

D0265

1. Faith and beliefs.
 2. ~~The~~ The problem of God at the every day level.
 3. Religious conversion.
-

1. a. To transform modern culture = to transform meanings & values by wh. people live.

How? By promoting authenticity.

Which is? In part, moral conversion.

b. Meanings & values = beliefs, in large part.

Problem w. beliefs today?

Why especially acute for Catholics?

- What clues are offered in BTI?

(next page)

A NOTE ON "PUTTING IT IN YOUR OWN WORDS"

RE: the writing and grading of papers for Theo. 128, Spring '77

This handout is intended to explain the purpose of the weekly short papers which you are asked to write for this course. Hopefully it will prove helpful to you when you sit down to write the papers, and when you look over the grades you'll find on them when they're given back.

We will be reading nine essays by Bernard Lonergan in the course of the semester, one each week, and we are asking you to write a 1-1½ page essay on seven of those nine essays. You are free to choose the seven which you find most intriguing (or, to leave out the two you found least intriguing) with the exception of the following three: "Belief, Today's Issue", "Theology in its New Context," and "The Subject". An essay is required for each of these.

The short essays are meant as an exercises in helping you to collect your thoughts about the various individual essays. The basic idea is for you to put in your own words the major points raised in the essay at hand. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ As an aid to help you focus on the points that are major, we will usually formulate a question or two, to be handed out a week before the paper is due, towards ~~w~~ (one of) which your essay is to be directed. In your own words, then, you will address the question which is asked of each essay. Now there are several ways of putting something in your own words--one is to simply write "Lonergan said "...'" followed by a quotation of the relevant passages. Of course that is not much better than copying. One step above this is paraphrasing. For example, many of you, in your essays on the Vatican II document, patterned your paragraph structure after the numbered paragraph structure in the document, paraphrasing the content of each as you went along. Now at this level of writing you are certainly putting the document's thought in your own words, but you are still simply repeating, for the most part, the contents of the document. If someone came along and asked you, "Now just what did that document say?" you would have no choice but to read him your entire paraphrase--since your paper doesn't ~~say~~ say what the Council members were trying to get at, it only repeats ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~, although in different words, their thought.

A much better way of putting something in your own words is to ask yourself the question, "Now just what is this essay saying?"--and answer it, in a brief, clear, concise essay. This usually involves isolating a dominant theme in the work at hand ~~(xxx)~~ (for example, a major theme of the Vatican II document seems to be the conception of modern ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ world as one in which sees rapid material progress without a correspondingly rapid spiritual growth) and organizing your essay around that theme, interpreting other themes and issues raised in the work in the light of this theme (for example, the document makes a point of also characterizing

Questions:

- * 1) Do you see any solution to this in BT1? (faith & expressions).
 * 2) What would you suggest? (Go beneath expressions to faith, find new ways of expressing faith).
 * 3) Clues:

Qw. of how we know God & about God? Can't be by modern sci -- why? -- but doesn't mean God cannot be known at all. (95)

Beliefs are in humans, faith is in God (96f.)
 who has entered into the division of labor by wk. men come to know, and value, & has done so in a unique way (97) -- how?

Adaptation in religion is more in form & structures than in content (97)

-- from outer to inner reality of religion

- 4) What is inner reality of religion?
- 5) Religious cv & moral cv
- 6) Uniqueness of Christianity

1. a. What are the conditions of the environment that contribute to the development of common sense?
 - b. What is the general form of the common sense that is the product of these conditions?
2. How do the analogies and generalizations of common sense differ from those of logical science?
3. Common sense is also said to differ from science in:
 - a. its viewpoint and ideal
 - b. its language
 - c. the plane of reality envisaged by common sense meaning
 - d. the questions common sense will entertain.
 Explain each difference.
4. Science and common sense are mutually exclusive and one must choose between them. True or false and why?
5. What does Bergson mean by the differentiations of common sense?

II. The Subjective Field of Common Sense

1. (181) "There is, then, a subtle ambiguity in the apparently evident statement that common sense relates things to us." Explain.
2. Patterns of experience:
 - a. What is it abstract to speak of a sensation? What two elements are always concomitant with a sensation?
 - b. What is a pattern of experience? What is its determinant feature?
 - c. In what way is the notion of a pattern of experience the result of an insight?
3. Biological pattern of experience:
 - a. What does insight grasp in certain patterns of experience to give rise to the notion of a biological pattern of experience?
 - b. How does the notion of the biological pattern take us beyond behaviorism? beyond a narrow positivism?
 - c. How does the notion not violate the canon of parsimony?
 - d. How does the notion of the pattern not, however, violate the canon of selection?
 - e. "A more informative characterization of the biological pattern of experience is to be obtained by comparing animals and plants." (183) What do animals and plants have in common? How is this common element supplemented in the animal by a biological pattern of experience peculiar to animal life? When does the biological pattern emerge, and for what purpose?
 - f. What is extraversion? elementary experience? the confrontational element of consciousness? the elementary object? the elementary subject?
4. Aesthetic pattern of experience:
 - a. How does the aesthetic pattern differ from the biological?
 - b. Is art identical with the aesthetic pattern? What is the role of insight in art? How does it differ from the role of insight in mathematics, science, and common sense?

