

Do272

April 20.21.3.

Thesis 5. Our example of historians A and B demonstrates that neglect of the subject is responsible for many problems in contemporary theology.

The simple fact is that there are differences in theology that stem not from the data nor from the methods employed, but from the subjectivity of the theologians. The difficulties raised by these differences can be obviated only by analysis of the subject. But such analysis has tended to be neglected, overlooked, in modern theology. To the extent a theologian neglects the analysis of the subject, he cannot provide a coherent account of religion, morality, and the capacities of knowing. And to the extent he cannot provide such an account, he risks being a poor judge of religion, morality, and knowledge in others. If he is a poor judge, he will misinterpret them others, water down the fact, explain it away, reduce it to something else: myth, psychological need, superstitions, etc.

Thesis 6. Explicit analysis of the subject will effect self-appropriation, and the latter will reveal certain foundational facts about human knowing, morality, and religion.

The crucial issue in theology turns out to be the subjectivity of the theologian. It is because of contradictory assumptions regarding religion, morality, and knowing that theologians reach different conclusions. The only cure for these differences lies in self-appropriation of one's own cognitive, moral, and religious living. One must raise and answer the questions:

April 20. 21. 34

- a. What am I doing when I am knowing?
Why is doing that knowing?
What do I know when I do that?
- b. What am I doing when I am choosing?
- c. What am I doing when I respond to the ultimate mystery of existence?

The answers that I give to these questions will provide one, respectively, with an intellectual, moral, & religious self-appropriation. The problems of theology force this movement of δ - a on the theologian, as we have seen.

The facts about morality and religion we have seen already in discussing moral and religious conversion.

But we must investigate further what one will find when one's concern is intellectual ~~self-appropriation~~ self-appropriation.

Thesis 7. Human knowing is a compound of operations that unfold on three distinct but related levels of experience, understanding, and judging, ^{bound together by the questions that result from one's desire to know.} Following through on these operations brings one to a knowledge of the real. The recognition that knowing is thus constituted comes about through an intellectual conversion.

Comments: Our spontaneous inclination is to think of human knowing as analogous to looking. Knowing, we think, is taking a really good look at what is already out there now,

April 20. 21. 45

seeing all that there is to be seen, seeing nothing that is not there to be seen. This, however, is at best animal knowing, not fully human knowing.

1. Fully human knowing begins with

the empirical presentation of data

either of sense or of consciousness --

i.e., with sensations, images, memories,

feelings, etc --

2. These data are

~~and~~ is questioned as to their intelligibility. Issuing

from the questioning process is an insight.

Etc. Draw out of them.

→ Judgment as a knowledge of the real.

Thesis 8: The real is whatever can be intelligently grasped and reasonably affirmed. The real is known in true judgment.

Thesis 9: The elucidation of religious, moral, and intellectual conversion is the bridge between the first phase and the second phase of a modern empirical theology.