for the differences when the last four are compared with one another.

The first principle of division may be expressed in many ways

The same division may be expressed in many other ways: as lectio and as the quaestio that arises from it; or as assimilating tradition and as passing it on; or as encountering the past and as taking one's stand toward the future; or as learning theology and as doing theology; or as learning history and as making history; or as theology in oratione obliqua that speaks only to tell what Paul or John, Augustine or Aquinas, or any other figure taught about God and the economy of salvation, and as theology in oratione recta that in the light of the past answers the questions of today.

1. Types of Specialization

It remains that both of these tasks are very large and so fully justify the fact that theology has been divided into a host of specialties. Such specialization, however, occurs in three distinct manners.

There is field specialization that divides and subdivides the field of data. So the study of scripture is divided into studies of the Old and of the New Testaments and each of these is subdivided still further. Similarly, the study of the Fathers is separated from study of the Scholastics and these undergo still further divisions. And, ~~in general~~ in general, as centres of learning increase, periodicals multiply, and monographs follow one another ever more closely, it becomes less and less possible for scholars to keep abreast over a given field, and there follows a division of labour based on a division of the field.

There also is departmental and subject specialization. For the cumulative results of scholarly investigations are classified by professors into departments, subjects, courses.

The first level, experiencing, has its proper end in the apprehension of the data. When this end becomes the aim of a specialty, the specialty concentrates on making the relevant data available. So the textual critic settles what was written in an original document that no longer exists. So the experimental physicist shows what ~~happens~~ are the resultant phenomena when his instruments are employed in a specified manner.

It is to be observed that, while the end of textual criticism or of experimental physics is to ascertain the data, still neither textual criticism nor experimental physics consists simply in experiencing. On the contrary, all four levels of our conscious and intentional operations are involved, but the contributions of the other three are directed towards the end of the first level

In terms of the four levels of conscious and intentional operation, then, the experimental physicist pursues the end of the first level, of experiencing; he makes the data available. The theoretical physicist on the other hand pursues the ^{end} of the second level, of understanding; he interprets the data that have been made available and, in the light of his theory, he is able to indicate where further significant data might be found.

Now such functional specialization is not confined to modern physics. The textual critic is out to determine what was written. He has developed highly complex techniques and criteria to attain this specific goal. But this goal ^{at its root is similar to} ~~is the same as~~ that of the experimental physicist, namely, to make the data available, to provide us today with the exact sequence of letters written down in an original document that no longer survives. On the other hand, the commentator tells us what the text means. To this end he has developed a quite different set of no less complex techniques and criteria. He has done so because his ~~and~~ purpose was ~~different~~ different, for he wished to understand and interpret the text that the textual critic ascertained. The commentator stands to the textual critic, as the theoretical physicist stands to the experimental physicist.

theology in oratione recta in which the theologian puts forward his own views and convictions on his own responsibility.

These two phases lead to a repetition of the four stages already mentioned to give eight functional specialties in theology, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) doctrinal history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

Research makes available the data relevant to theology.
General research

~~It~~ prepares critical editions of texts, reproduces or copies
 , pictures,
~~and~~ inscriptions ~~and~~ symbols from monuments and coins, locates
 and excavates ancient sites, composes indices, catalogues,
 handbooks,
~~and~~ bibliographies, dictionaries, encyclopaedias, and some day
 perhaps will give us an information retrieval system. Special
 research is the research done to treat a particular question
 or to solve a particular problem. It presupposes general
 research and uses the tools that the latter provides.

While essentially paedagogical, this ~~diminution~~ type of division is of permanent importance, for the achievement of the past can be increased in the future only if it is effectively transmitted from generation to generation. Such importance in no way is diminished in theology since Christianity itself is essentially ~~by~~ traditional.