C. What is faith, as opposed to beliefs?

(inner reality of religion)

discovery of God.

Problem: how is God discovered in human life? today?

AGMC deals with these problems. Your work esp. dealt w. discovery of God in everyday life. L. deals w. 3 problem areas: Before coming to deal

w. them ourselves, certain distinctions have to be made clear:

a. difference betw. social & cultural

b. two levels of the cultural

c. religion & theology: for now we are talking about religion, the everyday level; last part of course will deal w. superstructure, w. theology.

The problem of God at the everyday level, at the level of ings & values by which we live:

a. A reinterpretation of man and his world in modern culture, from which God is absent:

-- began in superstructure -- where? Enlightenment philosophy, natural & human sciences, history

-- popularized at everyday level

-- what are some of the factors that will be involved in this modern reinterpretation? (what we saw in 1st part of course in re: modern science, history, of E., secular humanism, atheism, broken image of man in social & behavioral sciences).

-- clear fr. Anne McT's question: culture at everyday level is not promotive of interiority as criterion

the modern world as a place of contradictions--another theme--
an example of which is the possession of an immense amount of
technical know-how and equipment, in spite of which there is still
much starvation, etc., and which is ~~now~~ even used for oppressive
purposes. From the standpoint of the theme we have chosen as
the one we will work with, the one which will be definitive, we can
see ~~xxxxxxxx~~ that this situation is a result of a value
system which is not as mature as the technology which it is directing
--that is, our spiritual growth has not kept pace with our material
growth. Note that this could have been worked the other way--
We could have chosen the theme of contradiction as our major theme,
and understood the theme of immense material growth/meagre spiritual
growth as a function of this theme. The point is, we do choose
a theme, and use it to unify, to make sense out of, all the other
points we bring up.). This way the paper says something in the
end--we truly say something in our own words, something all our
own, a synthetic commentary. And it doesn't have to be long, either.
In fact, its best when kept down to a page or two, made up of
two to four (about) tight, well-conceived paragraphs, which follow
each other in logical sequence.

You should not be discouraged if your first few attempts don't
quite make it. The idea is--we're practicing. In some manner
of speaking, this should be an enjoyable task (although admittedly
difficult). Read the ^{essay} ~~essay~~ through several times, one or two times
quickly to get the general idea, not getting hung up on difficult
spots, and then perhaps a third time more carefully, working over
the places you found difficult. It is best to separate the readings
from each other by a day or two. But write immediately after your
careful reading. Of course this method is only a suggestion, a
place to start from. You should feel your own way.

With the above in mind, grades were assigned the papers
on Vatican II in the following way:

An A was given those papers which said something, which
represented a synthesis of the material in the way explained above.
Such synthesis is by its nature original work, shows a thorough
amount of comprehension buttressed by a good bit of reflection.

A B was given ~~xxx~~ those papers which for the most part were
paraphrasing, and doing it correctly. Also receiving B's were
papers which tried to be synthetic, but failed at the same time
to raise all or most of the issues that were in fact raised in
the document.

A C was given for those papers which paraphrased, but with
no evident structure grounding the attempt (not even the ordered
paragraph sequence of the document), and which either paraphrased
incorrectly, or failed to raise issues which the document in fact
raised. Usually a C paper could be described as "vague".

A D was given those few papers which had almost nothing in
common with the document, reflecting a prefatory or a non-existent
reading of the text. No F's were given this time.

IF ANYONE FEELS THEY HAVE BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY -- it is
your responsibility to come talk about it. Please do.

-- what have been prob's in Church's dealing w. this reinterpretation?

a) classicism: escaping history
Aristotelian notions of science
defensive reaction agst. modern science
& history bec. of their anti-religious orientation

b) now, the opposite: a mere swing of the pendulum

-- what is L's recommendation?

aggiornamento -- which is?

a) disengagement fr. classicism, involvement in modern culture (Christians have always been involved in the culture of their times, until today)

b) - not desertion of the past, but disengagement fr. its limitations in a discerning & discriminating way

- not just acceptance of the present, but active of its evils as well as of its good, and meeting evil with good by the power of the cross, thus transforming evil into good (another & closer approximation to "the transf. of modern culture -- what wd. this mean?")

A NOTE ON "PUTTING IT IN YOUR OWN WORDS"

RE: the writing and grading of papers for Theo. 128, Spring '77

This handout is intended to explain the purpose of the weekly short papers which you are asked to write for this course. Hopefully it will prove helpful to you when you sit down to write the papers, and when you look over the grades you'll find on them when they're given back.

