
This article connects the work of M. Shawn Copeland to a dialogue between Bernard Lonergan and Emmanuel Levinas. Exploring these authors’ insights on intersubjectivity, alterity, dialectic, and embodiment, the article develops a framework for engaging and overcoming contemporary crises of relationality. These resources are then used to reframe questions of otherness in terms of the imitation of Christ, advocating encounter grounded in open, prayerful engagement with the marginalized.


The French phenomenologist and Passionist priest, Stanislas Breton, and the Canadian philosopher, theologian, and Jesuit priest, Bernard Lonergan, both worked out theoretical accounts independently of one another of how one can understand the mystical participation in and imitation of the Passion of Christ. While Lonergan’s account has to be drawn out and clarified, Breton offered a comprehensive intellectual schema for understanding it. Breton implied that the various aspects of his schema call for further philosophical harmonization and integration. Such integration is also the aim of a post-Lonergan endeavor to construct a systematic theology. Still, theoretical accounts can seem abstract and irrelevant to the concrete suffering of people in daily living. However, following the adage that ‘good theory is practical’, one can expect that orthodoxy and orthopraxis should be guided by a middle term orthotheory. Breton and Lonergan’s approaches, while very different, are also complementary of one another and both can be incorporated into such orthotheory.


The aim of this paper is to note the convergence between two critical realist philosophies of science, namely, that of Roy Bhaskar and Bernard Lonergan with regard to the intelligibility of experimental activity. Bhaskar very explicitly argues that ‘differentiation implies stratification.’ The idea is that because the situations produced in laboratories are special instances of closure (like the solar system in the open universe, they do not represent the general case) the significance of experimental activity is that it brings about regularities with a view to understanding scientific laws at a deeper level. This is to say, when experiment is properly understood, the weaknesses of empiricism are exposed. Although he is not as explicit, Lonergan also has recourse to this argument. The parallels between Bhaskar and Lonergan are not surprising given the Aristotelian heritage that is manifest in their common concern for a realist ontology. Nevertheless, some differences between the two emerge, for example, in Lonergan's concern with the development of statistical science, and as well, a firm commitment to substance (rather than to powers, simply). Some attention to the significance of experimental activity for the debate surrounding realism is explored; it is suggested that Lonergan has
something to offer in the subsequent conversation associated with Maxwell, van Fraassen, Hacking and Cartwright.


The eighty years of Theological Studies bear witness to the birth of American Catholic theology. This article traces that development through five stages. During its first two decades scholasticism reigned and authority was watchful. Vatican II then introduced a period of change, followed by a thirty-five-year creative phase in which a modern consciousness discussed new issues. By the final period corresponding to Francis’s papacy, an American Catholic theology was in place.


This chapter defines the terms religion, spirituality, and spiritualogy; provides an overview of the positions on transgender issues in the world’s religions, contemporary and traditional; compares these positions and presents a biblical and scientific criticism of the especially negative stance in Roman Catholic, Lutheran-Missouri Synod, and Southern Baptist teaching; reports the yet meager empirical research on the consistently discouraging religious status of gender diverse persons; applying Bernard Lonergan’s analyses of consciousness or human spirit, offers an understanding of spirituality appropriate to transgender people regardless of their religious affiliation or lack thereof; and suggests the key challenges to be met for addressing the spiritual needs of gender diverse people and all others “in this tumultuous historical period of new understanding and reevaluation of what was once thought to be so basic: ‘man’ and ‘woman.’”

Henman, Robert. "Contributions to an Adequate Methodology in the Social Sciences," Dialogs in Philosophy, Mental and Neuro Sciences 11/2 (December 2018), the official journal of Crossing Dialogs.

This essay exposes some of the ambiguities in contemporary social science methodology that inhibit progress in the social sciences. By listing these issues, discussing problems related to the notion of paradigm, providing exercises to assist the social science researcher in uncovering the data of human consciousness as the proper data of the social sciences these ambiguities are exposed, and pointers towards solutions are explored that will eventually provide a higher probability of more cumulative and progressive results. This work draws mainly on the work of Bernard Lonergan and his exposition of the data of human consciousness and its relationship and relevance to social science methodology. See http://www.crossingdialogues.com/current_issue.htm.


A response to Jeremy Wilkin's article, "Lonergan's Isomorphism of Knowing and Being." [See the entry for Wilkins further down.]


The author relies on the functional specialty dialectic to guide discussions on bioethics.


