

‘[This chapter] first elucidates the current debate between quantitative researchers and their critics by situating it within the paradigms articulated by Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan in *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. Then, it proposes a further refinement of Burrell and Morgan’s work by drawing on the work of Bernard Lonergan, demonstrating how his work bridges the chasm between the two camps. It then points out the current “flatland” state of the social sciences, drawing on Richard Bernstein, Jurgen Habermas, Charles Taylor, and Alan Wallace, who all address the limitations of contemporary social science that focuses solely on “what is.” It then uses the work of Daniel Helminiak, who extends Lonergan’s work to the social sciences, to propose a solution to the dilemma at hand, showing how spirituality and the social sciences can live together harmoniously and complement one another in the spirituality at work conversation.’


‘This article explores insights from René Girard and Bernard Lonergan on the ‘structure’ of evil in human living. For Girard, the root of human evil lies in rivalries, affections of the human heart that lead to mimetic competition, and in the extreme, to the scapegoating of innocent or vulnerable people. For Lonergan, evil is the opposite of the good, so that there is a sense in which he identifies evil as it opposes the good at every level of its structure. In the case of both thinkers, the hope of a solution to the persistence of evil lies in the positive mimesis or imitation and participation in the Triune life of God.’ (Abstract.)

‘This paper will explore how Lonergan’s later thought might bear on an aesthetic argument for God’s existence, which could complement the argument for God’s existence developed in *Insight*, chapter 19. ... The purpose of this paper is to articulate the aesthetic experience from the philosophy of Lonergan and illustrate how this gives way to a contemplation of beauty leading naturally (logically) to the question of God or some ultimate significance that is transcendent. Such a question is answered, one could say, in the moments of aesthetic experience, wrought with a surplus of meaning, which de facto imply a sense of ultimate reality in which general transcendent knowledge is reasonably deduced.’


‘This paper uses the thought of the philosopher and theologian, Bernard Lonergan, the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz, the writer on religion, Mircea Eliade and successor of Lonergan, Robert Doran, to look at sacred symbols. It argues that certain primary sacred symbols in a community function in an explanatory way. The paper concludes by illustrating how key symbols function in three religions: a native American religion, Christianity and Buddhism. The author notes that besides attending to the symbols of a religion, it is also necessary to pay attention to the concrete drama of daily living if we are to be able to interpret the symbols correctly.’ (Abstract.)


‘This paper introduces the work of B. F. Lonergan, a Canadian philosopher and theologian, who is almost unknown in [the] Slovak philosophical context. The paper covers basic elements and sources, which are necessary for the research on Lonergan’s work. Since Lonergan’s texts are new for our philosophical community, we are facing the problem of how to translate some of the key terms of his philosophy (e.g. ‘insight’). In its second part, the paper shows [some] basic principles of the transcendental method in philosophy. There is a specific tradition that Lonergan is part of, [namely,] transcendental Thomism. Its [other] representatives are, among others, Maréchal, Muck, and Coreth. They accept the classical principles of Thomistic philosophy, [and] respond to Kantian philosophy. The analysis of the success of the transcendental method in philosophy is valuable and helps us to understand the developments in modern philosophy.’ (Abstract, with slight amendments.)


This journal has recently moved to: [http://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda](http://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda). It now allows for completely online submissions and editorial process. Volumes 1-4 are still available at the old site: [http://www.mun.ca/jmda](http://www.mun.ca/jmda).

‘James and Lonergan both dealt with religious conversion issues as a sort of apex to their study in their major works. ... Because of Lonergan’s criticism of pragmatism, mainstream Lonerganian scholars have also seemingly been turned away from attending to classical American thought. As best as I can judge, they do not show much interest in relating Lonergan’s views to this school of American thought. They seem instead to pay more attention to European developments and to finding ways of relating Lonergan’s work to the European tradition. In this essay, therefore, I will specify and compare the ideas which are shared between William James and Bernard Lonergan in their study of religious conversion.’


