

CANADA

SPRING 1985

COMPASS

A J E S U I T J O U R N A L



SPECIAL ISSUE
HONOURING
BERNARD LONERGAN S.J.
1904 - 1984



“...a grain of wheat...a rich harvest”

In Memoriam
Patris Bernardi Lonergan S.J., 1904-1984



On November 26, 1984, Father Bernard Lonergan entered peacefully into eternal life. Just three weeks before his death, some twenty-one people whose lives and work he had profoundly affected agreed to submit short tributes and accounts of his influence. These were to be printed in this special issue of *Compass*, as a mini*Festschrift* from his own Jesuit Province, and as a small way of honouring him on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, which he would have reached on December 17, 1984. Those contributions written before his death might read a little differently if they were being composed now. But we have decided to print them by and large as they were written. Some of them reflect what their authors wanted to say to Bernard Lonergan as he turned eighty. Others indicate the impact of his thought on the authors' fields of study or institutional projects. All of them remain valid testimonies to the importance and significance of this great man, this superb philosopher and theologian, this holy Jesuit priest. - **Frederick E. Crowe, S.J., and Robert M. Doran, S.J., editors, Regis College, Toronto.**

I The Lonergan Family

"The bond of mother and child, man and wife, father and son, reaches into a past of ancestors to give meaning and cohesion to the clan or tribe or nation." - Insight, p. 212.

"So married life is launched... a focal point in the stream of history for the fostering of growth in the mind and heart of Christ, a pursuit of the highest human and eternal ends." – Collection, p. 37.

"What moves men and women is some concrete aspect of history, a national destiny, the maintenance of a cultural tradition, the continuity of a family; and even this will be apprehended by parents not in its abstract generality, but concretely as the good of bringing into the world and leaving in it behind them others like themselves." - Ibid., p. 48.

Some of Father Lonergan's most beautiful and most neglected sentences concern the purposes, the functions, and the joys of a Christian family. His readers may have suspected that the source of his thinking here lay in his own boyhood history, and this was abundantly verified in the last months of his life, when his mental powers were fading but he could still recall the past and reminisce about his family: father and mother, brothers, Aunt Minnie and other relatives. We thought this was the place to begin our issue of *Compass*, prefacing our tributes with a short account of the Lonergan family by Professor Valentine Rice, who is preparing a biography of Father Lonergan. - **Editors.**

THE LONERGANS OF BUCKINGHAM

Valentine Rice
Trinity College, Dublin

Bernard Lonergan was born on December 17, 1904, in the town of Buckingham, in that southwestern part of Quebec that is across the Ottawa River from Ontario. He was the first of three boys born to Gerald Lonergan, a civil engineer, and Josephine Wood, the daughter of a wheelwright at the local mill.

The town is dominated by the Lièvre, a great wide river that flows down from the mountains and empties into the Ottawa four miles



July 12, 1933, in front of the family home in Buckingham: L to R: Bernie, Gerald Lonergan, Josephine Wood Lonergan, Greg, Aunt Minnie, Mark.

below the town. Here at a waterfall Captain Joshua Smith built a sawmill in 1825. The town grew up around the mill; at the same time the first farmers moved into the area. It was a frontier town in the early days, but by 1904 it was confidently prosperous. There was a public water supply and a power station that supplied electricity after 4 p.m. every day; there were wooden sidewalks on the main street and separate elementary schools for boys and girls. The town was predominantly Catholic; of the population of 3,000 some three-quarters were French-Canadians. The wealthiest man in town was James McLaren, who owned the sawmill.



Bernie and Greg Lonergan in front of the family home, Buckingham

The Lonergans had come out from Ireland well before the great Famine of 1847. Two brothers, John and Timothy Lonergan, from the parish of Holy Cross, in County Tipperary, were settled as farmers in the parish of Ste. Thérèse de Blainville, outside Montreal, as early as 1830. They married two sisters, Ellen and Bridget Casey, from County Waterford. All of their descendants became French-speaking, with the exception of Michael Lonergan, the son of Timothy and Bridget. In 1865 Michael married Frances Gorman, daughter of Hugh Gorman, one of the earliest settlers in Buckingham, and moved to a Gorman farm about three miles upriver from the town. Their life was a struggle with fortune; they lost eight of their fourteen children. Michael was not particularly successful as a farmer, and so for twenty years he ran a butcher's shop in the town.

Gerald Lonergan was the second son of Michael Lonergan and Frances Gorman. He was a bright boy who worked as an untrained teacher in the local school until the parish priest encouraged his father to send him to university. He graduated in engineering at McGill

University and qualified as a Dominion surveyor. His working life was spent in mapping the Western territories; he would leave Buckingham with the first thaw of spring and would return when the snow was falling. In March of 1904 he married Josephine Helen Wood, the daughter of Jane Harrison and Hiram B. Wood. The Harrisons and Woods were of English stock; both of Josephine's grandfathers had become Catholics in adult life.

Josephine Wood went westward with her husband for the spring and summer of 1904; she returned pregnant, and her son Bernard was born on December 17 in her parents' home. Before he left again after the winter Gerald bought a large house on Pine Avenue which had been built by a medical doctor some forty years before. He invited his wife's parents to come to live with them; in due course he persuaded her sister Minnie to leave her job in the local post-office to become her companion. For this he paid her the equivalent of her government salary. And so was established the stable but somewhat unorthodox domestic structure in which the young Bernard Lonergan would spend his boyhood.

Two other children were born to the marriage, Gregory, who would also become a Jesuit; and Mark, who would study engineering and work in industry. They all served Mass in the local church and they walked the two hundred yards down Pine Avenue to St. Michael's College. It was run by the Brothers of Christian Instruction and functioned in practice as two separate schools. There was, in effect, a small three-teacher school for the English-speaking boys and a larger school for the boys from the French-speaking community. In summer the young Lonergans would bathe in the river, to the great terror of their mother; she would take them for a few weeks' holiday every year to the farm near Cornwall where her sister was married to Jimmy Willy McDonnell. In winter Gerald would return on the train and would harness his team of horses and take the family for Sunday sleigh rides up the frozen river.

Bernard's ability did not attract particular attention during his elementary school years, though his brothers remembered, in retrospect, that he liked to read the stock market reports in the newspaper. At the age of fourteen he was sent as a boarder to Loyola College in Montreal, where, in spite of a serious illness, he completed in two years the High School component of the old Cours Classique, taking first place in his class and winning the Governor- General's medal.



A relaxing moment: Greg, Bernie and Mark, at nephew Gerry's in Roxborro (near Montreal), July, 1979.

At the age of seventeen, in the course of a two-hour ride across Montreal in a streetcar, he decided that he would become a Jesuit. He entered the novitiate at Guelph on July 29, 1922. - At this point Bernard's "family" enlarged to include that of his Order and, eventually, of his worldwide circle of students and readers. So I may leave to them the further chapters of the Lonergan story.

II Personal Tributes

*"Inevitably such a thinker founds a school for what he builds is built securely, and what the span of mortal life or the limitations of his era force him to leave undone that none the less already stands potentially within the framework of his thinking and the suggestiveness of his approach."- **Grace and Freedom, p.140.***

*"Only by the slow, repetitious circular labor of going over and over the data, by catching here a little insight and there another, by following through false leads and profiting from many mistakes by continuous adjustments and cumulative changes of one's initial suppositions and perspectives and concepts can one hope to attain such a development of one's own understanding as to hope to understand what Aquinas understood and meant."- **Verbum, p. 216.***

Father Lonergan would object - vehemently, no doubt - to any mention of his founding a school; still, what he had to say about St. Thomas Aquinas applies so well to what his students experienced in studying his work that this pair of quotations seemed an apt introduction to this section. It contains tributes from people who had known Father Lonergan personally for many years, and been touched by the grace of his life and work in their own lives and work. We asked them to write under the general heading, "What Bernard Lonergan Has Meant to Me." Here is what they had to say. - **Editors.**

A TRIBUTE

William Arthur Stewart, S.J.
Saint Mary's University, Halifax

By and large former students are not noted for paying tribute to their teachers, and so I am grateful for this opportunity to acknowledge my debt to Father Lonergan.

As a student of philosophy in the old Jesuit Seminary I was left with more questions than answers. But I was fortunate a few years later to have Father Lonergan as a professor during four years of theological studies. Now admittedly no one can ask all possible questions let alone find all possible answers. That was one point we quickly learned. At the same time previously unanswered questions gave way to reasonable solutions.

That was a lucky break for me, for at the end of theology I was posted to Saint Mary's University to teach philosophy, a task I would have been rather poorly equipped to do had it not been for the knowledge absorbed from Father Lonergan's teaching and writing. Indeed any success my courses may have achieved is owed in very large part to him. I refer not merely to their substance but as well to the methodology, a most important element in a teacher's attempts to enlighten the minds before him. First and foremost Father Lonergan taught to one's understanding. Facts, dates, documents can be found in handbooks. But there is no handbook for an understanding of the data which the sources present. And so teaching must be aimed not at memorization but at

the development of understanding. The student must learn to stand on his own intellectual two feet and achieve a growing measure of intellectual independence. Ultimately the goal (and it is one to which Lonergan has directed a major part of his efforts) is the understanding of understanding itself.

A further debt arises from Lonergan's contribution to what may be an unexpected area, the spiritual life. How many of my homilies, sermons, seminars, retreats have drawn inspiration from his thought. The notions of authenticity, of self transcendence, of moral impotence, to name a few, are rich in their spiritual implications and bear fruit in their contemplation.

I have merely scratched the surface of debt's treasure house. Space allows me only a concluding attempt of the student to turn the tables on the master. When Father Lonergan taught me in freshman year at Loyola College, his favourite word of commendation to a student was "Superb!" Ten years later in his theology lectures, the expression was translated into "Optime quidem!" Now so many years later, the student can do no better than to say in tribute to his teacher, "Optime quidem! - Superb!"

PORTRAIT OF BERNIE

Tad Dunne, S.J.

Loyola House, Berkley, Michigan

You do not photograph very well, Bernie. There is a picture of you on *Method's* dust jacket that presents a man terrifyingly brilliant, with perhaps a shadow of discomfort. Nor does Bachrach's portrait do you justice. They portray a mind, but not a heart. I wish there were a picture that says, as you have said so clearly, "Be in love."

Still, I cannot picture you saying "Be in love" while looking a person straight in the eye. I imagine you rather as a cunning mountain guide, with your steel-gray eyes fixed on the path, except for those poignant moments when we glimpse for ourselves how lies the land. Then your face lights up with delight, like the time the young woman rushed into your class one morning and proclaimed, "I got it!" This is the look I want: delight in the company of discovery.

Perhaps we expect that a photograph should represent what a person has achieved - a person's wisdom, wit, or success. These you possess in abundance. But your achievement shifts attention away from yourself and towards our own questions about the problems we face.

Portraits of your own spiritual mentor, St. Ignatius Loyola, make him appear uncomfortable in the same way, and perhaps for the same reason. He too told us very little about what he knew of God and a great deal about our search for God. Just as you clarified what our knowing and deciding are like, so Ignatius taught us to scrutinize the feelings by which we name things worthy or unworthy. You object to the term "Lonerganians" just as Ignatius objected to "Ignatians."

Like Ignatius, you tell us to look at ourselves rather than at you, urging us to find God in our own hearts and in our own histories. If you have to sit and be "portrayed," you get nervous. You love

exceedingly well, Bernie. You have escorted me behind concepts to insights, behind words to persons, behind human behaviour to sinners-in-love. If you can be called a Doctor of the Church, then, like Aquinas, you are an Angelic Doctor - not exactly Michael the Conqueror, nor Gabriel the Herald, but Raphael - a wise and kindly guide for the soul.

