It seems to me now that my earlier characterization of the traditional way of doing theology as a form of rationalization rather than critical reflection can and should be improved upon.

Although it's not entirely wide of the mark, a more accurate characterization, I think, is that doing theology in the traditional way is a matter of reasoning *from* positions already taken, or assumed to be valid, rather than reasoning *for* them. Simply accepting certain criteria as valid, one then reasons from them as, in effect, axioms from which certain theorems can be validly deduced.

Such is precisely what I mean by reflecting, or appropriating, relatively less than more critically. On the other hand, to reflect, or appropriate, more rather than less critically is to concern oneself with critically validating the axioms.

17 November 2008