‘...there is a context of enrichment in so far as one pauses over the title question as a sort of an inner-divine dialogue: Hindu or Christian or even mono-divine self-searching. Of course, in a developed perspective on divinity, the question-mark comes to be acknowledged as metaphorical. But there is an enrichment to be had in brooding over the divine brooding. And it can be further enriched in so far as the “you” is not inner to divinity but “the other” brooded over by the divine, in whatever sense a high religion gives “the other”: then the want becomes the want of history, the desire of the everlasting hills or the hills of Zulu Africa. It is this want, especially as an educational want, that is my present topic, the want as brooded over by divinity and humanity, indeed best done in the togetherness of divinity and humanity that can be identified as kataphatic prayer. However, the simplest meaning of the title is as a question from me to you, a question then to be brooded over and cherished by you.’ There are frequent references to Lonergan throughout the text.


‘My contention is that Rahner’s and Lonergan’s philosophy of religion can ground the notion of a shared religious experience or common consciousness of grace that spans the borders of the religions and take seriously the claim of a genuine variety within religious experience. ... First, [this essay] summarizes Lonergan’s and Rahner’s universalist view. Second, it presents two challenges to the universalism of Rahner and Lonergan—one from George Lindbeck and his post-liberal school of theology and the other from the Levinas-Derrida tradition of post-modernism. Third, it offers a Rahnerian-Lonerganian response to these challenges. Fourth, the paper will spell out the implications of Rahner’s and Lonergan’s philosophy of religion for inter-religious dialogue. In this section, I will argue that Lonergan’s and Rahner’s philosophy of religion gives rise to an approach to other faith traditions that can benefit the study and practice of interreligious dialogue in a 21st century global situation.’


‘Lonergan's account of Christ's human knowledge, by its use of technical terms and a carefully worked out analogy from human knowing, represents an advance on Balthasar's often fluid position. While sympathetic to the notion of systematic theology as primarily an explanatory discipline, the article suggests several openings where more dramatically oriented categories might complement such an approach.’ (author’s abstract.)

‘[Lonergan’s] complex thought contains much of vital importance to understanding contemporary global issues from economics to education and, of course, philosophy and religion. Theology mediates between religion and culture. Theology of religions is the discipline that thematizes the relationship of Christianity to other religions. Three decades of effort by specialists have generated a theological ‘Babel.’ The confusion and lack of a cumulative result have led to alternative paths to the discipline: a comparative theology of religious engagement in the US, and an intercultural theology in Europe. Still, the impasse remains. Lonergan offers dynamic structures, heuristic tools, and a collaborative framework for specialists to rise to a higher viewpoint and move toward a comprehensive understanding of the fact and significance of religious diversity. The task and nature of the discipline can be reconceptualized with his critical contribution.’ (Publisher’s blurb.)


‘El artículo expone primeramente el método trascendental de Lonergan y el papel que en él juegan las conversiones, en especial la afectiva, y su influjo indirecto en dos de sus especializaciones funcionales (“dialéctica” y “fundamentaciones”). Luego lo relaciona con la “praxis como método” según el mismo Lonergan, y a ésta, con el conocimiento por connaturalidad tomista, el discernimiento afectivo ignaciano y el método directo blondeliano. Finalmente trata del método dialógico como método práctico para superar –según Lonergan – el absurdo social. Así se muestra la importancia de la conversión afectiva tanto en la teoría como en la praxis.’


‘... this paper seeks 1) to provide a synopsis of Bernard Lonergan’s proof for the existence of God as presented in chapter nineteen of Insight, 2) to explain how Lonergan later came to critique his approach in Insight 19 in light of subsequent philosophical developments, and 3) to assess the ongoing relevance of Lonergan’s Insight 19 argument given the aforementioned critique. The issues discussed in this paper are important for a variety of reasons. First, Lonergan’s argument for the existence of God may in fact be a sound argument. Second, Lonergan prefaced his argument with the incredibly bold and enticing claim that while arguments for the existence of God are many, all such arguments are implicitly included in the general form of his own argument. And third, however one may assess the preceding claim, the second and third parts of this paper will raise fundamental questions regarding the function and existential significance of any philosophical proof for the existence of God, and by doing so will contribute to contemporary discussions concerning the relevance of philosophical theology.’