Finally, there is functional specialization. It distinguishes and separates successive stages in the process from data to results. Where field specialization would divide Old Testament study, say, into study of the Law, of the Prophets, and of the Writings, where subject specialization would distinguish semitic languages, Hebrew ~~history~~ history, the religions of the ancient Near East, and Christian theology, functional specialization would distinguish textual criticism that settles what was written, commentary that determines what was meant, and ^{that} history [^] assembles interpreted texts into a coherent narrative or view.

theology in oratione recta in which the theologian puts forward his own views and convictions on his own responsibility.

When these two phases are combined with the four levels of conscious and intentional operation, there are eight functional specialities to be distinguished in theology, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

For the moment no more can be attempted than a preliminary characterization of ~~maximum~~ the eight specialties. The first four, then, pertain to the first phase of theology in oratione obliqua: it is attending to Christ and his Church, learning theology and history, listening and reading, encountering the past and assimilating tradition. This can be done in global fashion with little distinction and no separation of the ^{distinct ends of the} four levels of conscious and intentional operation. Then it is named apologetics or positive theology: apologetics, when one begins from research and moves through interpretation and history to the goal of conversion; positive theology, when one presupposes conversion and uses it to simplify the problems of history and interpretation and to direct research.

But the more elaborate theological investigation becomes, the clearer is the distinction between the proper ends of each of the four levels, and the ~~more painstaking and detailed are the means employed to reach each~~ greater the differentiation of the means employed to reach the respective ends. Then four functional specialties have to be distinguished and separated though, of course, precisely because they are

Now these four specialties are functional specialties.
For any process from data to results employs the four levels
of our intentional and conscious operations, and the four ends
For functional specialties are successive stages in a single
process from data to results. But the the four ends ~~of~~
are

was meant. It presupposes some acquaintance with the object meant, but it leaves to systematics the determination of its nature. Its concern is the prior task of ascertaining what others have thought and said about that object and, indeed, not of what they would think or say today, but of what they actually did in their own day in the modes of thought and expression of that time. To this topic we shall return when we treat hermeneutics.

History, similarly, will demand special treatment later. For the moment let us distinguish basic, special, and general history. Basic history determines the field, the material frame of reference, common to distinct, special histories. It tells who (persons, peoples) ~~mmmmmm~~ did what (actions, products) where (places, territories) when (dates, periods) to enjoy what success, suffer what reverses. It tells when (dates, periods), where (places, territories), who (persons, peoples) did what (actions, products) with to enjoy what success, suffer e what reverses, exert what influence.


Special histories regard institutional (family and mores, society and education, state and law, economics and technology) cultural (language, literature, art, religion) and doctrinal (mathematics, natural and human science, philosophy, history, theology) movemensts.

was meant. It presupposes some acquaintance with the object that is meant, but it leaves to systematics the task of determining the nature of that object. Its concern is with the prior task of ascertaining what others have thought and said about that object and, indeed, not of what they would think and say today, but of what they did in their day in the modes of thought and expression of that time.

~~As research is not possible without some interpretation,
no interpretation is not possible without some history~~

So interpretation leads into history which compares and relates the interpreted data. The basic task is comparison. Does one author agree with another, or do they disagree? In what respects? Does one add to ^{the} ~~then~~ other, or does he omit what the other states? To what extent? When authors agree, are they their differences to be regarded as complementary aspects of a single ~~organ whole~~ organic whole? When they disagree, are they related to one another as successive stages of a single, developing position? or are they contradictorily opposed? So comparison leads to determining organic, genetic, and dialectical relationships.

was meant. It presupposes some acquaintance with the object that is meant, but it leaves to systematics the determination of its nature. Its concern is the prior task of ascertaining what others have thought and said about that object and, indeed, not of what they would think and say today, but of what they did in their day in the modes of thought and expression of that time. To this topic we shall return when we treat hermeneutics.

History may be basic, social, or cultural. Basic history identifies persons, their deeds, and their works, and assigns them their relative places in the space-time continuum. Social history is concerned with the actual order of human living in the family and mores, in society and education, in the state and its  laws, in the economy and its technics. Cultural history is concerned with man's understanding of himself and his universe as exhibited in language, religion, art, literature, philosophy, science, history.