"NO BUMPS OR DENTS"

W.F. Ryan, S.J.
Gonzaga University, Spokane

In 1959 I came to Regis College in Toronto to make my seminary theological studies. At the beginning and the middle of my first year, I could not grasp what theology was about, and at the end, I feared I would still be satisfying these three conditions of Aristotle for a tragedy, for I still was not going to understand what I was doing. Our main textbooks were by Father Lonergan. Father Crowe was teaching the courses in systematic theology, informing us that theology should be studied according to Lonergan's method, and presenting the essentials of the method; he informed me that I did not have the method. But he did show me how to go about finding it.

I studied Lonergan's works carefully and, disappointing Aristotle's prescription for a tragedy, at the end of the first year I did get some notion of what I was doing. During the final three years of the studies at Regis, I became more encouraged as I observed Lonergan's way of attacking problems. While studying theology and scripture, I also tried to employ his powerful method in mathematics and philosophy. I discovered that his works had forced me to a position where I always asked myself: "Why does Lonergan always get the right answer?" There was of course the other question: "Why don't I?"

Then in 1963 I went to Europe for Tertianship and for doctoral studies in philosophy at Louvain. In Louvain, for the first time I read Father Lonergan's great book, *Insight*, from cover to cover. Shortly afterwards, I ran into a quaint phrase of his: "An insight into a circle has no bumps or dents." I was astonished. I grasped clearly that an insight is not just more sensing, like staring at the bumps and dents on a wheel. And finally I grasped that by having insights and recognizing them, one enters into the world of Lonergan's method, the world where sensing and insights perform such radically disparate functions.

In 1968 I came to know Father Lonergan personally. With the aid of his warm friendship, I was able to reinforce and expand some of my studies. The specific study in which I now try to apply his method is research on Viktor Frankl, the Austrian psychiatrist. I still ask: "Why does Lonergan always get the right answer?" And, of course, the answer is that the insight into a circle has no bumps or dents.

WHAT LONERGAN HAS MEANT TO ME

Bernard Tyrrell, S.J.
Gonzaga University, Spokane

When I hear the name "Lonergeran" I think of the unique person who is Bernie Lonergan and also of a dynamic, contemporary movement in Christian thought. There is Bernie Lonergan, fellow Jesuit priest, mentor and friend. There is also Bernard J. F Lonergan, premier philosopher, theologian, methodologist and initiator of one of the most significant developments in contemporary Christian thought. It is difficult, if not impossible, for me to distinguish between the "two" Lonergans when it comes to writing about "what Lonergan has meant to me."

Father Lonergan's greatest impact on me is rooted in his profound analysis of the meaning of intellectual, moral and religious conversion. In my journeying with Lonergan over the years certain memories stand out. I will mention just three.

While studying at Fordham University in 1961 two Jesuits, Joe Flanagan and Al Fritch, introduced me to *Insight* and to Lonergan's articles on the "word" in Aquinas. I recall distinctly the moment when, after a conversation with Joe Flanagan about the meaning of a passage in the Aquinas articles, I suddenly experienced that flash of insight which made all the difference and was the beginning of my intellectual conversion. Lonergan writes of the "startling strangeness" of this moment of insight into insight and the accuracy of his observation is validated by the vividness of my memory of that epiphanic moment at Fordham.

Again, I recall hearing Father Lonergan lecture on religious and moral conversion in 1968 at Boston College. I remember being deeply shaken by the insight that the religious and moral conversion of the theologian is as important for doing good theology as the intellectual conversion of the philosopher is for doing good philosophy. This moment of transformative understanding has served ever since as a religious and moral imperative for me in my writing and teaching.

My most recent encounter with Bernie Lonergan was in his room at Boston College in June 1982 when he told me he was going to have a serious operation and asked for my prayers. I gave him an awkward hug and left his room sad and yet hopeful because Bernie showed such serenity and trust in God. I have always experienced a certain awe in his presence and I am grateful to him for those various times when he spontaneously broke the barrier of the master-disciple relationship and let me experience his quiet affection and simplicity of heart. Thank you, Bernie.

A CATHOLIC MIND

Joseph A. Komonchak
Catholic University of America

I first met Father Lonergan through his lectures in theology at the Gregorian University. The circumstances did not favour a sparkling intellectual encounter. In front of him sat some 500

students from very diverse backgrounds, with greatly different intellectual interests. He had to address them in Latin and to follow the manual format and goals set for a course of the day. (The educational philosophy that guided the whole enterprise, he once said, rested on a systematic neglect of the inventions of the light-bulb and the printing press!) For my part, I was coming from an educational background in which a very good liberal arts program had been succeeded by an introduction into the linguistic and syllogistic techniques of Neo-scholastic philosophy. I had begun to wonder if the glory days of Catholic intellect had not passed forever. Aquinas I knew only through the distorting lenses of my textbooks. Newman I loved and, through him, the Fathers of the Church, but who among the Neoscholastics or the much-vaunted heroes of the Catholic Revival was there remotely comparable to them?

Despite those impediments, Father Lonergan's lectures were a revelation to me. Neither the language nor the format prevented students from recognizing the presence of a mind of great power and clarity, respectful of mystery and yet continually probing, careful of distinctions, inviting his hearers to stretch themselves towards an intelligent and contemporary appropriation of their faith. These attractions were confirmed by a reading of *Insight* whose effect on me, despite much incomprehension on my part, was the restoration of confidence in Catholic intellect. Father Lonergan showed me that the efforts of an Augustine, an Aquinas, a Newman were being taken up again in a different age and before different challenges.

To these contacts in classroom and in books I had the good fortune to be able to add more personal relations through Father Lonergan's willingness to receive David Tracy and myself for brief conversations in his room at the Gregorian. Here we would bring what we would now regard as embarrassingly innocent questions, to which Father Lonergan would respond patiently and generously, always taking us seriously even while prodding us beyond our starting points with deliberately enigmatic and elliptical answers. I will always remember how he watched us, waiting to see the light of insight show in our eyes. Sometimes he was even rewarded for his patience.

I have been trying to enter into Father Lonergan's thought for over two decades now, during which I have learned much, more than I could catalogue. But, given this opportunity, I wish to thank him publicly for those first moments and those first joys, when a young man's desire to understand was disciplined, encouraged, and, above all, welcomed.

A TRIBUTE TO BERNARD J. F LONERGAN, S.J.

Timothy P. Fallon, S.J.
University of Santa Clara

When I went to Toronto to begin my doctoral studies in 1956, I was a convinced Thomist, confident the intuition of being was fundamental and self-evidently true and with a conviction (borrowed I think from J. Maritain) that *VAE MIHI SI NON THOMISTIZAVERO*. At that time I felt that there was a necessary link between the church-approved Philosopher/Theologian, Thomas Aquinas, and the Faith which fully aware of itself, especially in the Bulls of her Roman Pontiffs, had given that approval.

It was with indescribable anguish that it slowly dawned on me that if Thomas Aquinas had the truth, it was not evident to a very wide circle of excellently trained and eminent philosophers and perhaps should not be so evident to me. These philosophers did what an army of Suarezians and Scotists had not been able to do; they reduced my "bastion of truth" to, at best, one well-defended alternative among many offered at the University. This raised serious questions not only about the philosophy of being and doing but also about what I was doing being a Roman Catholic - the beginning of an existential crisis!

It was at this moment that Bernard Lonergan came on the scene, first through his students, some of whom were my fellow graduate students, and then, through many years of reading, seminar searching each summer, and personal contacts with both Bernard Lonergan himself and others interested in his thought.

Bernard Lonergan supplied me with a satisfactory explanation of "Thomism" (we must do for the twentieth century what Aquinas did for the thirteenth), pluralism in religion and philosophy (a grounding in the factual self may well be preferable to any set of disputed concepts and propositions no matter how carefully analyzed and/or "self-evident"), and Roman Catholicism, despite its dogmatic stance and devotion to the Holy See (a level of judgment may well be differentiable and therefore truth may well be available even to ordinary people and even contained in dogmas of which the Holy See might be custodian). But most of all Bernard Lonergan "gave" me myself by showing me the way through consciousness to the objectification of the self in and through my operations and especially in the formation of a community of mutual self-mediation. This offered me at least as much hope for the future as was dashed in '56 when the lure of modernity and relativism first unsettled it. For this I am profoundly grateful and for that I offer tribute to Bernard Lonergan.

UNDERGRADUATES AND LONERGAN'S WORK

Michael Vertin
St. Michael's College, Toronto

Paul was typical of many of the undergraduates I have encountered during my fourteen years of teaching at the University of Toronto, although his personal intensity and enthusiasm won him, I must admit, a special place in my memory and affection. An excellent student, he had undertaken a double major in Economics and English. After three years he had made good progress in each discipline, but he was bothered by his inability to discern intelligible links between the two parts of his programme. As he put it when I first met him, at the start of his fourth year, "Economics and English not only seem to be giving totally different answers, they seem to be asking totally different questions. The one aims to be cool, detached, and objective. But the other is personal, concerned with feelings, subjective. I'm having trouble seeing how they connect with one another at all!"

At the suggestion of a friend, Paul had registered for my year-long course, nominally entitled "Epistemology." The friend, he reported, had noted that the course provided an opportunity to study the work of a thinker named Bernard Lonergan, and that this might be very useful for an

Economics and English major in his fourth year. ("I hear that this Mister Lonergan is pretty good on interdisciplinary questions.") In the first half of the course, Paul did quite well, coming to grasp clearly that every scholar, not excluding those in Economics or English, inevitably if often only implicitly takes some stance on certain common issues - knowing, objectivity, and reality. He did so well, in fact, that at mid-year he stood in my office, half pleased and half panicky, with a problem very different from his original one. "Professor Vertin, I'm in big trouble. Unless I can get better hold of my own operational stance on the question of objectivity, I won't be able to write the papers for my other courses!"

Aided by additional reflection on the Lonerganian dictum that genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity, Paul eventually resolved this second problem and went on to complete the papers for his other courses. He also wrote two outstanding second-term essays for the Epistemology course, essays whose title beautifully betokened not only his two main academic concentrations but also the level on which, to his great satisfaction, he had succeeded in relating them: "The Notion of the Real in Financial Accounting: The 'Current Value' vs. 'Historical Cost' Accounting Controversy"; and "The Notion of the Real in the Poetry of Wallace Stevens." And his story thus aptly illustrates the pivotal role that I have found the writings of Bernard Lonergan to play again and again, in various ways, for bright and eager undergraduate students.

FOR BERNARD LONERGAN

Sebastian Moore, O.S.B. Boston College

What I have from Lonergan is a haunting, persistent and systematic conviction that the movement of my heart to the unknown God, a movement of which I am more certain than I am of anything else in my life, can be understood as felt-after by all my other desires as their fundamental direction: and that therefore to help students to understand themselves as desiring beings is to move them toward the point where this fundamental direction of consciousness can show itself.

To say how Lonergan does this for me - and no other author does - is to point to the centre and focus of Lonergan's achievement: the "turn to the subject," the zeroing-in on consciousness as the central reality whose bewildering polymorphism is the reason for the dizzying variety of conflicting philosophies and policies, whose being laid-hold-of by the ultimate mystery makes it luminous and revelatory. Though Lonergan has said very little about mysticism, he has said the one thing that no one else has said, which is the point: that the infinite is mediated to the mystic through the immediacy with which the mystic knows his or her movement to the unknown. In other words, Lonergan alone has dared to go to consciousness in its deepest and quietest intensity for the knowing of God and the conviction that in this knowing all experience finds its meaning.

