

1. Class Lists.Lecture 1.

How many are contracting for honors credit? Names.

2. Office hours: T-Th: 8:30 - 9:15 A.M.
T: 3:30 - 5:00 P.M.
and by appointment

Grandmota 305
(Theology)

(See 71: day students should please try to see me
during my daytime office hours.

Appointment times are for evening students).

3. Course description:

John Cavallini MW 11:40 - 12:40 Th 1:15 - 2:15
+ by appt.

Our concern in this course is threefold:

- 1) What are the principal characteristics
of the modern world? Can we assemble a composite
picture of the
 - 2) What is the role of Catholic Christianity
in this modern world?
 - 3) How can theology aid Catholic Christianity
in fulfilling this role?
- problems facing
contemp. humanity,
ind'ly + socially?

The first concern, detailing the principal characteristics of
the modern world, will take up the first $\frac{1}{3}$ of our course.
We will treat the topic in two ways. Your first reading
assignment will be the Preface and Introduction to the
Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, which has
been dictated and will be distributed at the end of class. How the
Ca. at Pat. II saw the m.w.
I am going to ask that you write a paper of 3-5 pp.
by Wed., Feb. 9 (Thurs., Feb. 10), three weeks from
today, summarizing in your own words how the Church
understands the problems and possibilities of mankind
today. What is the Catholic Church's basic vision of the modern
world?

I want the paper to be an original statement, based on your own synthesis of the reading. No quoting of the reading. Reorganize the material, present it in your own words.

While you are working on this paper, I will be lecturing on various features that have come together in modern times to form modern culture. These features are:

- 1 - modern science
- 2 - modern understanding of history
- 3 - the philosophy of the Enlightenment
- 4 - the mood of secularity
- 5 - atheism
- 6 - the broken image of humanity today
- 7 - the theme of human liberation
- 8 - human interdependence on a global scale

These eight topics will take up our first eight classes. Our ninth class, Wednesday, Feb. 16 (Thursday, Feb. 17) will be our first examination. It will cover the lectures and the reading from Vatican II.

The second ^{1/3} part of our course will deal with the second major topic, the role of Catholic Christianity in the modern world, and with part of the third, how theology can aid Christianity in fulfilling this role. At this point you will begin reading in the text for the course, Lonergan's A Second Collection, and I will begin lecturing on the thought of Lonergan. The chapters you will read

are the following:

- a one-page paper on each with one or two qns. given for you to answer.
- For Feb. 23 (24): "Belief: Today's Issue", pp. 87-99.
 Mar. 2 (3): "The Absence of God in Modern Culture," pp. 101-116.
 Mar. 9 (10): "The Future of Christianity", pp. 149-163.
 Mar. 23 (24): "Theology and Man's Future," pp. 135-148.

That will take us up to our 2nd exam, March 28 (29).

The final $\frac{1}{3}$ of the course will continue to deal with the role of theology in modern times and with the thought of Lösergau.

The readings for this final part of the course are:

- a one-page paper on each.
- For April 6 (7): "Theology in its New Context," pp. 55-67.

- against
- April 13 (14): "Revolution in Catholic Theology," pp. 231-238.

- April 20 (21): "The Subject," pp. 69-86.

- April 27 (28): "The Response of the Jesuit...", pp. 165-187.

- May 4 (5): "Philosophy and Theology," pp. 193-208.

There will be, then, 3 exams in all, including the final, and one paper of 3-5 pp., and 9 one-page papers on the readings from the textbook. Grade distribution: Papers: $\frac{1}{3}$.

Exam 1 = $\frac{2}{3} \times \frac{1}{3}$
Final = $\frac{1}{3}$ (counted)

Theo 128
Lecture 1, 4

My lectures on Lonergan will center on his notions of conversion and authenticity and on how these provide theology with its foundations.

Say a word about Lonergan.

- one author, rather than a smattering of many
 - L. as the principal contributors to the future of Catholic theology.
-

Those contracting for honors credit:

one extra paper: take any theological issue or question that interests you and compare the treatments given it in

The Catholic Encyclopedia

+ The New Catholic Encyclopedia

and show what changes have taken place
in the treatment of the subject
from one presentation to another.

2. The function of theology today.

Theology has been understood in various ways in the course of its history. Today theology is best understood as a reflection on Christian religious experience that attempts to mediate this experience with modern culture. Theology may be defined as "the pursuit of accurate understanding regarding the limit-dimension of human experience, regarding the referent of this dimension, and regarding the meaning of both this limit-dimension and its referent for the individual and cultural life of humankind."