‘My aim is to highlight four philosophical presuppositional issues that underlie the questions associated with God-arguments precisely as such. ... The first of the philosophical presuppositional issues I have in mind is epistemological: Do I ever genuinely know anything at all? The remaining issues are metaphysical. One is general: What are the characteristics of
reality precisely as such? And two are particular: Is utter badness real? Is direct divine self-disclosure real? In the first part of my paper’s three parts, I will recount four common stances on these issues that short-circuit the enterprise of attempting to argue philosophically in favor of God before it gets started. ... In the second part ... I will review two other common stances that serve to undercut the potential religious relevance of any philosophical God-argument, even if it happens to be rationally successful. ... Finally, in my paper’s third part I will spell out a further set of philosophical presuppositions, all of which, in my view, must be in place if any particular argument in favor of God is to have hope of being rationally successful and religiously relevant.’

Walczak, Monika. ‘Bernard Lonergan’s Philosophy of Knowing’ (‘La filosofía del conocer de Bernard Lonergan.’). *Revista de Filosofía* 45 (Septiembre-Diembre 2008) 141-52.

The paper gives a general presentation of the profile and philosophical achievements of Canadian Catholic theologian and philosopher Bernard Lonergan, especially his cognitional theory and epistemology. It confines itself to expounding his views from his main philosophical book: *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. To present Lonergan's philosophy of knowing it addresses the following issues: 1. Life; 2. Influence; 3. Works; 4. A general account of Lonergan's philosophy; 5. Knowing as a subject of philosophy; 6. Self-appropriation as the aim and method of philosophy; 7. Basic philosophical questions and a hierarchy of the areas of philosophy; 8. Cognitional theory and the cognitional question: a) The generalized empirical method; b) The dynamic structure of knowing (experiencing, understanding, judging); 9. Epistemology and the epistemological question: a) The aim of knowing; b) The notion of objectivity; 10. The metaphysics of the knowing subject and the metaphysical question: a) The notion of being (reality); b) The infinite desire to know and being an authentic knower.’ (From the Abstract.)


‘Ce livre présente la pensée d’un philosophe et théologien canadien anglophone, Bernard Lonergan, jésuite, considéré outre-Atlantique comme un des grands penseurs contemporains. Bernard Lonergan est l’homme d’un projet: réconcilier la foi et la raison, et l’homme d’une découverte: le rôle essentiel de la conversion, qu'elle soit intellectuelle, morale et religieuse, dans le processus de la vérité. Sa théorie de l'objectivité, comme subjectivité authentique, tente de réconcilier la métaphysique classique avec la gnoséologie moderne issue de la philosophie du sujet. Elle cherche à unifier les champs de l’expérience, de la norme et de l’absolu. L’illégitimité de ce qui s’offre au regard de l’homme lui fait prendre conscience que son existence est fondée sur l’inconditionnel d’une nature primordiale à laquelle il donne le nom de Dieu. Et dans l’événement de sa foi, qui est la transfiguration de son désir d’être, il découvre que Dieu se nomme lui-même et le fait devenir être en amour. La Presqu’île du divin indique d’une façon imagée la profondeur de la découverte de Bernard Lonergan au coeur de l'intelligence humaine, de son processus, de son désir d’être et de connaître. Le Transcendant n’est pas enfermé dans sa propre immanence mais le mouvement de sa propre immanence lui fait reconnaître qu’il existe une signification de lui-même qu’il ne peut tirer de lui-même, qui n’est pas pure auto-transcendance mais qui se révèle dans son auto-transcendance, ce que Lonergan appelle aussi la subjectivité authentique. Ce livre voudrait faire connaître en France cette pensée qui cherche à la fois à abattre les bastions mais encore à franchir les limites habituelles que l'on met entre philosophie et théologie, entre raison et foi, entre culture et foi, à travers l’éròs de l’esprit humain.’


**REVIEWS**


Martin, Stephen L. *Healing and Creativity in Economic Ethics* (LSN 28/3; 2007).