I am finding just now that students respond rather eagerly to the notion that thinking and speaking about God is subject to an unnoticed and fatal constriction: namely that my inability to think of myself as not being makes me assume, without noticing it, the status of necessary being; the which experienced necessary-being provides the unacknowledged model for my thinking and preaching about God. The whole feminist discovery, that the church's "God" is very much the result of celibate men doing this, comes in here. Thus only through a supervening of what I am

now calling "consciousness two," such as the "I-am me" experience in childhood where the obviously necessary and necessarily oblivious self is suddenly dissipated by the surprisingly existent self, can a real sense of God be recovered. The conviction, that I can trace back to infancy, that to know God one would obviously have to be somehow different, differently and more intensely aware, has found for me its legitimation in this relentlessly thorough and seemingly non-mystical thinker. I love that man.

At the anecdotal level, the first thing he ever said to me was "Concepts have dates." That was said in the late fifties. The church - especially church authority - has still to learn it. Just now, it shows little willingness to do so. And politics just now is an orgy of conceptualism. In this seeming night of the world, thank God for this quiet, steady and humourous light.

COLLEGE DE L'IMMACULÉE-CONCEPTION: WHERE IT ALL BEGAN

Father Lonergan taught theology at the College of the Immaculate Conception in Montreal from the summer of 1940 to Christmas of 1946, for just half therefore of his years in Canada, before he was seconded to the Gregorian University in Rome. Those early years are largely unknown to later generations of his students, yet he himself has stated with full conviction that he owes his start in scholarly publishing to the environment of leisure for study and research, of protection from non-academic burdens, of high regard for the life of the mind, that he enjoyed during his years at "L'Immaculée." I remember him quoting Chesterton, in a retreat he gave to Toronto Jesuits at that time, to the effect that we are all the great might-not-have-beens, and I reflect, with a new sense of divine providence, on the might-not-have-been of Bernie's career, and on the void there would have been in our world had he never got this start in 1940 and the years following.

Almost equally unknown to later generations, but important in this little chapter of history, are what I call the "first-generation" Lonergan students at L'Immaculée, people like James Doyle, who taught theology for many years in the scholasticates of the Chicago Jesuits, and wrote a few months before Bernie's death to express his deep gratitude and affection; or like Paul Vanier, author of *Théologie trinitaire chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, who died so early in his own career. There were dozens of others, for L'Immaculée was overflowing with students during those years of isolation from European centres of study, and humming with intellectual activity, but they must go unmentioned. It would be grossly negligent, however, to omit, in this list of tributes to Bernie, his own tribute to the college where it all began. - F. E. C.

FROM OVERSEAS

We deeply regretted that, due to the lateness of our planning, we could not open these pages to tributes from overseas. The gap this leaves is shown by this excerpt from a letter written by Giovanni Sala on learning of Father Lonergan's death. We presume his kind permission to print these lines, for few students and friends of Father Lonergan are better qualified than he to speak for us all. - **The Editors.**

Lei può comprendere il dolore che anche in me ha provocato la notizia della dipartita di P. Lonergan. L'incontro con lui a Roma durante i miei studi di Teologia (1958-1962) è stato decisivo per la mia formazione intellettuale. Considero questo incontro come una delle grazie più grandi che Dio mi ha fatto durante la mia formazione. Se anche nel burrascoso periodo post-conciliare ho potuto continuare serenamente e con sicurezza interiore il mio cammino nella fede cristiana e nella riflessione teologico-filosofica, to debbo in gran parte a quanto allora appresi dalla sue lezioni romane e non meno a quanto anche in seguito imparai attraverso i suoi scritti. . .

Ora, alla notizia della sua scomparsa, ricordo il P. Lonergan come un confratello - un fratello maggiore, in compagnia del quale ho camminato per tanti anni nella ricerca dell'intelligenza della fede e della verità che, anche nella provincia della filosofia, è pur sempre di origine divina Gott möge es ihm vergelten.

- Giovanni Sala, S.J.
(Jesuit Philosophical Faculty)

Hochschule für Philosophie, Munich.

**INDISPENSABLE RESEARCH TOOL: THE LONERGAN
STUDIES NEWSLETTER**

We cannot even name here all the institutions that have felt the influence of Bernard Lonergan, but we must include a paragraph on one that receives that influence to radiate it far and wide around the globe. The *Loneran Studies* Newsletter is a quarterly listing publications by and about Bernard Lonergan along with reviews of these, unpublished papers and dissertations, reports on workshops and conferences, news from the various Lonergan centres, current projects, etc. It was begun just five years ago (to celebrate Bernie's seventy-five years, in fact), by Terry J. Tekippe, Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans, and Michael O'Callaghan, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. Its mailing list, besides covering the United States and Canada, includes nearly a dozen countries in Europe, half a dozen in Latin America, and such far off lands as Taiwan, Japan, Israel, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Tanzania; Australia, with a relatively large number of subscribers, has its own mailing list and system of distribution. Testimony, all this, both to the remarkable spread of Bernard Lonergan's influence and to the value of this indispensable research tool. - F. E. C. -.

III Institutional Impact

" . . . institution, in its broadest sense. . . is the sum of the ways of cooperating that commonly are understood and commonly are accepted " - **A Third Collection, p. 6.**

"Human knowledge results from a vast collaboration of many peoples over uncounted millennia." - **A Second Collection, p.185.**

"Method . . . is a framework for collaborative creativity." - **Method in Theology, p. xi.**

These quotations introduce us to that collaborative aspect of progress which becomes effective through institutions. Father Lonergan's work has already influenced a number of institutional programs, among them the Thomas More Institute in Montreal, Lonergan University College at Concordia University in Montreal, and the Pulse Program at Boston College. Already two semi-annual scholarly journals, *Lonergan Workshop* and *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, are devoted to Father Lonergan's work and its implications, and a *Lonergan Studies Newsletter* keeps track of it all. Regis College in Toronto is establishing a Lonergan Research Institute, incorporating the work of its present Lonergan Centre and enlarging its scope. Our next statements are descriptions of some of these projects and programs, journals and institutions. - **Editors.**

THE THOMAS MORE INSTITUTE, MONTREAL

Charlotte Tansey, President

The Thomas More Institute for Adult Education of Montreal was rooted in, and flowered from, the long friendship of Bernard Lonergan, S.J., and Eric O'Connor, S.J. They met when already years into the Jesuit Order and their individual studies, both avidly curious, both patient at learning more and more of patterns to be recognized and questioned. They began to learn from each other's special explorations, and with a wonder which kept clear and candid over fifty years.

It began with Lonergan sharply going after and finding what there was to find (for what became the early chapters of the book *Insight*) in O'Connor's studies at the University of Toronto and at Harvard in mathematical physics, post-atomic physics, pure mathematics and statistical thinking. It carried through by afternoon meetings of the two of them, whenever Lonergan passed through Montreal, as he did regularly, and by evening phone calls to and from Toronto and Boston in the later years. Through it all we picked up scholars to watch and to invite to a lecture or interview - among them Eric Voegelin, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Gibson Winter, Ernest Becker, and we were, through his enthusiasm, carried into the ongoing work of Ira Progoff, Rosemary Haughton, the post-Keynesians, and many others. We learned early to appreciate John Henry Newman, Herbert Butterfield, Bruno Snell.

All of this gave us a way to be at ease in appropriating great scholars and provocative thinkers. It opened up the world of systematic thought to non-specialist adult learners. One of our long-time

collaborators has said with some humour that Eric O'Connor never knew that if you weren't an English literature scholar you weren't supposed to question Shakespeare.

We were helped by Lonergan showing us the steps, the stages, the patternings that curiosity needs to take so that the explorations can be respectful and, begun in common sense, move delightedly beyond it.

Both O'Connor and Lonergan have had the rather unusual experience of rejoicing in their progeny - Lonergan rolled off the phrase "ongoing collaboration" and saw with joy the world-class work in German university doctoral programs of Fred Lawrence, Matthew Lamb, Michael O'Callaghan. We got to know them, and Philip McShane, Fred Crowe, Robert Doran, David Tracy. The scholars involved in "ongoing collaboration" are now in their hundreds. A few of us know one hundred and watch and hear a dozen of them.

The Thomas More Institute of Montreal and its environs have over the years seriously touched about 25,000 persons for sustained inquiry. The Thomas More Institute of Canada for Research in Adult Liberal Studies, with Bernard Lonergan as a long-time member, celebrated its 25th Anniversary in 1983. It has published nine books, the most recent one last November: *Future InSight: Conversations on Latent Futures*. We have seen with satisfaction *Discovery Theatre* of Toronto catch hold and be a questioning presence for sixteen years.

Eric O'Connor stands as a man who gave and inspired great love. Each of hundreds of persons knew himself or herself to be an intimate, recognized friend and fellow learner of whatever was to be looked for and gained by intelligent attention.

Each time Bernard Lonergan came to Montreal in the later years a group of us met around a dinner table for an evening of free-association questioning within which he relaxed and was at home.

In 1945, our beginning year, Lonergan gave the course "Thought and Reality" out of which lecturing he has recorded "I knew I had a book." The book was *InSight*. To celebrate with the Institute its thirtieth anniversary he wrote and delivered the paper "Healing and Creating in History."

We salute Bernard Lonergan's life of nearly eighty years as we celebrate, now, the forty years of Thomas More Institute.

LONERGAN COLLEGE,
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY,
MONTREAL

Sean McEvenue Founder and First Principal of Lonergan College

Concordia University results from the happy merger in 1974 of Loyola College and Sir George Williams University. It groups 25,000 students this study year.

Gigantic universities can suffer, rather than profit, from their size. Individuals can get lost to all but the computer; and specialized disciplines can become dispersed into competent but trivial pockets of knowledge. At Concordia, Lonergan College is part of a massive attempt to meet this problem.

The college operates primarily at the undergraduate level in its own building on the Loyola campus. It has acquired a respectable collection of Lonergan manuscripts, books and articles, and teaches introductory courses in the thought of Bernard Lonergan.

The main activity of the college is an interdisciplinary seminar. Each year a classic is chosen for study: so far Lonergan himself, Carl Jung, Northrop Frye, Niccolo Machiavelli, Theresa of Avila, and Charles Darwin. A scholar in the field is invited to run the seminar. Every second Monday afternoon the college "Fellows" (i.e. 15 professors from diverse departments and disciplines) sit around a table with the seminar leader, and discuss a segment of the classic, while the college students listen. On alternate Mondays the students meet in small groups with their "Fellow" to extend the discussion of the previous week. The level of discussion is assured by the texts chosen each year; its quality is enhanced by the multiplicity of competent



On the occasion of receiving an honorary doctorate at the University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, 1969.

viewpoints brought to bear on it. Because of the Lonergan basis of the college, values and religious viewpoints implied by the various discussants are neither hidden nor overlooked. It is, altogether, an astonishing experience in academia.

Last year the college was professionally evaluated at the request of the university senate. The evaluator, Dr. William Berquist of the Wright Institute in California, praised it so highly that it was embarrassing. He claimed that it was unique in North America for its success as an interdisciplinary faculty seminar. As he knew little, if anything, of Lonergan's contribution to the possibility of human understanding and dialogue, he could not understand how Lonergan College had succeeded so well.