I will say something later about the limit-dimension of human experience. For the moment, indeed for ~~the first 1/3 of the course~~, I want to focus on the last phrase in this definition: the individual and cultural life of humankind. What I want to do at the beginning of this course is attempt to understand as well as we can just what is the modern world in which we live. What are its principal constituents? What is emerging in our time? If theology's task is to mediate religion with modern culture, then it seems there are two entities that any theologian must understand if he or she is to do theology properly: what is Christianity? what is the modern world? We will deal with the second of these two questions first. Following this, I will attempt an understanding of Christianity. ~~Only then can we proceed to a discussion of the two main objectives of this course:~~ ^{w. Longman's aid} the role of the Catholic Church in the modern world, and the role of theology within the Catholic Church.

3. The constituents of Modern Culture.

As I indicated earlier, there are eight topics I want to discuss in answer to the questions concerning the principal constituents of the modern world: 1) modern science; 2) the modern understanding of history; 3) modern philosophy; 4) worldwide human interdependence; 5) secularization and secularism; 6) atheism; 7) the broken image of humanity today; and 8) the theme of integral human liberation.

Lecture 1, B 6

In one way or other, all of these topics are covered in the material you will read from Vatican II, but I want to cover them in a more thorough fashion, and try to pinpoint their cultural import, i.e., how they are the constituents of modern culture.

First, then, modern science and its cultural significance.

Obviously, these are all large topics, and I can do more than describe their cultural impact, their effect on the total human world in which we live.

1) First, then, modern science. There are many philosophies of science, many conflicting accounts of modern scientific method. What I propose to indicate is what is new, modern, about modern science, what distinguishes it from the scientific ideal of the ancients, and how this peculiarly modern twist has had an impact on the cultural lives of modern men and women. I take this from Lonergan, and you will meet it several times in your readings.

The ancient ideal of science was gradually built up by the Greeks, and was finally formulated by Aristotle. The major difference between the ancient science and modern science is not that modern science understands more than ancient science but that science is differently conceived by moderns from the way the Greeks conceived it. There is a quite different notion of scientific knowledge, of what is going on when one is doing science.

There were five elements that constituted the Greek ideal of

Chart 1 science as this was proposed by Aristotle: truth, certainty, knowledge, necessity, and causality. Science was envisaged as true, certain knowledge of causal necessity. In many ways this notion of science penetrates into modern thought. It is certainly present in the modern philosophers, Descartes (17th century) and Kant (18th century). But it has clearly broken down in our century. Modern science is not true, but on the way toward truth, hypothetical, probable.²⁾ It is thus not certain, for it claims no more than verified possibility.³⁾ It is not yet knowledge but hypothesis, the best available scientific opinion of our day.⁴⁾ It does not want to know necessity, but what cannot possibly be otherwise, but what in fact is so.⁵⁾ Finally it speaks not of Aristotle's four causes (end, agent, matter, and form) but of the explanations of all phenomena by the determinations of the terms and relations that account for all data.

These two different conceptions of science have far-reaching implications on the respective cultures they inform. Two very different world views emerge from these two different notions of science, and they radically affect the assumptions of a culture.

1. The divided ^{world} of the science
2. The notion of the human person
3. The scientific unified ^{universe of mod.}
4. The modern notion ^{of the} _{person.}

1) Thus, for the Greeks, the object of science was necessary. But the Greeks knew that there was much in our world that was not necessary but contingent. And so the Greeks divided the universe: the universe is partly necessary and partly contingent. Only what was necessary could be known by science. The rest had to be known only by opinion. Thus too the human mind was divided. Insofar as the universe was necessary, it could be known scientifically; but in so far as it was contingent, it could be known only by opinion. Theory and practice were also divided from one another: in so far as the universe was necessary, human operation could not change it, but could only contemplate it by theory. But in so far as it was contingent, it could be changed, and that was the realm of practice. Finally, there was a division set up between wisdom and prudence. Insofar as the universe was necessary, man could find ultimate and changeless foundations. To pursue there was philosophy, the pursuit of wisdom. But in so far as the universe was contingent, no hard and fast rules could be found to organize it, and prudence was the key to making one's way. This prudence of daily living had little to do with philosophy, which was intent on what was ultimate and unchanging.