**WEBWORKS**

Bernard Lonergan.com

Since the last LSN, many new materials have been added to www.bernardlonergan.com (primary materials). Check the ‘News and Events’ section on the site. Recent additions include the ‘fragments on assent’ still extant from Lonergan’s lengthy essay on assent in the early 1930s and notes for a lecture delivered in 1947 on the metaphysical framework for the psychology of *Verbum.* A transcript of the 1971 Institute on *Method in Theology* at Milltown Park, Dublin, is now available, as are both recordings and transcripts of the question-and-answer sessions at the Lonergan Workshops of 1977, 1978, and 1979. Bob Doran has transcribed some Latin and English handwritten notes written in the early 1960s related to the various courses and institutes on method. A number of these transcriptions are available on the site.

Lonerganresource.com.

Now available at www.lonerganresource.com are all the back issues of *Lonergan Workshop* and of *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies.* Also new to this website are the following events/conferences:

Doran, as well as lectures by Mark Morelli (‘Fides et Ratio: The Final Chapter’), H. Daniel Monsour (‘Harmonious Continuation of the Actual Order of This Universe’), and Tad Dunne (‘Next Revolution in Ethics’ and ‘How a Christian Watches the News and Prays’). Some of these are pdf documents, and some include mp3 recordings.


McShane, Philip. [www.philipmcshane.ca](http://www.philipmcshane.ca).  


*Bridgepoise 10:* ‘The Liberal Arts as the Core of Future Science: Part Two.’ The keynote address given at the International Conference on the Liberal Arts (Sept 29- Oct 1) at St.Thomas University (Fredericton, New Brunswick). It complements the paper given at this conference which appears in *Bridgepoise 3*.

**GEMS**

*This section includes works that make little or no mention Lonergan but focus on topics that Lonergan has written about. Contributors are asked to give a few words explaining the relevance of the citation. We encourage other contributors to share their wealth!*


‘A common set of metaphysical assumptions inform the theological proposals of many contributors to *Theology and the Political: The New Debate*. Those assumptions are orientated toward grounding the possibility of genuine ontological creativity (poesis) in a particular construal of nature’s mediation of the supernatural. Applying the claims of Bernard Lonergan’s early work on grace and freedom to those assumptions, the argument is made that this position repeats the most fundamental flaws of the Bañezian position in the *de Auxiliis* controversy: namely, a basic confusion of form with act, which gives rise to the misguided assumption that a “third” (i.e., physical premotion, causal influx, sophia) must be posited to mediate divine grace to the world and within it. It is argued that this confusion reveals that a competitive understanding of the God/world relation is presumed in this proposal, which itself is the result of a failure to affirm the absolute and immediate dependence implied by the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*.’


‘The purpose of this paper is twofold: first, to discuss certain key issues involved in the science wars; second, to review William Rehg’s *Cogent Science in Context: The Science Wars, Argumentation Theory, and Habermas*.’ There are frequent references to Lonergan throughout the article. At one point, the author writes: ‘Lonergan’s (1992) *Insight* was originally published in 1957, a few years before Thomas S. Kuhn’s *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Kuhn, 1970) started the science wars that Rehg discusses. In my estimate
Lonergan’s *Insight* provides the most robust epistemological defense of scientific cognition and reasoning that I know of. In it Lonergan has painstakingly worked out what he refers to as the generalized empirical method (Greek *methodos* = *meta* + *hodos*, way, hence way of proceeding). Moreover, he claims that the generalized empirical method governs all well-grounded, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible human thinking.’


‘An analysis of the concepts of subjectivity and objectivity at work in standard introductions to philosophy reveals an oversight of self-knowledge and tracing the move from a common-sense culture to a scientific one throws up the idea of self-appropriation as the hidden heart of modern thought. The aftermath of the rise of modern physics has been a picture of reality as alienated from our commonly experienced sense of purposes, aims, and intentions as defining our everyday lives, what we may call our “subjectivity”. The existentialist reaction to this has been stifled by this Cartesian dichotomy but the non-sceptical neo-Thomist approach of Bernard Lonergan uncovers the element of self-reflective judgment in knowledge and grounds an act of self-affirmation, thematizing responsibility and agency. I present, with critique, influential moments in the genesis of the received notions of objectivity and of subjectivity, and argue for the inadequacy of Nagel’s problematization of these categories of contemporary thought. With the aim of suggesting a rethink of how philosophy questions are framed in our syllabus I argue [that] two recent papers by colleagues exhibit this very oversight of self-knowledge.’