We will be reading nine essays by Bernard Lonergan in the course of the semester, one each week, and we are asking you to write a 1-1½ page essay on seven of those nine essays. You are free to choose the seven which you find most intriguing (or, to leave out the two you found least intriguing) with the exception of the following three: "Belief, Today's Issue", "Theology in its New Context," and "The Subject". An essay is required for each of these.

The short essays are meant as an exercises in helping you to collect your thoughts about the various individual essays. The basic idea is for you to put in your own words the major points raised in the essay at hand. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ As an aid to help you focus on the points that are major, we will usually formulate a question or two, to be handed out a week before the paper is due, towards which (one of) which your essay is to be directed. In your own words, then, you will address the question which is asked of each essay. Now there are several ways of putting something in your own words--one is to simply write "Lonergan said '...'" followed by a quotation of the relevant passages. Of course that is not much better than copying. One step above this is paraphrasing. For example, many of you, in your essays on the Vatican II document, patterned your paragraph structure after the numbered paragraph structure in the document, paraphrasing the content of each as you went along. Now at this level of writing you are certainly putting the document's thought in your own words, but you are still simply repeating, for the most part, the contents of the document. If someone came along and asked you, "Now just what did that document say?" you would have no choice but to read him your entire paraphrase!--since your paper doesn't ~~xxx~~ say what the Council members were trying to get at, it only repeats ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~, although in different words, their thought.

A much better way of putting something in your own words is to ask yourself the question, "Now just what is this essay saying?"--and answer it, in a brief, clear, concise essay. This usually involves isolating a dominant theme in the work at hand ~~xxx~~ (for example, a major theme of the Vatican II document seems to be the conception of modern ~~xxxxxx~~ world as one ~~in~~ which sees rapid material progress without a correspondingly rapid spiritual growth) and organizing your essay around that theme, interpreting other themes and issues raised in the work in the light of this theme (for example, the document makes a point of also characterizing

b. the transformation of man's control over nature and a consequent reordering of society (114)

- re: nature -- technology, automation, built-in obsolescence, population explosion, increasing longevity
- re: society -- urbanism, mobility, detached & functional relations, universal education (prolonged & continuing), increasing leisure & travel, instantaneous information, perpetually available entertainment
- God appears an intruder, etc.
- problem in Church's dealing w. this?

rigorously codified religious organizations
can't move w. times, etc., 114, integrism

- will God be absent from everyday modern culture if Church frees itself fr. this integrism? L's answer is "No."

c. a new sense of power & responsibility, 114 f.

- a concern that can seem purely secular but only if religion is a blind traditionalism
- rare moral achievement, heroic charity
- God's presence is potential

but not just potential

"The Spirit of God is moving the hearts of many and, in Paul Tillich's phrase, ultimate concern has grasped them." → future of Christianity.

the modern world as a place of contradictions--another theme-- an example of which is the possession of an immense amount of technical know-how and equipment, in spite of which there is still much starvation, etc., and which is ~~now~~ even used for oppressive purposes. From the standpoint of the theme we have chosen as the one we will work with, the one which will be definitive, we can see ~~immediately~~ that this situation is a result of a value system which is not as mature as the technology which it is directing --that is, our spiritual growth has not kept pace with our material growth. Note that this could have been worked the other way-- We could have chosen the theme of contradiction as our major theme, and understood the theme of immense material growth/meagre spiritual growth as a function of this theme. The point is, we do choose a theme, and use it to unify, to make sense out of, all the other points we bring up.) This way the paper says something in the end--we truly say something in our own words, something all our own, a synthetic commentary. And it doesn't have to be long, either. In fact, its best when kept down to a page or two, made up of two to four (about) tight, well-conceived paragraphs, which follow each other in logical sequence.

You should not be discouraged if your first few attempts don't quite make it. The idea is--we're practicing. In some manner of speaking, this should be an enjoyable task (although admittedly difficult). Read the ^{paragraph} essay through several times, one or two times quickly to get the general idea, not getting hung up on difficult spots, and then perhaps a third time more carefully, working over the places you found difficult. It is best to separate the readings from each other by a day or two. But write immediately after your careful reading. Of course this method is only a suggestion, a place to start from. You should feel your own way.

With the above in mind, grades were assigned the papers on Vatican II in the following way:

An A was given those papers which said something, which represented a synthesis of the material in the way explained above. Such synthesis is by its nature original work, shows a thorough amount of comprehension buttressed by a good bit of reflection.

A B was given ~~for~~ those papers which for the most part were paraphrasing, and doing it correctly. Also receiving B's were papers which tried to be synthetic, but failed at the same time to raise all or most of the issues that were in fact raised in the document.

A C was given for those papers which paraphrased, but with no evident structure grounding the attempt (not even the ordered paragraph sequence of the document), and which either paraphrased incorrectly, or failed to raise issues which the document in fact raised. Usually a C paper could be described as "vague".

A D was given those few papers which had almost nothing in common with the document, reflecting a prefatory or a non-existent reading of the text. No F's were given this time.

IF ANYONE FEELS THEY HAVE BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY -- it is your responsibility to come talk about it. Please do.