2) The notion of man that came from this worldview was also quite determinate. If science concentrates on the essential, the universal, the necessary, then one formulates a notion of man that holds for all of us whether we are awake or asleep, infants or adults, morons or geniuses, sinners or saints; that emphasizes that you can't change human nature;

that ignores, from the standpoint of science, all that is accidental, contingent, and particular, such as the multiplicity and variety of personalities, the developments and achievements, catastrophes and breakdowns, of human living. The Greek notion of man, rooted in Greek science, is: Man is a rational animal, composed of body and immortal soul, endowed with vital, sensitive, and intellectual powers, in need of habits and able to acquire them, free and responsible in his deliberations and decisions, subject to natural and positive law. Everything particular, concrete, contingent is excluded from such a definition.

- 3) Modern science gives rise to a very different worldview and thus to a different conception of set of assumptions that inform our culture.
- 4) Just as we do not contrast science and opinion, but speak of scientific opinion, so we do not exclude any data from being ^{investigated} by science.³⁾ So too we do not divide theory and practice into two compartments, one dealing with the universal and necessary and the other with the particular and the contingent. Rather, we orient our theory to practice, and our practice is the fruit of our theory. There is pure science (theory) and applied science (practice), but both are science. While they are ~~not~~ distinct, they are not separate, as they were for the Greeks, but are linked together by investigation, discovery, invention, insight.³⁾ If our minds are not divided, at least in the same way as for the Greeks, we do not make the same distinction they made between wisdom and prudence, nor do we conceive philosophy as the pursuit of what is ultimate and unchanging. Rather, philosophy has invaded the field of the concrete, the particular, the contingent. Philosophers in the modern world write about individual people's decisions, about the history of societies and ~~cultures~~ cultures. Wisdom is now a matter of concrete living. It is concerned with practice, with alienation, with authenticity.⁴⁾ We have, consequently, a new image of the human

person. The accidental, contingent, particular lie within and not outside of our modern humankind. All the men of every time and place, all their thoughts and words and deeds, provide the data for our modern study of the human person. The human person is no longer standardized in an arbitrary fashion. We know that the human spirit expresses itself in symbols, we affirm the priority of the symbolic, and we say that if really want to know what human persons are, study the symbols through which they express themselves: ^{their gestures, rituals, myths, etc.} for example, study their dreams. ~~But we have many different theories of dreams - Freud, Jung, Binswanger - who is correct?~~ We know too that people express themselves inter-subjectively not just in words, but through their bodily presence to one another, by their shift of eyes, their countenance, their color, the tone of their voice, their posture and stance. Another person in this way works immediately on my subjectivity, and I on his. Without saying a word, I can encourage another to meet me or I can quietly close the door. Modern humankind studies such things. It also studies our perceiving, our preconceptual activities, our freedom. ^{The point is:} All of these particular, contingent, accidental phenomena lie within the purview of modern humankind.

for modern culture arises largely out of the modern science of the human person:
The problem: When the human person was abstractly standardized according to a cultural ideal, it was not difficult at least for the well-to-do to decide what to make of themselves -- they would strive to be the standardized educated person. Today we may feel ourselves standardized by a different cultural ideal, but the very fact that we feel it means that we can criticize this standardized product, that we have an awareness of myriad other possibilities to choose from, that we can choose not to be a standardized middle class suburbanite if we want to. ^{what} But will we positively choose to be? The agony of that decision imposes itself on every intelligent person facing adulthood. Who can tell us? We can find psychologists, philosophers,

educators who will interpret our dreams and our symbols, our smiles and our gestures; who will analyze our minds and chart our souls; who will interpret in different and conflicting ways the course of history -- and all in the ~~the name of~~ name of science. Who is to judge, who to decide? This is the cultural impact of the modern scientific ideal. We have or at least seem to have no secure intellectual foothold. ^{Everything is opinion, hypothesis.} Even the best minds, our scientists, claim no more for their affirmations than possibility. We have no authorities to turn to, for they too are no more human than we are, and we can chart the reasons they said what they said, and we can find conflicting interpretations of what they meant. Are we left to relativism, to scepticism? Is there a control of meaning that will replace the one that has broken down? This is the modern question in at least one of its major forms.

Theo 128,
Lecture 1,
Charts

1. Ancient and Modern science

truth	hypothesis
certainty	possibility
knowledge	opinion
necessity	fact
four causes	mathematically expressed correlations

2. The divided ^{world} ~~universe~~ of Greek science:

universe: necessity / contingency

mind: knowledge / opinion

operations: theory / practice

ideals: wisdom / prudence