To explain his title, Massa sets aside an institutional history of Catholicism, as well as a studies of what ordinary Catholics believe and what efforts were made by marginalized groups (women, Hispanics, immigrants from Southeast Asia). Instead he takes a ‘history of ideas’ approach, citing Charles Taylor’s *A Secular Age* as an illustrative model. The key idea he proposes is *historical consciousness*, citing Lonergan in several places, particularly his 1966 article, 'The Transition from a Classicist World View to Historical Mindedness' (*A Second Collection*, pp. 1-9).


‘It is rather widely agreed among thoughtful people, that the humanities in our universities have gone to hell in a handbasket. If I may reassure the reader, and change the metaphor, I do not state or imply that universities are going to the dogs. In the words of George Orwell, ‘These are the dogs. You are at them.’ Objective scholarship and rational discussion have largely gone by the board, and the identity politics of race, gender and sexual orientation have taken their place. What are the causes, and what is the solution? The answer to both questions, I maintain, is basically philosophical.’ There are frequent references to Lonergan throughout the article, and the author concludes: ‘our culture, frankly, is starved of what Lonergan has to offer; and this is nowhere better illustrated than in the state of our universities. Higher education, and indeed education in general, is not about telling people what they want to hear. It is about exercizing people’s minds in the ways indicated by the transcendental precepts, so that they can use them for themselves to find out what is true and what is good, and act accordingly.’

In this address—originally given to conferees at the Lateran University in November of 2006—Ryba identifies one of the causes of the success of the phenomenological movement connected with the *Analecta Husserliana*: membership in this movement is accompanied by a *conversion* (understood in the phenomenological sense). Following the ideas of Husserl, Stein, Lonergan, and Tymieniecka, Ryba explains in what sense commitment to the project of the *Analecta Husserliana* may be construed as a philosophic conversion. He concludes that this conversion is tantamount to the re-education of the *esemplastic* sense, a re-education which takes place both through a conscious understanding of Tymieniecka’s phenomenological project and though a liminal, 'alchemical' transformation that the style of her philosophical writings effects in the reader’s imagination.

### CONFERENCES & COURSES

**Teaching as an Ethical Act: Faculty 2010 Summer Seminar, Center for Catholic Studies Seton Hall University.** Facilitator: Dr. Michael Doorley. ‘Teaching is a profession that places those of us who are teachers into powerful and influential roles. As with any exercise of power, one must learn to wield that power responsibly. It is on this question of responsibility that this workshop focuses its energies. We will look for guidance in the work of the late philosopher/teligionist Bernard Lonergan to sort through the ethical dimensions of teaching – raising questions about one’s attentiveness to the task, one’s openness to insight, one’s quality of judgment, and one’s more or less adequate response to what is valuable. Finally, we will explore how one can understand and value one’s teaching as an act of love, calling on St. Augustine for inspiration and example.’ The following seminar reflection articles are available online at:

http://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=summer-seminars#page=49

1. **Paula B. Alexander**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
2. **Tracey L. Billado**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
3. **Maureen Byrnes**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
4. **Colleen Carrington**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act: The Profession of Nursing’;
5. **Colleen M. Conway**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
6. **James K. Daly**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act: Reflections’;
7. **Mark Doorley**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
8. **Paul F. Gibbons**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
10. **Rosemarie Kramer**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
13. **Tony Loviseck**, ‘Reflections on Teaching as an Ethical Act’;
14. **Elizabeth McCrea**, ‘Teaching as an Ethical Act: Designing Courses as a Means of Fulfiling the University’s Mission’;
15. **John T. Saccoman**, ‘All I Needed to Know about Teaching Mathematics I Learned from Bernard Lonergan ... and George Harrison’;
16. **Kelly A. Shea**, ‘Do We Know How to Teach?’;
17. **John Wargacki**, ‘Patterns of Experience and of Poetry: Meaning and Beauty in the Universe of Verse’;
18. **Yeomin Yoon**, ‘Economics: An Important Dimension of Ethics’;