Those who conceived the college, and actually saw to its establishment, recognize its radical debt to the thought of Bernard Lonergan. Many of them were trained by the Jesuits, and two of them are Jesuits who may be familiar to our readers: Michael Fahey and Marc Gervais. The current college principal, Dr. Mark Doughty, is a senior professor of chemistry from the Loyola campus, who has published important studies on the relations between science and religion from a Lonergan perspective.

Thanks to Bernard Lonergan, it is now possible for isolated scholars and students to meet here precisely on the basis of what is deepest in the human spirit.

THE LONERGAN WORKSHOP

Charles C. Hefling, Jr. Boston College

Not until the final day of the most recent Lonergan Workshop did it really dawn on me: Lonergan himself wasn't there. It was not because I didn't miss him, in the personal sense, as a friend and mentor; I did, and I do. Nor was it because his direct contribution to the workshop over the years had been unimportant; on the contrary, many would say that the dialogue sessions in which Lonergan responded to questions submitted by participants were the main event on the workshop's busy and varied schedule. But in another sense, the sense in which he had been the workshop's centre of gravity, so to say, I did not miss him. No longer "already out there now," Lonergan was still very much present. Trite though it may be to speak of someone's spirit animating a conversation, I can think of no better way to say it. The "ongoing collaboration" that was Lonergan's hope and vision for the workshop was still going on, and he was still a collaborator.

Recently, as I was reading through the transcripts of his dialogue sessions, one thing I could not help noticing was Lonergan's persistence and patience. The workshop has always welcomed participants at every level of interest and expertise, and so it was not surprising to find that their questions have run the gamut of sophistication. There are elementary questions, recondite questions, questions precisely framed and questions floundering in their own wordiness, questions posed by dubious critics and questions from admiring fans. From another point of view, I was struck by how often questions on the same topics - feelings, Newman, liberation theology - came up year after year. From Lonergan's point of view, though, to judge from his answers, the main thing was that each of them *was* a question, someone's own unique quest for understanding, to be honoured and taken seriously as such.

Often enough, he might simply have answered by referring to one of his published works. But he never did. Even if he had already discussed the matter in print, he always tried to give it some new twist, some allusion or example or turn of phrase that might help someone get the point. I remember his saying, with reference to a section of *Method in Theology* that goes over ground covered in an earlier chapter, "It won't hurt to have another go at it, eh?" It didn't. For me, at any rate, Lonergan's variations on his own themes often made it possible to hear the theme for the first time.

The aim of the dialogue sessions has been the aim of the workshop as a whole - patiently and persistently to pursue possibly relevant questions. For Lonergan, that pursuit was nothing less than a way of adoring God. And for five days each summer for a dozen years, the workshop that bears his name has given hundreds of people the chance to engage with him in the same pursuit, an open-ended conversation that is only just beginning.

THE PULSE PROGRAM AT BOSTON COLLEGE

Patrick H. Byrne
Boston College

The PULSE Program is a curriculum of studies in philosophy, theology and the human sciences for undergraduate students at Boston College. It began in 1969 amidst the climate of student activism characteristic of the time. Yet it survived that period's ephemeral sense of urgency and relevance because it took seriously the injunction of Father Bernard Lonergan to be "supremely practical by ignoring what is thought to be really practical," to "withdraw from practicality in order to save practicality."

Not only was the Program's distinguishing feature inspired and informed from the beginning by Father Lonergan's work, but its uniqueness and successes can be traced to the fact that he, unlike any other contemporary thinker, was able to make it clear that while the pursuit of truth is a proximate goal of philosophy, theology and the sciences, their most fundamental intentionality is the transformation of the human social situation.

The PULSE Program has been cited for the unique way in which it has integrated social service with academic study. PULSE students volunteer twelve hours each week at some social service agency in the Boston area while at the same time studying the classics of the Christian and Western cultural traditions. The agencies at which the students serve include soup kitchens, shelters for the homeless, alcohol and drug rehabilitation centres, programs assisting refugees, homes for abused and disturbed children, schools for handicapped children, prison fellowship projects and offices rendering legal aid to the poor. In PULSE courses, students read traditional works including those from Plato, Aristotle, the Bible, Augustine, Machiavelli, Locke, Marx, as well as contemporary authors such as C. S. Lewis, Rosemary Haughton, Jane Jacobs and so on. Yet the PULSE approach to these texts is quite different from what is commonly found in academic classrooms. In PULSE the texts are treated as *transformational* rather than *informational*. That is, the reading material is presented as raising questions every human being faces *en route* to what Lonergan has described as the project of "producing the first and only edition of oneself," and as setting forth fundamental options for just, happy and holy living.

This approach seems to work because PULSE faculty endeavour to show students how these texts were produced by people who have struggled with issues and feelings very similar to those encountered in PULSE field projects - questions of proper action, fidelity in friendship, institutional injustice, ignorance, evil and redemption. The extent to which the PULSE faculty succeeds is in large part due to the way Lonergan has shown how the unrestricted desire for human self-transcendence, its distortions in bias, and its redemption in the loving transformations of God's grace underlie every human being's thoughts and actions. Lonergan's profound discovery of these brings out the best both in the authors read, and in the experiences encountered. Most importantly, Lonergan has prepared a context within which PULSE students can discover the best in themselves.

METHOD: JOURNAL OF LONERGAN STUDIES (ISSN 0736-7392)

Mark D. Morelli, General Editor
Loyola Marymount University,
Los Angeles

Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies was founded in 1982 to promote scholarly, critical study of the ideas of Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J., and to provide a vehicle for the dissemination of the results of such study. With the generous assistance of Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, and the friendly support of Rev. Donald P. Merrifield, S.J., Chancellor of the university, the first number of *Method* appeared in March, 1983. *Method* now has fifty-five subscribing institutions in nineteen nations, from Brazil to Tanzania and from Ireland to Japan. Individual subscribers number approximately two hundred, and the number of interested scholars continues to grow.

The need for more rigorous and thoroughgoing research into Lonergan's philosophical, theological, economic, and methodological achievements had been felt since the publication of his central work *Insight* in 1957. Then, as now, many accomplished scholars in diverse fields discerned in that lengthy and challenging exploration of cognitional, epistemological and metaphysical issues the graceful and deliberate motions of an extremely well-informed, disciplined, and powerful mind. The seemingly exhaustive breadth and depth of Lonergan's inquiries, his evident distaste for brushing aside further relevant questions, the consistency and coherence of his proposed solutions, the disarming concreteness of his call for the existing thinker to consider and judge for himself the answers he provides, and his Socratic insistence upon self-appropriation and self-development - these have combined to lead those scholars apprised of the need for a more encompassing world-view to turn hopefully to Lonergan's works for inspiration and enlightenment.

Lonergan addresses in a basic way the problems and issues that have arisen in the wake of revolutions in the sciences and historical studies. But instead of falling victim to scientism and agnosticism, he has managed to reconcile modern scientific achievements with the truths of the Catholic faith. And while Lonergan acknowledges the historicity of consciousness, he escapes the grip of cognitive and ethical relativism. Any twentieth-century thinker who is truly cognizant of twentieth-century intellectual developments, and who is able to enunciate Catholic pluralism

without sacrificing either clarity or comprehensiveness should receive our close, scholarly attention. *Method* aims to promote that scrutiny and, moreover, to disseminate as widely as possible the results.

In its first two years of publication, *Method* has offered articles, notes, dialogues and book reviews of interest to students of Lonergan's thought and others concerned to meet effectively the demands of the present age. In addition, beginning with Volume 2 (1984) *Method* has made available, with the advice and assistance of Frederick E. Crowe, S.J., previously unpublished writings of Bernard Lonergan. In 1985 *Method* will provide its subscribers with an early "Preface" to *Insight* and with the lengthy introduction to Lonergan's doctoral dissertation, *Gratia Operans*.

Among the members of the Editorial Board of *Method* are David Tracy, Frederick C. Copleston, S.J., David Burrell, C.S.C., William Johnston, S.J., Frederick Crowe, S.J., Frederick Lawrence, and Robert Doran, S.J. These scholars are joined by nineteen other specialists in the fields of economics, scientific policy, clinical psychology, comparative religions, theology, and philosophy. These, and many others, have contributed greatly to the emergence and survival of *Method*.

IV “... aiming ...high and far”

*“There is a disinterestedness and an objectivity that comes only from aiming excessively high and far, that leaves one free to take each issue on its merits, to proceed by intrinsic analysis instead of piling up a debater's arguments, to seek no greater achievement than the inspiration of the moment warrants, to await with serenity for the coherence of truth itself to bring to light the underlying harmony of the manifold whose parts successively engage one's attention.” - **Grace and Freedom, p.140.***

*“A completely genuine development of the thought of St. Thomas will command in all the universities of the modern world the same admiration and respect that St. Thomas himself commanded in the medieval University of Paris.” - **Verbum, p. 220.***

*“Every. . . historical movement, however great, profound, and lasting it may be, begins with a ‘creative minority’: it is the minority that questions, thinks, understands, decides, and takes the lead; the majority are taught, persuaded, and led. Marx lived in the nineteenth century and was an object of ridicule; in the twentieth Marxist doctrine is victorious over a large part of the world.” - **De Scientia atque Voluntate Dei, no. 23.***

Father Lonergan's influence, of course, is primarily due to the powerful impact of his thought and its far-reaching implications for so many fields of study. In the intellectual sphere his influence has only begun to be felt. The impact of his work on the next several centuries of intellectual activity is liable to be quite extraordinary, if those of us to whom his legacy has been left will assume our responsibility. Here we can provide only a few short statements of the importance of that legacy. We begin with an overall portrait of the reach and range of "the Lonergan enterprise." Then we have some statements on Lonergan and the intellectual apostolate, the future of philosophy, political thought, psychology, and mystical theology. - **Editors.**

THE HISTORICAL REACH OF LONERGAN'S MEANING

Philip McShane
Mount Saint Vincent University,
Halifax

“More than any other modern man he shared the fresh and fearless vitality of medieval inquisitiveness, His questions go to the roots of things The answers he demands must be right on the nail. He combined a whole-hearted contempt for the irrelevant with an ability to appreciate enormously, one might say inordinately, what really was relevant.”

The author is Lonergan, in a short article on "Chesterton the Theologian" published in *The Canadian Register* in 1943, but what Lonergan says of Chesterton is surely more profoundly true of Lonergan himself. Furthermore, the degree more of profundity is precisely the key issue in seeking to specify the historical reach of Lonergan's meaning. I have on occasion compared Lonergan's achievement to the achievements of Galileo, Mendeleev, Joyce, Rembrandt, Beethoven. But in fact such comparisons fall radically short of the point of profundity. For the profundity of Lonergan's life preoccupation was that of the "root or key from which results intelligibility in the ordinary sense" (*Insight*, p. 647) and meaning in the ordinary sense, and "the intelligible in the profounder sense... cannot be understood without understanding what understanding is" (*ibid*). - So, one must reach towards larger comparisons to touch the sense of the man's reach into meaning towards the generative principle of genetic and dialectic sequences of meanings. One thinks then, for example, not just of the genius of Beethoven, but of a plumbing of sonata-meanings from before Bach, through Beethoven, to Bruckner and beyond.

Or one might think of the massive transposition of the history of logic made possible, if at present improbable, by Lonergan's location of the foundations of all logics in the self-illuminated incarnate spirit. That history may be suitably symbolized by Kneale and Kneale's classic *The Development of Logic*, where the authors conclude by noting the necessity in our time "to strive for greater precision in the characterization of logic." That characterization can only come through a subjective vortex-spinning into an elucidation of sequences of limited coherencies sparked by Lonergan's generalized empirical method.

