

to adapt to changing circumstances and opportunities, but neither circumstance nor opportunity modified human nature, and so adaptation could never affect the substance of things.

While classicist culture conceived itself normatively, modern culture conceives itself empirically. It is the culture that ~~that~~ recognizes cultural variation, difference, development, breakdown, that ~~studies~~ investigates each of the many cultures of mankind, that studies their histories, that seeks to understand what the classicist would tend to write off as ^{strange or} uncultivated or barbaric. ~~Instead of thinking of man as an immutable nature~~ ~~immutable nature providing substantially unchanging~~ ~~immutable nature that excluded substantial change in human affairs,~~ it conceives human operations to recur in an invariant structure of experiencing, understanding, judging, deciding, which, however, admits enormous differences in the patterns of experience, in the manner of understanding, in the judgements made, and in the decisions taken. ~~now is the time for all good men to~~ barbaric. Instead of thinking of ^f man in terms of a nature common to all men whether awake or asleep, geniuses or morons, saints or sinners, it attends principally to men in their concrete living. If it can discern common and invariant structures in human operations, it refuses to take flight from the particular to the universal and endeavors to meet the challenge of knowing people in all their diversity and mutability.

This concern for the concrete and the detailed has been forcing a twofold transformation upon Catholic theology. Before man's historicity became an acknowledged fact, Vincent of Lerins canon -- quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus -- was a truism. It was taken for granted that if one knew and understood the faith as it is preached today, then one could

not go wrong in interpreting the Old and New Testaments, the Greek and Latin Fathers, the Scholastics and the later controversialists. After all, all were saying just the same thing. ~~But~~ There was no need for endless scholars concentrating on this or that part of the bible, of patristic, or medieval, or later writings. But in the last hundred years this situation has been reversed. Interest in the concrete and the detailed has revealed development, var variation, change. What before was thought the province of one or two professors, cannot now be managed by less than a large and extensive collaboration. Just how this collaboration is to be carried out, is a fundamental problem in Catholic theology at the present time, and the solution of this problem will entail, I believe, a vigorous restructuring of theology.

But there is a further aspect of the matter. Concern for the concrete and the detailed has eliminated the faculty psychology that distinguished intellect and will, speculative and practical intellect. In its place has come the structure in which our conscious and intentional operations occur. The result has been to replace the practical intellect by the existential ^{first} subject, and the speculative intellect by the three of the four levels of conscious intentionality. Where before