Within this general setting there is the social history of the Christian church and the cultural history of the ^{these} Christian religion. Both types of history, I feel, will be more and more be integrated within the theology of the future more and more integrated

Within this general setting and not to be withdrawn from it there are the social history of the Christian church and the cultural history of the Christian religion. Both of these, I feel, will be more and more intrated integrated with the ~~more~~ more concrete and detailed theology of the future

4. An Eightfold Division

The transcendently grounded fourfold division of functional specialties, when applied successively to each of the two phases of theology, yields an eightfold division, namely, (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

The first four pertain to the first phase of theology in which one is assimilating tradition. The process from research through interpretation and history ~~x~~ towards conversion bears some resemblance to what in the past was named apologetics. Again, when the field of theologically relevant data is considered to contain privileged areas, the loci theologici, such as the scriptures, conciliar and papal pronouncements, patristic and mediaeval teaching

4. An Eightfold Division

Each of the two phases of theology can be divided into four functional specialties to yield a total of eight. These may be named (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

The eight name not different specialists but different specialties. They are distinguished, not to prevent theologians from performing more than one of the eight tasks, but to make them and their critics realize that the eight tasks are different, that they are performed in different manners, that they ~~are~~ follow different rules and criteria.

Again, the eight name functional specialties. So each of the eight, so far from being independent of the other seven, is functionally interdependent with the other seven. Such interdependence, however, does not mean a logical interdependence, which would be just a set of vicious circles. It means the interdependence of the two phases of theology and of the four levels of our conscious and intentional operations.

4. An Eightfold Division

~~See~~ Each of the two phases of theology can be divided into four functional specialties to yield a total of eight. These may be named (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

The first four pertain to the first phase of theology in which one is assimilating tradition. They may be regarded as the successors of apologetics and of positive theology. For the straightforward process from theological ~~a~~ data through research, interpretation, and history towards conversion resembles apologetics. Again, when this process is guided by foundations and doctrines, one gets positive theology. For an apologetic is obtained by the direct process from research through interpretation and history towards conversion; and such apologetic becomes positive theology in the measure that it is guided by foundations and doctrines.

The second four pertain to the second phase in which one applies objectivifies and transmits to others what one has assimilated from the past. Though they do not coincide, these four this fourfold division do correspond in some fashion with the fourfold division of theology into fundamental, dogmatic, systematic, and pastoral.

4. An Eightfold Division

Each of the two phases of theology may be divided into four functional specialties to yield a total of eight. The first phase of assimilating tradition would divide into (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, and (4) conversion. The second phase of objectifying and transmitting what one had assimilated would be a matter of (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, and (8) communications.

These eight are not altogether new. The last four recall the traditional distinction between fundamental, dogmatic, systematic, and pastoral or practical theology. The first three have become familiar through the development of positive theology. The fourth, conversion, is an aim of apologetics and a basis usually assumed in theological writing.

What is new is their conception as functional specialties, a conception that governs their respective procedures, the ~~relations of each to the others, and the unity of the group~~ distinction of each from the others, and the relations of each to the others.

It governs their respective procedures. For the eight name not different specialists but different specialties. They are distinguished, not to prevent theologians from performing more than one of the eight tasks, but to help them and their critics realize that the eight tasks are different, that they are performed in different manners, that they follow ~~different rules and criteria. This I consider of the greatest importance, especially at the present time when there exists a plethora of amateur theologians and critics~~

4. An Eightfold Division

The transcendently grounded fourfold division of functional specialties, when applied to each of the two phases of theology, yields an eightfold division, namely, ~~research~~ (1) research, (2) interpretation, (3) history, (4) conversion, (5) foundations, (6) doctrines, (7) systematics, (8) communications.