Or one may move from such seeding of new meanings in music and logic to the larger canvas of total history that concerned men like Arnold Toynbee and Eric Voegelin in their later years. Then one can take note of a broader shift in history that may be named the self-discovery of mind, a ferment in a few Greek minds that faded with Aristotle's death, reborn in a Christian medieval drive that briefly blossomed in Aquinas' searches into the minds of Aquinas and God, rescued in this century from Scotist Thomism by the medieval inquisitiveness of a man who could take the revelations of the scientific revolution of these past centuries as serious data on the meaning of history.

But while Toynbee, Voegelin, Jaspers, Butterfield or Snell can point here to some axial shift and there to a relevant differentiation of consciousness, Lonergan over decades delved into the hiddenness of the hierarchically dynamic subject in history to distinguish genera and species of differentiations of meaning possible and probable in the adventure of history into the noosphere. So, for example, the vague description of a movement of consciousness in these recent centuries contained under the blanket name "historical consciousness" becomes from the root perspective an explanatory heuristic of varieties of scholarly consciousness correlated with cultures through space and time. Again, Christian issues pivoting on unclear meanings of "development of doctrines" brings forth from Lonergan a discontinuity of heuristics that draws on precisions regarding plant and animal development to provide a natural analogue that, as Chesterton might multiply mean, goes to the root of the issues.

Perhaps such far-reaching heuristic shifts might be somewhat elucidated by recalling a basic strategy of science associated with Galileo. Modern physics is called, not Galilean, but experimental. Stillman Drake notes that before Galileo there was no dearth of mathematical

reasoning, but "the systematic appeal to experience in support of mathematical laws seems to have been lacking. . .the design of experiments to discover new mathematical laws comes after Galileo's time" (*Galileo Studies*, University of Michigan Press, 1970, p. 44). Drake notes the difficulty of believing this, and so goes on to describe the inadequate strategies of Tartaglia (1546), Cardano (1570) and Ubaldo (1577) in seeking out laws of force for bodies on inclined planes.

Returning now to Lonergan we may note that his lasting achievement is the identification of generalized empirical method and its basic strategy: "It does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject: it does not treat of the subject's operations without taking into account the corresponding objects" (The Donald Mathers Memorial Lectures at Queen's University 1976). The strategy is precise, empirical, and profoundly novel, and I would suggest that the successful implementation of that strategy in the next centuries pivots on an honest admission into consciousness of the tandemness of its demands. The central data of the new science are insights: for philosophers and theologians the discomfort is that the relevant insights include those of centuries of advancing science and aesthetics; for those involved in the arts and sciences there is the painful challenge of reaching towards a luminous authentic subjectivity.

In that light the verdict of history on Tartaglia, Cardano and Ubaldo of the sixteenth century will be paralleled by a like verdict on some of the best efforts of the twentieth century. So, the solid drive towards a more sophisticated and empirical methodology of science associated with men like Bertalanffy, Kuhn and Lakatos will eventually be revealed as having a central opaqueness in regard to subjectivity. Again, there are occasional brilliant aesthetic insights such as that of Henry Moore when he remarked that the sculptor "gets the solid shape, as it were, inside his head - he thinks of it, whatever its size, as if he were holding it completely enclosed in the hollow of his hand. . .he identifies himself with its centre of gravity, its mass, its weight." Yet such insights cry out for a later stage of meaning where lucidity regarding the art object will deliver aesthetics from descriptively synaesthetic and metaphorical obscurity. And in the broad field of Christian theology, there will slowly emerge the profundity that will bring to light the deep cultural exclusion of the illuminating realities of both subject and object that frustrated the courageous searchings for a post-medieval theology of such a thinker as Karl Rahner.

Less remote is Lonergan's own transposition of previous achievements in areas of aesthetics, science and theology. His brief foray into Susanne Langer's aesthetics, during lectures on education in 1959, shifts that field massively into a context foreign to present debate: the lucid context of confinement to subjectivity's position in being (*Insight*, pp. 484, 521, 571). Later we will note the deeper strategy of functional specialization needed to lift such fields as musicology and poetics out of their present cumulous confusion of specialties. In the sciences, Lonergan's innovative contributions are not only methodological - as in his structuring of canons of empirical procedure but at times proximate to content. Present theorizing in relativistic quantum physics and chemistry is subtly bedevilled by the extroversion of a Euclidean imagination: what is lacking is Lonergan's leap to the abstract and concrete intelligibility of space and time. The middle sciences are bogged down in reductionist imaginings and Darwinian obscurities regarding units and patterns of evolution: Lonergan's relevant focus is on a thematic of schemes of recurrence at all levels, within an explanatory perspective on emergent probability,

underpinned by a precise heuristic analysis of genera and species, grounding uniquely a needed clarity.

One may gather that the shift initiated by Lonergan is a deep cultural shift transformative of the mediation of meaning in human life reaching into areas as diverse as genetic chemistry, the psychology of management, the philosophy of law, the theology of play. It is a pivotal contribution to an axial shift in history initiated primarily in the Greek and Hebrew traditions. Before turning to Lonergan's contribution to theology, however, something should be said in particular of his still unpublished advancement of foundational economic dynamics. It is, I suspect, this contribution that will primarily lead to the wider recognition of his genius in the next few decades.

Lonergan's economics moves more in the perspective of Cantillon and Quesnay than that of Adam Smith or Walras. But again we must note a transposed perspective that can focus on the good of a standard of living that is concrete yet contextualized by transvalued values. There is here no labour theory of value but value as specified by a good of order within an emergent universe that measures success in strange ways. Moreover, as against abstract and centralist economic dynamics, Lonergan's analysis, mediated by procedural lucidity, focuses relentlessly on concrete possibilities and fosters individual creativity.

Causing in the human group the horizon-shift necessary to reach such a dynamic economic creativity is the massive century-long task of education of which Lonergan has written in one of his economic manuscripts: "coming to grasp what serious education really is, and, nonetheless, coming to accept that challenge constitutes the greatest task of the modern economy." That grasp is the root grasp which has been our topic throughout, a grasp deeply beyond present educational efforts of theory and practice, ranging from kindergarten through *Harry Stottlemier's Discovery* to the cultured truncation of graduate life.

Turning, finally, to theology, I may be brief: other contributors point to Lonergan's enrichment of the theology of churches and states. I am content to note two giant steps. First, there is the slow, thorough, creative recovery of Aquinas grounding a profound yet preachable coherence of Trinity and Incarnation, mind and grace and liberty. It is a recovery that, sadly, remains to be shared, as Lonergan noted occasionally in his later years. But the second giant step is a seeding of such sharing. Secondly, then, there is the startling differentiation of theological tasks that crowns Lonergan's long search for an integral empirical transposition of the methods of theologians. His discovery is equivalent to the sudden appearance of Mendeleev among pre-Lavoisier chemists. No longer can theology be a broad sweep that might appear to be a latter-day contribution in continuity with the common-sense contribution of a Newman or a Pascal. Theology moves beyond public discourse and its tasks become a reaching forward within history as revelation in the enlarging confines of the differentiated empiricity of functional specialization. The beginnings of the implementation are tasks for centuries to come.

Nor is that strategic differentiation of tasks restricted to theologians: it will range into the confused fragmentations and specializations of the cultures of human meanings, to provide a cyclic reaching for an ever more adequate founding of human collaboration in the making of history. In its vortex movement it invites an ever-broadening recollection of past achievement so

that, for instance, the recovery of Aquinas is not the solitary chance achievement of an eccentric but a recurrence caught up by schemes of recurrence of differentiations within generalized empirical method. Further, that vortex movement of functional specialization spins forward and upward to a crowning ever-fresh mediation of everyday meaning, opening up ministry and management to a new lucid gentleness with the mysteries and creativities of multicultural subjectivities.

Lonergan concludes his essay on Chesterton by noting that Chesterton's "medieval insistence on the relevant is to be found in anything but medieval dress. Perhaps his deepest theological intuition is to be found in the most bizarre of mystery yarns. *The Man who was Thursday* is a labyrinth of double roles, of plots and counter-plots, of aimless, painful quests, of buffoonery and high seriousness, that lures the unsuspecting reader face to face with God and the problem of evil." For Lonergan himself there is the central bizarre yarn of *Insight* with its painful quests bred of the revelations in modernity both of science and of human inadequacy, luring the unsuspecting reader face to face with God and the problem of evil. Generations of thinkers, no doubt, will dodge the postmedieval labyrinth of that yarn. But the Man who was Sunday has the patience of emergent probability.

BERNARD LONERGAN AND THE INTELLECTUAL APOSTOLATE

Matthew L. Lamb
Marquette University, Milwaukee

My own encounter with Bernard Lonergan's work occurred in the context of a contemplative Trappist monastery. The encounter was profoundly transformative. Years of prayer and communion with God had deepened an affective appropriation of faith. Monastic spirituality had enabled me to appreciate the Augustinian insight that our human hearts are restless until they rest in God. Meditating upon Lonergan's *Verbum* articles as a young monastic theology student, I was overwhelmed by a growing realization that through Lonergan's retrieval I could appropriate, or make my own, the related and recurrent experiential questions informing Thomas Aquinas's theology. Not only our affective desires, but also our cognitive desires, are created participations in Divine Intelligence and Love. The source of all human questioning, what Aquinas termed "the light of active intellect," is an unlimited, infinite potentiality or desire which can only find its fully adequate realization in the Infinite Actuality of Divine Consciousness. As Lonergan put it so well, for Aquinas our minds will ever be restless until they rest in God.

Self appropriation, then, becomes in a very real sense an intellectual apostolate. Lonergan's efforts at charting the stages of meaning and discoveries of mind in history indicate the shifting orientations which human questioning and cognitive desires have taken since Aquinas. While Aquinas could pattern much of his philosophy and theology according to questions, he never analyzed how his philosophical and theological writings, as well as his teaching practices, resulted from the collaborative efforts he shared with his confreres and colleagues. We know of such collaboration only through historical reconstructions. The enormous creativity in the emergence and developments of modern empirical sciences and human scholarly disciplines has quite literally overwhelmed wisdom. It is as if the questioning dynamism or cognitive desires of

countless human minds exploded in dazzling arrays of insights and concepts which defy any and all efforts to constrain their brilliance in manageable systems or theories.

No one understood this characteristic of modernity better than Lonergan. The dilemma of modernity consisted, for him, in an ever expanding creative questioning in countless sciences and scholarly disciplines, without comparable developments in understanding moral and religious value orientations capable of relating such sciences and scholarship to a life-promoting wisdom. Empirical science and technology, without wisdom, can all too easily intensify a longer cycle of decline into destructive militarism and death. Neither common sense nor theory suffices for what Lonergan termed a new notion of wisdom. Self-appropriation of the related and recurrent patterns of human questioning provided Lonergan with the key to a sapiential transformation of method. No longer would method be left to merely extrinsic rules and the resulting collaboration be left to bureaucratic professionalization. Functional specialization provides creative, collaborative patternings of questions which are both open to all further questions and also sapientially integrative. The ongoing developments of intelligence are related intrinsically to moral and religious developments. Freedom is not constrained or minimized, rather freedom's own effective orientations are appropriated in the transcendental imperatives.

Lonergan's own intellectual apostolate invites a serious collaboration in personal and cultural transformations. Those of us whose own self-appropriations he engendered or facilitated are responsible for the very real graces his life and achievements represent. Aquinas's achievements were too quickly buried in the arid conceptualisms of schoolmen turned imperial inquisitors and anti-Reformation polemicists. As the twentieth century comes to a close, the danger of decline into militarism and death are too real to ignore the possibilities of renewal and life offered in Bernard Lonergan's achievements. The ongoing intellectual apostolate of bringing wisdom to the pressing questions of these troubled times requires that creative collaboration for which Lonergan's work provides a framework and an orientation.