A meeting organized by Saturnino Muratore, Edoardo Cibelli and Cloe Taddei-Ferretti under the title, *The Centrality of the Subject for the Foundation of a Method in Theology by Bernard Lonergan*, was held Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, Via Monte di Dio 14, 80132 Naples, Italy, on Thursday December 2nd, 2010. Among the presenters were: **G. Guglielmi** speaking on ‘Reflections on Fundamental Theology Starting from the Methodological Proposal of B. Lonergan’; **E. Cibelli** on ‘The Hierarchy of Values in the Existential Horizon of the Subject’; **G. Piccolo** on ‘Lonergan’s Contribution to a Theory of Interpretation’; **S. Muratore** on ‘The General and Special Categories in the Foundational Work of Lonergan’s Method’; **W.A. Mathews** on ‘On the Relationship between Self-Appropriation and Intersubjectivity according to Bernard Lonergan’; **P. Giustiniani** on ‘The Centrality of the Subject for the Lonerganian Foundation of a Method in Theology’; **A. Trupiano** on ‘The Turn to the Subject and Transcendental Method: The Encounter with
Lonergan on the Edge


The Second Annual Colloquium on Doing Catholic Systematic Theology in a Multi-religious World was held on November 4-5. Three papers were presented: Robert Doran, ‘Social Grace and the Mission of the Word’; Thomas Hughson (Marquette University) ‘Classical Christologies and Social Justice: Why the Divinity of Christ Matters’; and Danielle Nussberger (Marquette University), ‘The Spirit of Truth: Receiving and Communicating the Word in Dialogue’. Professors Paul LaChance of St Elizabeth’s College in Morristown, NJ, John Dadosky of Regis College, Toronto, and Susan Wood of Marquette University responded to Professor Doran's paper. Professors Darren Dias of St Michael's College, University of Toronto, and Bryan Massingale of Marquette University, and Marquette graduate student Juliana Vazquez responded to Professor Hughson's paper. Professor Randall Rosenberg of Fontbonne University and the Marquette graduate students Jeremy Blackwood and Anne Carpenter responded to Professor Nussberger's paper.

COMING UP

The 26th Annual Fallon Memorial Lonergan Symposium will be held from Thursday, April 28th to Saturday, April 30th, 2011, at Loyola Marymount University, Los Angles. This year’s symposium
(cosponsored by the Los Angeles Lonergan Center at LMU, the Lonergan Institute at Boston College, and the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto) will pay tribute to Philip McShane in his 80th Year. Paper proposals (one-page abstracts) and panel proposals must be received no later than January 15th, 2011, and notices of acceptance will be sent by February 15th. Completed papers must be submitted no later than April 1, in .doc or .docx format by email to: mmorelli@lmu.edu. Papers will be distributed prior to their presentation. They may be of any length, but speakers will be allowed only 20 minutes to present their central thesis and 10 minutes for questions. Digital copies of the Symposium Program will be distributed by email prior to the symposium. Pre-register by March 1, 2011 by email to mmorelli@lmu.edu. Provide your name and professional affiliation. Let us know if you plan to attend our Saturday evening banquet and if you require a vegetarian meal. Registration Fee is $40 US payable on the first day of the symposium. The registration fee is waived for graduate students.

2011 Vancouver Lonergan Conference. Theme: Lonergan’s Final Specification of Cosmopolis: Implementing the Longer Global Cycles of Incline, July 11-15 at the University of British Columbia. Papers on this theme should be submitted in Microsoft Word for distribution to participants by July 1st to Robert Henman at rohenman50@hotmail.com. Registrations (fee=$75) should be emailed to Robert Henman. For residence reservations, contact Stephanie Weston at stephanie.weston@ubc.ca For a booking go to https://reserve.ubcconferences.com/GROUP/availability.asp?hotelCode=UBC&checkInDate=07%2F10%2F2011&checkOutDate=07%2F14%2F2011&adults=1&children=&rooms=1&requestType=invBlockCode&code=G110711. Updates will be available at a later date at www.sgeme.org

PROJECTS

Lonergan Research Institute.