The first four pertain to the first phase of assimilating tradition. When one proceeds from research through interpretation and history to conversion, one is doing apologetics. Inversely, when one supposes conversion and employs its fruits to direct research and simplify interpretation and history, one is doing positive theology.

The second four pertain to the second phase in which one applies and transmits what one has assimilated. Very roughly and ~~approximately~~ approximately this fourfold division was anticipated by the division of theology into fundamental, ~~lingua~~ dogmatic, systematic, and ~~a~~ pastoral.

The first and second four are intimately related and, of course, this tends to heal the breach between the more contemporary and the more traditional parts of theology.

Conversion (4) and foundations (5) are on the level of encounter and decision. What for research (1) are just data, for interpretation (2) have a meaning, which for history (3) is held true by some and false by others, so that I today ~~am confronted with a threefold challenge to conversion (4), to intellectual conversion, to moral conversion, and to religious conversion~~

(2) Apart from obvious generalities methods of research differ from field to field and are best learnt in the seminar and the dissertation. Interpretation

Communications (8) are inter-disciplinary, inter-group, and inter-personal. They are concerned to relate theology to philosophy, to history, to the human and the natural sciences; again, to relate religion to the arts and the literatures of mankind.

As research (1) assembles data from the past, communications
(8) produces data in the present for the future. Above, we
said that theology is thematized knowledge, that it formulates
or indaequately formulated
the ~~knowing~~ unformulated knowing functioning in Christian
living

As theology begins from research (1) into sensible data,
so it ends with communications (8) through sensible data.
Again, as theology was explained to be thematized knowledge
that more adequately formulates the unformulated or inadequately
formulated knowledge functioning within Christian living, so

As research (1) assembles data from the past, so communications (8) produces data in the present for the ~~future~~ present and the ¹ future. Above we noted that theology is thematized knowledge, that it formulates more adequately the unformulated or inadequately formulated knowledge functioning within Christian living. But just as there is the reflective process that thematizes, so too there is the incarnational process that fleshes out. This process, of course, is simply ignored and omitted when it is conceived as the subsumption of particulars under universals process that fleshes out. To this end theology has to become a component in an apprehension of the concrete universe, and so it must be integrated with natural and human sciences, ^{the} with

As theology begins from research (1) into sensible data, so it ends with communications (8) through sensible data. Above we explained that theology was thematized knowledge, that it formulated more ~~and~~ adequately the unformulated or ~~and~~ inadequately formulated knowledge functioning within ~~the~~ Christian living. Now we must add that besides the reflexive process that thematizes there is also the opposite, incarnational process that ~~fleshes out~~ creatively fleshes out the Christian themes.

Such creativity ~~is~~ has a threefold complexity. First, theology must become a component within an apprehension of the concrete universe; to this end it has to be integrated with philosophy and history, with the natural and the human sciences, and especially with the science of religions. Secondly, ~~communications themselves must be understood in their psychological foundations, in their various media, and in their artistic possibilities.~~ Thirdly, the capacities and the needs of Christian and non-Christian groups and sub-groups have to be investigated with an eye to discovering what theological and religious communication could accomplish for them. Thirdly, communications themselves have to be understood in their psychological foundations, their social and historical conditions, their various media, and their artistic possibilities.

It may be objected, perhaps, that such a programme is over-ambitious. I should ~~urge, however, that it is to be preferred to the~~ ~~admit that it contrasts violently with~~ methodology must be exigent and that ambition is to be preferred to the view that theology does not have to speak from within the context of a culture, that it need not attend to those whom it addresses, and that it may be amateurish, awkward, inept in its use of media.

5. A Dynamic Unity

~~We began by distinguishing three types of specialization~~

Our attention has centred on functional specialization, which divides up the process from data to results. We have now to recall the prior field specialization, which divides up the data, and the consequent department and subject specialization, which classifies results.