I wish to correlate Bernard Lonergan’s functional specialty Communications with Mikhail Bakhtin’s notion of novelistic discourse with the goal of teasing out how the Bakhtinian notion of discourse furthers on-going reflection on inculturation. Theology as a highly differentiated and specialized reflection on religion bears fruit in the final stage (Communications) of theological
reflection. This fruit – inculturation – can be explained using different constructs. This paper privileges the Bakhtinian construct in that it addresses “the life and behavior of discourse in a contradictory and multi-languaged world” in ways that Lonergan’s differentiated and specialized reflection on theology accounts for multiplicity of cultural traditions in an ever-changing world church.


The complexity of Lonergan's works has tended to limit his accessibility to average readers. Bringing Bernard Lonergan Down to Earth seeks to remedy this limitation by showing how Lonergan did address problems of community life. He also broadened his interest after writing Insight to include a reaching into our hearts as modeled, for example, by Blaise Pascal. Lonergan also sought to bridge religious divides. Here the Christian theological virtues of faith, hope, and love are indispensable but that does not impede Lonergan's efforts to reach out to secularists by focusing on ethics. The importance of Lonergan's interdisciplinary work is signaled in the book's twelve explorations (in the concluding Part IV) that detail for interested readers his extraordinary ability to solve major philosophical issues.


The book Insight and Method: Philosophy and Theology of Bernard Lonergan offers an introduction to Lonergan for Croatian readers but also presents the author’s original syntheses and interpretations of Lonergan’s thought. The first chapter of presents Lonergan’s intellectual history. The second chapter introduces his cognitive theory. The third chapter evaluates Lonergan’s role as a bridge between classical scholasticism and modern developments in philosophy, culture and science. Chapter four considers the concept of objectivity, which is the link between epistemology and metaphysics. Chapter five contrasts Lonergan’s critical realism with other Neoscholastic solutions to the problem of objectivity. The sixth chapter interprets elements of Lonergan’s theory of knowledge and justification in the context of contemporary analytic epistemology. The seventh chapter is an introduction to his ethical thought. Chapter eight is dedicated to Lonergan’s theory of religion and his contribution to fundamental theology. Chapter nine explores the possibility of integrating intellectual development with religious approaches to life. The final chapter looks at Lonergan’s theological achievements.


This study presents and interprets Lonergan’s analysis and reception of the Aquinas’ concept of the internal word. It specifies Lonergan’s contribution to the development of the Thomist approach to the issues of fallibilism and reductionism with respect to the functioning of cognition, and the real foundation of the concept of being. The foundation for the corrigibility of knowledge is found in the connection between intellection and reflection, and the reliability of the intellectual desire for knowledge. Elucidation of the psychological features of insight into phantasm as an event and experience protect Thomistic theory of knowledge from a hasty reductionism. This study points out the potential of these theses for a contemporary update of Thomistic theories of knowledge.


This article contributes to the debate about the nature of a Catholic philosophy of education by exploring the philosophical issues involved in the apparent conflict between scientific and religious knowledge claims. The claim that modern science has rendered religious truth claims unreasonable appears to be influential among students of secondary school age. The suggestion is made here that the thought of Bernard Lonergan can usefully be deployed to help secondary-school students explore the nature of scientific and religious knowledge claims in greater depth. The contribution which Lonergan’s philosophy can make to philosophy of education more generally is also indicated. Finally, the advantages of this approach for those involved in Catholic education are discussed.


To contend with the racist scaling of bodies seems to tend toward the ontological and metaphysical. Counter-strategies entail engagement with the predominant framework – i.e., with its categories of being and its grounds of analysis – however, much subjected to critique and deconstruction. Both Shawn Copeland and Mayra Rivera identify and accept this “risk” in their theological projects. I argue that, although each does it with differing relative emphases, their political theologies trade upon an alternation between practical and poetical modes of critical reflection – the one is more negative and formal, the other is more positive and material; and this unitary alternation is what staves off failure in ideology and foundationalism. I furthermore suggest that the practical-poetical alternation I describe represents a contemporary politicization of the aesthetical.


Gaven Kerr argues that Lonergan is a metaphysical realist but follows an inherently idealist method. Furthermore, Kerr claims, Lonergan’s isomorphism of cognitional and ontological elements does not hold, because ontological act is not parallel to cognitional judgment. In so arguing, however, Kerr conflates ontological act with efficient causality, misunderstands the nature of the parallel asserted by Lonergan’s isomorphism, and involves himself in a priori speculation about the implications of Lonergan’s method. An efficient cause is an extrinsic principle, whereas “act” names an intrinsic constituent of contingent being. The parallel between ontological and cognitional composition, moreover, and the isomorphism of ontological and cognitional elements, are subtler than Kerr appreciates. The suspicion, finally, that Lonergan’s method is somehow inherently idealist is idle and not borne out by the facts.