The Lonergan Research Institute sponsored two Graduate Seminars during the 2010 Fall Semester. On October 15th, Eugene Ahner presented a paper titled, ‘Progress: The First of Lonergan’s Three Heuristics of History.’ Sean Mulrooney from Regis College was the respondent. On November 12th, Mario D’Souza, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, University of St. Michael’s College, presented a paper titled, ‘Something Rather than Nothing?: Contemporary Culture’s Confusion about the “Something”;’ Pamela Reeve from St. Augustine’s Seminary was the respondent. The Institute also sponsored a guest-lecture in philosophy on Thursday, November 25. Dr. Dwayne Raymond, Department of Philosophy, Texas A&M University, lectured on ‘Euclid and the Euthyphro,’ arguing that ‘some of the problems that we discover in ancient arguments stem from an incompatibility between the sound logic that we use to reconstruct and evaluate the argument and the sound logic used by the ancient author.’ The following day, Dr. Raymond conducted a seminar entitled ‘Distinguishing between Logical and Linguistic Insights.’ The seminar delved into ‘the role that qua (hei in Greek) plays within ancient logic, focusing on the reason that the ancients use qua as they did.’

Collected Works

Volume 22 appeared in October: Early Works on Theological Method 1, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken. Volume 19, Early Latin Theology, has been approved for publication by University of Toronto Press. Look for a late 2011 publication. Volume 23, Early Works on Theological Method 2, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, is well on the way to being submitted to the Press. It will be submitted early in the new year.
Lonergan Organizations Website

The Lonergan Centre at Saint Paul University has launched a website dedicated to communications among Lonergan organizations. This website does not aim to replace any of the existing websites; rather, it aims to help communications among Lonergan organizations worldwide. It is a Wiki site, so it is co-owned by animators of centers, institutes, and associations dedicated to the Lonergan enterprise. See 'Join this Wiki' at http://lonergan-links.wikispaces.com/ for instructions on how to register so you can post announcements about the work you are doing and messages about forthcoming events of your Lonergan organization. There is also a discussion forum for exchanging ideas. (Since the goal of this website is confined to assisting Lonergan organizations, it does not list personal websites.

PEOPLE

On Thursday, October 14, 2010, Eugene Ahner from the Catholic Theological Union at the University of Chicago delivered the Ninth Annual Lonergan Lecture in St. Joseph’s Chapel, Regis College, University of Toronto. The talk was titled, ‘Business as a Spiritual Vocation.’ On Friday, October 15, 2010, John Dadosky presented a paper at the Kierkegaard Circle, Trinity College, University of Toronto, titled ‘Recovering Beauty in the Subject: Balthasar and Lonergan Confront Kierkegaard.’

Danny Monsour has announced his retirement from the Lonergan Research Institute and plans to relocate to Australia by late December. Danny will continue to collaborate in the work of the LRI, principally as a contributing editor for the Collected Works of Lonergan and a resource person for the production of the Lonergan Studies Newsletter. ‘Make no mistake: his research has been both thorough and letter-perfect. Just a phenomenal contribution to anyone who wants to know "what's going forward" in the Lonergan enterprise.’ - Tad Dunne, ed.

Subscriptions

Online current and past issues available at www.lonergan.on.ca and lonergan.concordia.ca. For mailed issues, subscription payments are payable in advance ($25 Canadian or U.S.). Send to: Newsletter, Lonergan Research Institute / Regis College / 100 Wellesley Street West / Toronto, Ontario / Canada M5S 2Z5. For account information, contact Danny Monsour.

Contributions

While we have regular contributors, we invite anyone with news to submit it. The Lonergan Studies Newsletter is published quarterly in March, June, September, and December. News for any issue should be in the hands of the editor by the 15th of the preceding month (February, May, August, November). Send to

Tad Dunne
2923 Woodslee
Royal Oak, MI 48073

Phone: 248-549-3366
Email: My first initial, followed by last name, followed by @sienaheights.edu. No capitals, no spaces.
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