Thomas Merton's final lecture was on Marxism and Monasticism. His contemplative spirit glimpsed the importance of addressing the pressing questions of social justice and effective freedom within the sapiential traditions of monastic spirituality. Similarly, Bernard Lonergan's final large project was devoted to an explanatory understanding of macroeconomics. Informing his unfinished manuscripts is his firm conviction, born of faith and insight, that intelligible and intelligent economies and productive processes would promote both genuine human freedom and justice for all members of society. There are many vocations and apostolates. Intellectual life informed with faith, as a knowledge born of love, is at the service of others, especially the least of our brothers and sisters. If there are to be future generations enjoying more humane and free and just societies and cultures, then intellectuals in our nuclearly armed age should contribute creatively and collaboratively to reversing what Lonergan analyzed as the longer cycle of decline:

On an earth made small by a vast human population, by limited natural resources, by rapid and easy communications, by extraordinary powers of destruction, there will arise sooner or later the moment when the unstable equilibrium will seem threatened and the gamble of war will appear the lesser

risk to some of the parties involved. If the war is indecisive, the basic situation is unchanged. If it is totally destructive, the longer cycle has come to its end...

Still, on the assumption of emergent probability, nothing is inevitable. Indeed, the essential logic of the distorted dialectic (in the longer cycle of decline) is a reversal (Insight, pp. 232f).

Intelligence cut off from the sapiential source of unlimited questions becomes, over time, irrational and irresponsible. The escalating nuclear arms race between capitalist and communist superpowers is a terribly real illustration of such irrationality and irresponsibility. Neither activism nor conceptualism can go the roots of the massive alienations, of which that weapons race is such a horrendous symptom. Bernard Lonergan's invitation to an intellectual apostolate is indeed a grace, a call from the Spirit, towards a transformative, reversing, wisdom.

LONERGAN AND THE FUTURE OF PHILOSOPHY

Hugo Meynell
University of Calgary

I first heard of Lonergan when I was a research student in philosophy and theology, some three years after the appearance of *Insight*. This sounded the sort of book one ought to look at when one did not have pressing commitments; so, like many books in that category, it remained for a good while unread. Some time later, I was sent the collection *Spirit as Inquiry* for review; and it struck me as remarkable that scholars in such a wide range of disciplines, from mathematics through the natural sciences to aesthetics and theology, had found Lonergan's work a seminal influence. Soon afterwards I saw *Insight* on the shelves of a colleague who taught philosophy, and asked if I could borrow it. He said that I was welcome to keep it, in exchange for a book from my collection on which he had had his eye; he commented that he himself had found *Insight* a waste of money and time. I am still wondering what he meant, since, very soon after I started reading, it seemed evident to me that I was in the presence of philosophical genius. As I continued, I found that a large number of important questions to which important thinkers had given implausible solutions, and which contemporary philosophers and theologians seemed to have given up in disgust or despair, appeared to be solved, or to be well on the way to solution, by thorough application of a method which was comprehensively critical, and based on the fundamental operations of the human mind itself.

My initial burst of enthusiasm must have been felt by my friends and colleagues, on good inductive grounds, to be unlikely to last; I and others had passed through fads before. But I have never found any reason, apart from the authority of professional fashion, to revise my initial assessment of *Insight*. Shortly afterwards, I first laid my hands on the Latin theological treatises. Here the early history of Christian thought is revealed as a single "research programme" (to employ the useful jargon of Imre Lakatos), devoted to understanding the mystery of Christ, so far as this is possible to human beings on earth; and by no means, as I had gathered from most of my teachers, a confused and chaotic jumble of ideas and opinions without coherence or intelligible succession.

What seemed to emerge from *Insight* was a sort of antithesis of Logical Positivism, which was a doctrine on the basis of which all philosophical doctrines, including ultimately itself, could be shown to be nonsensical. On the basis of the framework of ideas developed in *Insight*, on the contrary, there was something to be learned from virtually everyone, and yet everyone could be subjected to searching criticism. Here was an existentialist stress on the value of freedom purged of the irrationality with which it is so often associated; an enthusiasm for the achievements of science without the slightest tendency to "scientism" with its neglect of the human subject as such; a political philosophy which clearly placed both liberalism and Marxism as partial viewpoints; an ethics which adroitly steered through the shoals of scepticism and relativism without capitulating to dogmatic authoritarianism; and finally a stringently rational philosophy of religion which issued neither in atheism nor in fideism.

In a book of papers devoted to the criticism of Lonergan's work, one contributor complained that Lonergan was too charitable to opinions however bizarre, another that his thought was so exclusive that hardly any theologian or philosopher hit the jackpot but Lonergan himself. The contradiction here is instructive. It is one thing to be invited onto the field which Lonergan calls "dialectic," another to survive the resulting encounters altogether intact. What has to be done to and for each author is the development of his "positions," and the reversal of his "counterpositions"; that is, the following-through of those of his opinions which are compatible with the fact of their being intelligently conceived and reasonably affirmed, together with rejection or modification of those not so compatible. For example, it is of the essence of what is called "eliminative materialism" that the nature and activity of human beings is to be explained exhaustively in terms of chemistry and physics, and that all "mentalist" description or explanation of them and their actions is mistaken in the last analysis. It follows from this that no one can really accept eliminative materialism because there is good reason for him to do so; and thus eliminative materialism, as committed to a "counterposition," eliminates itself. But it by no means follows from this that the physical sciences ought not to be pursued, or their conclusions enthusiastically embraced, as the most intelligent and reasonable explanations of the data so far available about the aspects of reality, including aspects of the human person, with which they deal.

I conclude that Lonergan's work offers enormous benefits to contemporary and future philosophy, and indeed to culture in general. His principles enable the raucously conflicting doctrines and methods of the established schools to be reconciled within a higher viewpoint from which can be seen the applications and limitations of each. Still, it is one thing to hold that something is on offer, another to be confident that the offer will be taken up. It is to be feared that it is not at all unlikely that members of the philosophical profession will continue to prefer mutual hostility and misunderstanding to the attempt to learn from one another; in which case, they will be well advised to go on neglecting Lonergan's work.

LONERGAN AND THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Robert M. Doran, S.J.
Regis College, Toronto

Loneragan's analysis of the structures of consciousness provides a new ground for a transformed science of the psyche. Lonergan has clarified what it is to be a flourishing human person: attentive to the experience of data of sense and of consciousness, intelligent about inquiring into the meaning of this experience, critical in one's judgments, and responsible in one's decisions; and he has argued that all of this is possible as the fruit of God's love flooding one's heart through the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Now these "levels of consciousness" (experience, understanding, judgment, and decision), and the level of religious love, are shot through with feelings. Some feelings make these operations easy, while others are obstacles to authentic performance. Lonergan's work provides a way of understanding our feelings in relation to our possibilities for intelligent, rational, and responsible behaviour.

More precisely, Lonergan has specified the relation of feelings to *values* and to *symbols*; and you can connect his insights on these two points with one another, and gain a starting point for understanding dreams.

On feelings and values, Lonergan writes:

Feelings that are intentional responses regard two main classes of objects: on the one hand, the agreeable or disagreeable, the satisfying or dissatisfying; on the other hand, values, whether the ontic value of persons or the qualitative value of beauty, understanding truth, virtuous acts, noble deeds. In general, response to value both carries us towards self-transcendence and selects an object for the sake of whom or of which we transcend ourselves. In contrast, response to the agreeable or disagreeable is ambiguous. What is agreeable may very well be what also is a true good. But it also happens that what is a true good may be disagreeable . .

Not only do feelings respond to values. They do so in accord with some scale of preference. So we may distinguish vital, social, cultural, personal and religious values in an ascending order... (Method in Theology, p. 31).

And on feelings and symbols, he says: "A symbol is an image of a real or imaginary object that evokes a feeling or is evoked by a feeling" (*ibid.*, p. 64).

Now if you connect *symbols* with *values* because of their common relation to *feelings*, you arrive at the insight that our spontaneous symbolic expressions, such as dreams, can at times be manifestations of our orientation in the realm of values, of what Lonergan calls the subject as

existential: they can show what one has decided for oneself that one really wants to make of oneself, or what one is perhaps making of oneself due to desires that originate independently of one's free decisions.

Now dreams come into our consciousness at the first level, as data at the level of *experience*. But the dream can be worked on at each of the higher levels of consciousness. First, we can inquire into the *meaning* of the dream. This inquiry and the insights that lead to an answer are operations of the second level of consciousness. These operations, of course, are not easy. The interpretation of dreams is a difficult art, and some of the depth psychologists have a great deal to teach us in this regard. But the meaning of the dream, in many cases, will be a clarification of what I *want*, of my spontaneous scale of value preferences, of the habitual orientation of my desires: this is the point.

Next I can ask: Is my interpretation of the dream correct? I must weigh the evidence -in this case, I must ask, among other things, does the interpretation *feel* the same way the dream *felt*, and does it account for all of the dream's nuances of feeling and symbol? As the evidence mounts, I draw closer to being able to say, Yes, at least this much is correct, however much further reflection may reveal deeper dimensions. The symbols of many dreams have a significance that will never be adequately expressed. But this is no reason for abandoning the quest for truth, especially about oneself.

Finally, there is the *responsible* level of inquiry: in this case, what am I going to do about this? The dream may disclose some unpleasant truths about one's desires and actions, one's value-preferences and orientations. But there is nothing fatalistic about the dream. It is *data* for the higher levels of consciousness. I can ask, Do I really want to be like this? What can I do to change my orientation? If I act on these questions and their answers, I will find that the quality of dreams gradually changes. The dream may be beckoning to a *conversion*. It may itself be an occasion and instrument of God's grace.

Now not all of our dreams can be understood precisely in this way. A complete theory would have to be very nuanced and subtle. But to grasp the relation of feelings to values and to symbols, and then to relate values and symbols to one another: this, I have found, is a starting point for a whole science of depth psychology that would provide an alternative to the reductionistic positions found in so many other authors. And it is all possible due to the work of Bernard Lonergan, who has analyzed the structure of consciousness and has clarified the differences between converted and unconverted orientations as we produce what Lonergan himself calls the first and only edition of ourselves.

BERNARD LONERGAN AND THE FUTURE OF SPIRITUAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

Harvey D. Egan, S.J.
Boston College

In 1982 when I wrote *What Are They Saying About Mysticism?* chapter nine, "A Future Mystical Theology," focused exclusively on Father Bernard Lonergan's spiritual and mystical theology. I contended in this work that his works can provide the unshakable foundation required for the successful transposition of traditional spiritual and mystical theology into a much needed contemporary framework. Spirituality and mysticism now exist in an age of science, technology, statistical analysis, psychoanalysis, biofeedback, philosophical and theological pluralism, ecumenics, and the East-West religious dialogue. Therefore, theologians of spirituality and mysticism can and should find in Lonergan's theological method, based on the inherently *mystical* dynamism of the human mind, one of the best ways to correlate critically and comprehensively religion, spirituality, mysticism, theology, science, and culture in general. In short, Lonergan has provided the requisite critical foundations for a "new science" of spirituality and mysticism.

