

1. What is the difference between history 1 and history 2? Which of these is the subject matter of these two chapters?
2. Do the two chapters have different emphases? Why is the material divided into two chapters?
3. Lonergan begins the chapter by noting that the object of historical inquiry and the nature of historical investigation are matters of some obscurity. What for him is the object of historical inquiry? Where in the text is evidence for your answer?
4. What is Lonergan's overall attitude to the critical historical method? Again, what indications from the text can you provide?
5. What is the point of the first section of chapter 8, 'Nature and History.' To put the question another way, why are these reflections on time introduced at the beginning of the study of the writing of history?
6. What is the field of historical investigation? What differentiates this field from the field of natural-scientific investigation? What is the relevance of chapter 3, on Meaning, for understanding the historical field? How does this introduce a difference between history and natural science? How do historical and scientific expression differ?
- ✓7. What is meant by 'what is going forward'?
- ✓8. What is meant by the claim that 'where exegesis is concerned to determine what a particular person meant, history is concerned to determine what, in most cases, contemporaries do not know?' Why is it the case that contemporaries do not know what is going forward? How is this related to the distinction in section 2 between historical experience and historical knowledge?
9. What is the relation between history and the kind of human science that does regard meaning as constitutive of human action?
- ✓10. Referring back to p. 128 in the chapter on 'Functional Specialties,' what is the substantial concern of history as part of theology? How is this related to basic and general history?
- ✓11. What are some of the elements in the series of steps that leads from rudimentary existential or precritical history to scientific or critical history? Again, what is the difference between stringing together credible testimonies and achieving historical knowledge? What constitutes historical evidence? What is the difference between potential, formal, and actual evidence? Why is this process called ecstatic? selective? constructive? critical?
12. What is meant by the following statement: 'Now it is the distinguishing mark of critical history that the process occurs twice?' (189)
13. What are historical *discoveries*?
14. When do historical investigations come to a term? What is the criterion?
15. What are the sources of historical revision? What are the limits of historical revision?
16. What is critical history at the second degree?
- ✓17. How is it the case that historical procedures effect at least a partial elimination of historical relativism?
18. What is the overall point of chapter 9?
- ✓19. What is the difference between historical data and historical facts? How is this distinction related to the fact that the process of critical history occurs twice?
- ✓20. What is perspectivism? How does it differ from relativism?