Clarity requires a distinction between straightforward field specialization, which divides up relevant data in a material fashion, and the religious and theological acknowledgement of privileged areas, such as scripture, papal and conciliar pronouncements, patristic and mediaeval thought. From an apologetic viewpoint, which begins from data through interpretation and history towards conversion, such an acknowledgement is not prior to research, as are the divisions of field specialization. It emerges as an acknowledgement made by others in interpretation and history. It is made by the theologian himself in foundations and doctrines

(4) Conversion may be considered as a singular event within personal experience or as a member of a class and sub-class. As a singular event, it is an existential transformation of a subject. As classified, it has three dimensions or components to be distinguished and qualified. There is a religious conversion, in which God floods our hearts with his love by the Holy Spirit who is given to us (rom 5, 5). There is a moral conversion, in which one swings out of a habitat organized about one's ego and into a universe centred on God, one's Father. There is an intellectual conversion, in which one lays aside the inadequate criteria of reality and objectivity, worked out in childhood, finds one's way beyond the idealisms, and arrives at a critical realism.

Such differ components are separable. There is not the and disjunction or all or none of the three, though the presence of one helps the advent of the others, still

Such components are separable. One type of conversion can occur without the others, or two without the third, as well as all or none of the three. Moreover, these eight possibilities are merely an initial scheme: conversion can be more or less complete and enduring, and its implications can be differently interpreted and implemented.

History, as a functional specialty within theology, is concerned in different manners with basic, special, and general history. It presupposes basic history. Substantially it is concerned with the doctrinal history of Christian theology and ~~it~~ with this history's antecedents and consequences in the cultural and institutional histories of the Christian religion and the Christian church. ^{But it cannot} ~~Nevertheless it~~ remain aloof from general history, for it has to attend to the differences between Christian churches, the relations between different religions, and the role of Christianity in world history.

~~(4) Kant lamented that, though scientists tend to agree, philosophers perennially differ. But the oppositions of and abstract philosophers are only a refined statement of the mountainous conflicts exhibited by human history.~~

But no less than hermeneutics, contemporary historical thought, ~~fundamentally~~ over and above its own proper complexity and difficulty, has become involved in basic philosophic problems. To it, then, we return in a later section.

(4)

History as a functional specialty within theology will presuppose basic history. It will be concerned not only with the special history of Christian theology but also with ^{doctrinal} ^{cultural and institutional} ~~xxx~~ the special histories of the Christian religion and the Christian church, in which theology appears in its ^{de} antecedents and its consequences. Moreover, as theology is concerned with the relations between different religions, with differences between Christian churches, with the relations between different religions, and with the role of Christianity in the world and in world history, it has also to attend to general history.

(5)

(4) Conversion and its antithesis, apostasy, are the existential categories

(4) By conversion is understood an existential transformation of the subject, of his outlook, and of his values. Normally it is a gradual, cumulative process. It has begun long before any explicit, outward manifestation occurs. Long afterwards it continues to work out its own implications, to live them ever more fully, to find deeper and more ^solid foundations, and on them to build ^a richer and more fruitful living.

(4) By conversion ~~is~~ is understood an existential transformation of the subject, of his outlook, and of his values. Such a transformation may be religious, moral, or intellectual; it may be any two of these; or it may be all three.

In religious conversion God floods our hearts with his ~~his~~ love by the Holy Spirit that is given to us (Rom 5, 5). In moral conversion one swings out ~~of~~ of a habitat organized about one's ego and into a universe centred in God, one's Father. In intellectual conversion one lays aside the inadequate criteria of reality and objectivity worked out pragmatically in childhood and finds one's way beyond the idealisms ~~find~~ ~~to~~ to a critical realism.

~~Conversion may be considered~~

Contemporary developments seem to require that conversion be considered both from a confessional and from an oecumenical viewpoint. From a confessional viewpoint conversion is the transformation or sequence of transformations that actually has occurred in the given individual and that results in his commitment or in the renewal ~~of~~ and confirmation of his commitment to the church or sect to which he belongs. The oecumenist, however, while respecting all instances of such existential commitment, is ~~not~~ concerned to go ~~beneath them~~ beyond them, to list their similarities and differences, to ~~uncover~~ uncover their roots, and so to place all ~~of~~ of them within a single if dialectical view.