"But what does *Lonergan* have to do with spirituality and mysticism?" is a question I have been asked since then all too frequently. *Everything!* God has engraved into every person's being, according to Lonergan, not only a call to seek the truth, but also a call to unrestricted love of God. The transcendental precepts, the "native spontaneities and inevitabilities" of human consciousness, are not only: "Be attentive," "Be intelligent," "Be reasonable," and "Be responsible." One precept also demands: "Be in love!" Hence, loving God without restrictions fulfills and perfects the primordial orientation of our consciousness.

Mystical love affects a person's entire being, changes a person's roots, and provides the ultimate ambience, or matrix, in which a person experiences, understands, reasons, judges, and acts. For this reason, Lonergan distinguishes, but never separates, the theologian's call to unrestricted love of God and his or her own theological reflection. Theological reflection always takes place in the personal atmosphere of the acceptance or refusal to surrender to the unconditional love of God.

The experience of God produces the undertow of our beings, our basic spiritual metabolism, a dreaded call to holiness that speaks either loudly or softly from our very roots. This immense longing that varies from person to person --and even varies during a person's lifetime - provides the silent or the loud ambience for all theological reflection. The more the theologian surrenders to this innate mystical hunger for ultimate truth, meaning, and love, the more he or she experiences intellectual, moral, psychic, and religious conversion.

Lonergan views conversion as a major theological reality and concept. Many breakthroughs in theology happen only when the theologian is changed, only when he or she surrenders to the Spirit's dynamism to be attentive, understanding, reasonable, decisive, and in love. Lonergan's cognitional theory and theological method ground themselves in the very life of the human spirit and in the intellectual, moral, psychic, and religious conversions this life effects.

Therefore, the theologian must examine his or her own *readiness* for conversion, because this readiness or its absence permeates the entire theological enterprise. And if a person's living faith, hope, and love provide the essential source for right living, thinking, and deciding, then the living faith, hope, and love of the entire church, of the mystics and the saints (as special paradigms of this living faith, hope, and love), and that of the theologian proper must be more clearly and more explicitly used as theological sources. Theology is to a large extent *sentire cum ecclesia, cum sanctis, cum mysticis*, and even a *sentire seipsum*.

Father Lonergan has given us a theology rooted in the truth and love of an authentic self embraced by God's call to unrestricted love - and from a self structured by judgment, decision, and surrender to Love itself. In one sense theology is nothing more than prayer, spirituality, and mysticism seeking understanding with unflinching rigour.

After nine years of relatively close living with Father Lonergan, I would say that the genuine theologian is the authentic self, methodologically, resolutely, and scrupulously thinking his thinking and understanding his understanding - a thinking and an understanding permeated by the call to the unrestricted love of God. Lonergan was a holy thinker who worshipped both with his mind and with his heart, who joined together discreet love and loving understanding. His theology is a love that thinks and a thinking that loves. What Dame Edith Sitwell wished for, Lonergan has shown to be true: "the fire of the mind and the heart are one."

"COR AD COR LOQUITUR": BERNARD LONERGAN, S.J.

Fred Lawrence
Boston College

Bernard Lonergan, S.J., died 26 November 1984, barely a month before his eightieth birthday. He has been acclaimed one of the greatest theologians of this century; many believe him to be one of the greatest thinkers of our time. But we really have no idea how great he is. He has students around the globe. External tributes to his greatness are there: kudos on various occasions, Festschriften, ecclesiastical and secular honours, congresses, symposia, workshops, journals, institutes, research centres, the archive and trust fund established in his name at his home college (Regis in Toronto). But he would certainly have no illusions that these constitute any intrinsic measure of greatness. In fact, his influence is rather low-key, and the achievement and stature of his students is still difficult to assess. His own standards were awfully high and incredibly rigorous. Those who are convinced that he fulfilled them must have learned enough about such matters to know that estimating greatness of a world-historical order is a dangerous business indeed.

We can glimpse something of the tenor of his lifework in the following passage taken from his most well-known work, *Insight*:

Even with talent, knowledge makes a slow, if not a bloody, entrance. To learn thoroughly is a vast undertaking that calls for relentless perseverance. To strike out on a new line and become more than a weekend celebrity calls for years in

which one's living is more or less constantly absorbed in the effort to understand...

But what really was Lonergan's line?

Well, we know how, relatively early on, he admired the way Thomas Aquinas laboured in the high Middle Ages to make his transformation of the intellectualism of Aristotle shine "as unmistakably as the sun on the noonday summer hills of Italy." And so, in two breathtaking works on Thomas Aquinas's thought, *Grace and Freedom* and *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, he aimed at "reaching up to the mind of Aquinas." Then, in a massive (748 pp.) book he modestly called an "essay in aid of the appropriation of rational self-consciousness" - *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (1957) - he attempted to "transpose St. Thomas's position to meet the issues of our own day."

We may get a suggestion from Lonergan about what these issues were:

Modernity lacks roots. Its values lack balance and depth. Much of its science is destructive of man. Catholics in the twentieth century are faced with a problem similar to that met by Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Then Greek and Arabic culture were pouring into Western Europe and, if it was not to destroy Christendom, it had to be known, assimilated, transformed. Today modern culture, in many ways more stupendous than any that ever existed, is surging around us. It too has to be known, assimilated, transformed.

Insight is an awe-inspiring documentation of how Lonergan undertook to contribute to that job of knowing, assimilating, and transforming modern culture. His prior effort to reach up to the mind of Aquinas helped him in this. Not only did it strengthen his appreciation of what it meant to attain explanatory theory; but, in grasping what Aquinas meant by "understanding," Lonergan discovered that the key to uncovering the intelligibility at the basis of all science and action is what he later called *generalized empirical method* - an expansion of awareness that attends to the data of our consciousnesses even as we advert to any sense data we happen to be inquiring about or are interested in. If philosophers have attended explicitly to the data of consciousness before, no one ever focused upon the act of understanding or insight in quite the way Lonergan has done. And this focus enabled him to make the striking claim in *Insight*

Thoroughly understand what it is to understand, and not only will you understand the broad lines of all there is to be understood but also you will possess a fixed base, an invariant pattern, opening upon all further developments of understanding.

Insight into insight - something he never could have hit upon in quite the way he did without subjecting himself in a long and hard tutelage to St. Thomas would be for Lonergan a key to providing modernity with roots, balance, and depth, and for transforming its human and natural sciences.

So Lonergan had learned much from Thomas Aquinas: not just that theology is a theoretic apprehension of what believers already know by faith, but that theology is a "principle for the moulding and transformation of culture." As he put it, "theology not only has to reflect on revelation, but it also has somehow to mediate God's meaning into the whole of human affairs." Or again; "theology is called upon to influence the cultural context, to translate the word of God and to project it into new mentalities and new situations." Indeed, *Insight* alone would have secured Lonergan's place in the history of thought. But it was only the initial phase of a far vaster undertaking whose dimensions are encoded in the title of his next foundational work, *Method in Theology*.

This work is the summary and elegantly rounded-off outcome of over two decades of painstaking thought accomplished even as Lonergan was teaching his courses on the Incarnate Word and on the Trinity at the Gregorian University. It was perilously endangered by a lung operation in his mid-sixties. Those fortunate enough to have attended one or another of those method seminars (or, perhaps, to get hold of some of the notes from them), held on both sides of the Atlantic during those years of gestation, can appreciate just how much of a summary *Method in Theology* is - maddeningly dense, allusive, and elliptical all at the same time.

But in *Method*, one notices that the Lonergan who had been stunningly abreast of so much in *Insight* was still changing, learning, growing, ripening. In *Verbum* Lonergan had written, "For Augustine our hearts are restless until they rest in God; for Aquinas, not our hearts, but first and most our minds are restless until they rest in seeing Him." Before the appearance of *Method in Theology*, one supposed that Lonergan had sided with Aquinas. As he grew older, Lonergan often said, "I've gotten more and more Augustinian." And *Method* (along with the many essays written and published since its completion) provides abundant evidence of that.

True, one is almost blinded by the brilliance with which the *lectio* (exegesis), *quaestio* (speculative theology), and *praedicatio* (preaching) of Thomas get transposed by Lonergan into a functionally specialized process of research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematics, and communications. But those familiar with *Insight* and the earlier works were to be astonished by Lonergan's treatment in *Method* of feelings, values, and conversions (intellectual, moral and above all religious); and by its almost haunting talk about "being in love with God." The refrain of *Romans* 5, 5 ("God's love has flooded our inmost heart through the Holy Spirit he has given us") was a signal that *Insight's* "pure and unrestricted desire to know" had been swept up into what Lonergan could then speak of as "the passionateness of being."

As a result of *Method's* new apprehension of the significance of values and of religious conversion, from 1974 on Lonergan repeatedly describes human development as a hermeneutic circle with two vectors:

There is development from below upwards, from experience to growing understanding, from growing understanding to balanced judgment, from balanced judgment to fruitful courses of action, and from fruitful courses of action to the new situations that call forth further understanding, profounder judgment, richer courses of action.

But there also is development from above downwards. There is the transformation of falling in love: the domestic love of the family; the human love of one's tribe, one's city, one's country, mankind; the divine love that orientates man in his cosmos and expresses itself in his worship.

Where hatred sees only evil, love reveals values. At once it commands commitment and joyfully carries it out. . . Where hatred reinforces bias love dissolves it. . .

For just as the creative process when unaccompanied by healing is distorted and corrupted by bias, so too the healing process, when unaccompanied by creating is a soul without a body ...(F)or a single development has two vectors, one from below upwards, creating the other from above downward healing.

A startling instance of Lonergan's response to the need for human creating is his work on economics. It is a major example of that relentless perseverance that he told us is the condition for thorough learning. At the very outset of his career, for more than a decade, and during his years as Visiting Distinguished Professor at Boston College, Lonergan carried on his "long, hard, uphill climb" toward an economic analysis "that reveals how moral precepts have both a basis in economic process and so an effective application to it." As he expressed it, "When survival requires a system that does not exist, then the need for creating is manifest." As a result of all his toil, there exist several revisions of an approximately 150-page typescript of an economic analysis of the production process and monetary circulation, along with several thick volumes of transcripts of his Boston College lectures on economics and the dialectic of history, for which that text supplied the main reading. All this represents a harvest that Lonergan in a sense did not live long enough to reap, and his students will have to labour mightily to keep it from going to waste.

To conclude, Lonergan spent years and years - right up to his 78th year - teaching, at Jesuit schools of theology in Canada, in Rome at the Gregorian where he taught students from 80 different countries, and at Harvard and Boston College in the U.S. Through these years, he kept up a virtually symbiotic relationship with the Thomas More Institute for Adult Education in Montreal. Like his beloved Newman, education was always Lonergan's line. I don't think we would be far from the mark in supposing that the test he set for a genuine development of the thought of St. Thomas was never far from his mind: "A completely genuine development of the thought of St. Thomas will command in all the universities of the modern world the same admiration and respect that St. Thomas himself commanded in the medieval University of Paris."

And those who have been involved in his knowing and caring can scarcely doubt the centrality for his life-practice of Newman's simple motto: Cor ad cor loquitur. Heart speaks to heart.

V Envoi

“ . . . inasmuch as being in Christ Jesus is the being of subject, the hand of the Lord ceases to be hidden. In ways you all have experienced, in ways some have experienced more frequently or more intensely than others, in ways you still have to experience, and in ways none of us in this life will ever experience, the substance in Christ Jesus becomes the subject in Christ Jesus.” – Collection, p. 250.

“For the spirit of inquiry within us never calls a halt, never can be satisfied, until our intellects, united to God as body to soul, know ipsum intelligere and through that vision, though then knowing aught else is a trifle, contemplate the universe as well.” - Verbum, p. 53.