Such a single view may serve two further purposes. On the one hand, it can throw light upon the differences revealed by the study of history. On the other hand, it can contribute to oecumenical foundations for theology.

(4) Conversion may be considered as event or as object.

As event, it is an existential transformation of a subject. Three dimensions or components may be distinguished. There is a religious conversion, in which God floods our hearts with his love by the Holy Spirit who is given to us (Rom 5, 5). There is a moral conversion, in which we swing out of a habitat organized about our ego's into a universe centred in God our Father. There is an intellectual conversion, in which we lay aside the inadequate criteria of reality and objectivity worked out in ~~our~~ childhood and find our way beyond the idealisms to a critical realism.

Such components are separable, for one type of conversion may occur without the others, or two without the third, as well as all or none of the three. Nor are ~~but~~ there just these eight possibilities, for conversion can be more or less complete, and differences of interpretation and criteria can easily emerge. By such considerations one moves from conversion as event, through a comparison of events, to conversion as object.

Now there is little room for doubt that ~~the~~ differences of conversion have much to do with the confessional differences between the Christian churches and sects.

It follows that a comprehensive view of the different types and or contribute to or modes of conversions would provide the basis for working out oecumenical foundations for theology

But if a given type and measure of conversion is basic to a given type of confession religious confession, it follows that a comprehensive view of all types and measures would provide oecumenical foundations for theology.

(4) By conversion is understood an existential transformation of the subject, his outlook, and his values. It may be religious, moral, or intellectual; or any two of these; or all three. In religious conversion God floods our hearts with his love by the Holy Spirit who is given to us (Rom 5, 5). In moral conversion we swing out of a habitat organized about our ego's and into a universe centred in God, our Father. In intellectual conversion we lay aside the inadequate criteria^t of objectivity and reality worked out in childhood and find our way beyond the idealisms to a critical realism.

Conversion may be considered from a confessional or from an oecumenical viewpoint. From a confessional viewpoint conversion is the existential transformation that terminates in adherence to the church or sect. From an oecumenical viewpoint there is sought a comprehensive account of all the alternative views of conversion that will include and relate all of the confessional views in adherence to the church or sect. The oecumenist, however, seeks a more basic position that will include, dialectically, all the confessional positions in their similarities and their differences. This position he will relate to the similarities and differences brought to light by the study of history and, further, to the theological foundations that are our next topic.

Conversion may be considered existentially or scientifically.

Existentially, conversion is the term of one's encounter with Christ through his Body, one's apprehension of him, one's response to him

(4) By conversion is understood a transformation of the subject and his world. It is, then, not just a development or a even a sequence of developments. Rather it is the radical change which fructifies in inter-locking, cumulative sequences of developments on all levels and ^{in all} departments of human living.

Though existential and intensely personal, conversion is not restricted to isolated individuals. On the contrary, to be a Christian is to partake in that transformation of humanity that comes of Christ Jesus. So the history of Christianity is the history of that transformation, of its successes and failures, of its developments and aberrations. Again, Christian theology

Where Christianity is conceived as a movement characterized by conversion, Christian theology certainly would have conversion among its objects. But the present question concerns subjects.

Must the theologian be converted? In what manner can ^{the} conversion of the theologian [^] be a functional speciality within theology?

$RI\bar{M}$	$R\bar{M}\bar{I}$	$R\bar{M},$	$R\bar{M}\bar{I}$
$\bar{R}IM$	$\bar{R}M\bar{I}$	$\bar{R}\bar{M}I$	$\bar{R}\bar{M}\bar{I}$

With conversion there terminates the first phase of theology, in which we encounter the bo Body of Christ, apprehend it, and respond to it