HOMILY, FUNERAL OF FATHER BERNARD LONERGAN, S.J. Our Lady of Lourdes Church, Toronto, Nov. 29,1984.

Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. Regis College, Toronto

Dear friends, my brothers and sisters in the family of God.

With this holy Eucharist, and with these ceremonies, we take our leave of one who was with us throughout a long life, and was related to us in many ways. To some he was an older brother, an uncle or cousin. To others a fellow religious in the family of Ignatius. To still others, a teacher among his students, or a colleague in the world of academe and in the Christian intellectual apostolate. In each of these capacities, and in the diverse ways they suggest, he was very dear to us.

With all of us, with all God's people, he was present in another way that lies at a deeper level: as one of the great human family, with its joys and its hopes, its griefs and its anxieties; as one who came forth, as we all did, from the hand of God, whose life on earth, as for each of us, was a pilgrimage; as one to whom the word has now come, as come it will to us all, that his pilgrimage is over, his days on earth completed, his time fulfilled, his life arrived at its term.

To speak in this way is to suppose that life has a unity. It is to suppose a plan, an ordered course, not just the aimless wandering between a chance beginning and a meaningless end. And so we ask, naturally and with human affection, as relatives and friends, but reverently too, as before God and the mystery of human life, we ask what made the unity in the life of Father Bernard Lonergan. We know that three times at least in his life he was very near to death, only to be saved, from a human viewpoint, by major surgery, but from a higher viewpoint, surely by the will of a mysterious providence. And so we wonder about that mysterious providence. Why did not God say, sixty-five or twenty or even two years ago: This life has reached its term? Why only now did God see it as whole and complete?

There is, of course, the familiar metaphor of the course of the day: the morning, noon and evening of life, as forming a natural unity. Personally I find a great appeal in that metaphor as applied to the life of Bernard Lonergan. I think of the morning of his life in the valley of the Lièvre. I remember Lampman's poem about morning on that river

*Like a vapor from the forge
Of a giant somewhere hid,
Out of hearing of the clang
Of his hammer, skirts of mist
Slowly up the woody gorge
Lift and hang.*

And I picture the boy Bernard, as his eyes dwell on those morning mists, and his young mind opens already to receive the wonder of the world. I think of the noontide of his life, when he was at the height of his power in Italy. I remember his own words on the work of Aquinas, that it "shines as unmistakably as the sun on the noonday summer hills of Italy" (*Verbum*, 219). And I think of his own magnificent intelligence, shedding new light during those years on old questions, uttering wisdom with the clarity of the Italian skies. I think finally of the evening of his life, spent at Regis College and Boston College, when his great masterpieces were done. And again I find a fitting description of this in his own lines on "the serenity of old age, when perforce the self becomes selfless as the field of enjoyment contracts to joy in the enjoyment of others, in the romping vitality of grandchildren" (*Collection*, 37). His grandchildren, to be sure, were his students rather than flesh and blood descendants, and some of us are rather greyhaired to be grandchildren; but it is true that in his declining years he could rest more quietly, knowing that his work was going forward, carried on with boundless energy by a numerous spiritual progeny.

It is a pleasing picture, especially for one who has lived out his allotted fourscore years. And yet I know that it is too idyllic - too idyllic by far for a life that did not in fact run smoothly from morning mists through noonday sun to the shadows of evening. And what alone is important, such a life does not bear much resemblance to the life of him who is our way and our truth, of him whose way and truth Bernard strove throughout life to understand, so that, in the Ignatian prayer, he might love him more and follow him better.

Is it not then to that very source itself, to him who is our way and our truth, that we should turn for enlightenment on our question? He who was sent into the world to be our Leader, who invited us to follow him and become his disciples, he seemed to provide, in his great prayer at the Last Supper, the perfect summation of what a human life on earth should be: "I have glorified thee on earth by completing the work which thou gavest me to do" (*John*, 17:4). Have we here the clue we seek to the unity of life, of life for anyone? Is it not to be found in completing the work that God has given each of us to do? And must we not study the work that Bernard was given to do, and thus discover the unity of his life, and the mystery of the providence that spared him so long?

If so, we will look, first and most naturally, as his sixty-year career in seminary and university; for there, without a shadow of doubt, his particular vocation lay. We will examine his teaching

and lecturing, his published and unpublished writings, the recorded consultations and interviews and responses to questions, his studies of his beloved Thomas Aquinas and his own independent philosophy and theology, the method he created to push forward the boundaries of knowledge in these and other fields - the whole great accumulation of half a century of unremitting labor and productivity, the products of his mind, and not just of his mind, but of his mind and heart, works of beauty too and not just of arid argument.

Is this the place to find the clue we seek? Certainly it is an area we would gladly explore, those of us who are convinced of the importance of that productivity for church and world. But maybe this is not the time, nor this the place, for that exploration. In any case are we quite sure that the meaning and unity of life is to be discovered there? Is it the works we produce externally, be they works of hand or voice, of mind or heart, is it these products that reveal the mind of God on the work given each one of us to do?

At least, they do not seem to tell the whole story. Too often the great Lord of life and death cuts short a work half done or only started. Sometimes we are listening to a symphony on the radio, and a glorious piece of music is moving to achieve its incomparable unity, when a hand reaches out to switch off the radio, and the music comes to a sudden end, broken off in mid course. Does not God sometimes seem to act that way with us?

Bernard Lonergan was spared so shattering an interruption of his work. But even he had to round off one great book before it was really finished, complete another in shorter form, pressured by ill-health and an uncertain life-span, leave a third only partly ready at his death. And if we go back to the divine Model himself, we find that his work too, considered as a product, was not so obviously completed: a few uncomprehending disciples, squabbling among themselves at the Last Supper itself, and running to escape at the first sign of danger - does this adequately describe the work that God gave the only Son to accomplish?

Maybe we have been somewhat hasty in determining what the prayer at the Last Supper means; maybe there is something more to be said. Indeed there is another aspect to the task set the Son of God, and I find it in the Letter to the Hebrews: "It was clearly fitting that God for whom and through whom all things exist should, in bringing many sons to glory, make the leader who delivers them perfect through sufferings"(2:10). And, again, "son though he was, he learned obedience in the school of suffering, and, once perfected, became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him" (5:8-9).

Here surely is a new insight on the work that Jesus was given to do: not now the calling of disciples, not the teaching of a doctrine, not the founding of a church; rather, a work that directly concerned himself. He was to learn obedience, he was to perfect himself, he was to make of himself what God would have him be. To be sure, it was in and through achievement of the work which is a product, that he was to perfect himself, and make of himself what he was to be - through his calling of the disciples and the founding of a church - but in the order that Hebrews reveals, first to perfect himself and then to bring many children to glory.

And now maybe we can see a little more clearly, and in relation to the life of our Lord and only Master, what the work was which Bernard Lonergan was given to do, and how the years of his life form a unity.

I would like, in order to make this clearer still, to use here a pair of ideas from his own writings. I know that some of you loved Bernard without always understanding what he wrote. But, just because you loved him, I know also you would like to hear how he would explain what I have been trying to say. He would use a pair of Greek words, *poiesis* and *praxis*. *Poiesis* refers to the work we produce, the product. When a carpenter builds a house, or a musician composes a sonata, or an author writes a book - all that refers to *poiesis*. But *praxis* lies behind all such production; it refers to our own conduct: our own deliberations and choices and decisions, our own responsible actions. There is a unity in the two: a carpenter does not build a house without making a deliberate choice, and we have no responsible action unless we do something. But it is *praxis* that makes us what we are, in what Father Bernard would call our existential decision: the decision of what we are to make of our lives, that is, what we are to make of ourselves. And, as what we make of ourselves is more important than any house we build, or music we compose, so in the very Son of God, as Hebrews says, it was of first importance that, Son though he was, he should learn obedience. From that the *poiesis* would follow: the doctrine, the disciples, the church.

It is here too that we must look for the pattern of Father Bernard's life. More and more, as I discover in neverending study of his writings, as I reflect on his manner of life, especially in these recent years, more and more, it seems to me, it was this realization that guided him as he moved from the noontide of life to its evening. I think of a line that in its simple profundity speaks volumes to me, as I think it will to you. Writing of the good choices and actions that make us what we are, he calls them "the work of the free and responsible agent producing the first and only edition of himself" (*Second Collection*, 83).

The "first and only edition of himself" - that is a book I and each one of us must write alone as we go through life, producing day by day a new paragraph, to achieve the first and only edition of myself. The empire of an Alexander, the plays of a Shakespeare, the music of a Beethoven - all testify to the great potential of the human race. But God could raise up from the stones of this church those who would provide the empire or the plays or the music that God's people need, or indeed the great works of Bernard Lonergan. There is only one person who can toil throughout life, who must toil throughout life, under God's grace, of course, to accomplish the work given me at birth to do, and, turning it over to God at the end, say, with my Lord and Master, It is finished.

This is the work that Bernard Lonergan was about all his life, whether coursing down the rapids of the Lièvre with brothers Greg and Mark, or lecturing in Latin to six hundred and fifty students in the Gregorian University, or listening indulgently to the papers of his disciples at a Boston College Workshop, or -not least -accepting and enduring these last two years the gradual fading of his mental powers.

The one and only work that really mattered was the work of which he wrote last Monday morning the final paragraph, and turned it over to his Maker for censorship and - we have not the slightest doubt - for divine approval.

A Word of Thanks and Apology

We thank the Rev. William Addley, Provincial, and the other Jesuits of the Province of Upper Canada, for sponsoring what initially we meant to be a tribute to Bernie Lonergan on his eightieth birthday; likewise Mr. Grant Maxwell, editor of Compass, and Ms. Reta Cutler for their full co-operation in preparing this special issue for publication, and all who responded at such short notice to help produce the contents. And - it almost goes without saying - we regret very much that so many who would have wished to contribute had to be omitted from our list. - Editors.

FINAL WORD FROM THE EDITORS

We have referred to this collection of tributes as a “*mini-Festschrift*” – “mini” in comparison with other publications edited with a similar purpose. Thus, twenty years ago Father Lonergan's friends put out a volume called *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. The stock of this was sold out within a month of its publication, but it was followed five years ago by *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*, published by Marquette University Press. This too was quickly sold out (in fact it became the all-time best-seller of the publishers), but the original hardback edition has just been reissued in paperback. Finally, papers from a conference on Religion and Culture, held at the University of Santa Clara in 1984 and meant to celebrate Father Lonergan's eighty years, are being published soon by State University of New York Press. - Still, “mini” though it be, we hope our readers will take the wish for the deed and regard our little collection as a worthy tribute to one to whom we all owe so much. Further copies may be obtained at cost from the Editors at Regis College, Toronto.

BOOKS BY BERNARD LONERGAN:

- Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, London & New York, 1957.
De constitutione Christi ontologica et psychologica, Rome, 1956.
De Deo Trino, 2 vols., Rome, 1964.
De Verbo In carnato (mimeographed), Rome, 1964. *Collection*, New York & London, 1967.
Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas, University of Notre Dame & London, 1967.
Grace and Freedom in Aquinas, London & New York, 1971.
Method in Theology, London & New York, 1972.
Philosophy of God, and Theology, London & Philadelphia, 1973.
A Second Collection, London & Philadelphia, 1974.
Bernard Lonergan: 3 Lectures, Montreal, 1975.
The Way to Nicea, London, 1976.
Understanding and Being: An Introduction and Companion to Insight, Toronto & New York, 1980.
A Third Collection, New York & London, 1985.