Dissertations & Theses
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WEBWORKS


The Journeyism series takes an elementary first step towards exposing why the world’s universities have not only been rendered an “ivory tower,” but also have been severely restricted in their potential to enrich the pulse of life and its possibilities. Readers are encouraged to reflect at their own pace on their post-secondary experiences through a series of strategic illustrations and exercises. The results of their participation will help reveal why and how generalized empirical method will be the foundation for new standards of competence, as well as a coherent division of labour, in the future academy.


This series provides a brief and generally accessible introduction to Lonergan's discovery in economics. The series sheds light on the importance of Lonergan's discovery and touches on the problem of a needed paradigm shift in culture and economics, the possibility of recovery, and the dynamics of ongoing progress.
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!


This paper retraces some of the contrast between Aquinas and Scotus with respect to the metaphysical foundations of morality in order to highlight how subtle differences pertaining to the relationship between the divine will and the divine intellect can tip a thinker toward either an unalloyed natural law theory (NLT) or something that at least starts to move in the direction of divine command theory (DCT). The paper opens with a brief consideration of three distinct elements in Aquinas’s work that might tempt one to view him in a DCT light, namely: his discussion of the divine law in addition to the natural law; his position on the so-called immoralities of the patriarchs; and some of his assertions about the divine will in relation to justice. We then respond to each of those considerations. In the second and third of these cases, following Craig Boyd, we illustrate how Aquinas’s conviction that the divine will follows the ordering of the divine intellect can help inform the interpretive disputes in question. We then turn our attention to Scotus’s concern about the freedom of the divine will, before turning to his discussion of the natural law in relation to the Decalogue as a way of stressing how his two-source theory of the metaphysical foundations of morality represents a clear departure from Aquinas in the direction of DCT.


In his book, *An Essay on Divine Authority*, Mark Murphy argues that God does not have practical authority over created, rational agents. Although Murphy mentions the possibility of an argument for divine authority from justice, he does not consider any. In this paper, I develop such an argument from Aquinas’s treatment of the virtue of religion and other parts of justice. The divine excellence is due honor, and, as Aquinas argues, honoring a ruler requires service and obedience. Thus, a classical conception of God coupled with some of Aquinas’s theses concerning justice show that God has practical authority over all created, rational agents.


This article provides an update on the logic undergirding Karl Rahner’s theology of mystery through a dialogue between Rahner and Jean-Luc Marion. It focuses on Rahner’s account of truth in Aquinas and Marion’s Gifford Lectures on revelation. Marion’s distinction between “alethic” (modern-epistemological) and “apocalyptic” (phenomenological-Christian) logics elucidates anew Rahner’s commitment to mystery as deep, abiding truth. Also addressed is Marion’s Balthasarian concern about Rahner and “anticipation,” expressed as criticism of the “anonymous
Christian.” The article aims to encourage future, robust theological reflection on truth, an always timely endeavor.


Thomas Aquinas argues that the agent intellect's function is to abstract an intelligible species from a phantasm. However, insofar as he claims that the intelligible species is not present in the phantasm, it is unclear how the agent intellect accomplishes this task. In this paper I explore two models of abstraction – the extraction model and the production model – suggesting that each fails to capture Aquinas’ understanding of abstraction. I then offer my own interpretation of the function of the agent intellect – the illumination model – by employing Aquinas’ comparison of the agent intellect to light. I argue that the agent intellect neither extracts nor produces an intelligible species, but rather makes the nature that is already present in the object intelligible by actualizing its passive power of intelligibility. This involves the co-actualization of partner powers in the intellect and in the intelligible object, and ultimately makes it possible to cognize a particular, material object in a universal way.


Jonathan Schaffer, among others, has argued that metaphysics should deal primarily with relations of “grounding.” I will follow John Heil in arguing that this view of metaphysics is problematic, for it draws on ambiguous notions of grounding and fundamentality that are unilluminating as metaphysical explanations. I take Heil’s objections to presuppose that “grounding” relations do not form a natural class, where a natural class is one where some member of that class has (analytic or contingent a posteriori) priority among others and explains order among other members in the class. To strengthen Heil’s criticism that “grounding” is a non-natural class of relations, I will draw on an unlikely ally. Thomas Aquinas’s “analogy of being” doctrine, if accurate, offers reasons that no categorical relations (like grounding relations) form a natural class.


This essay examines the theological grounds for rejecting metaphysics and the correspondence theory of truth, and argues that while there are good grounds for rejecting a certain kind of metaphysically oriented theology, metaphysics per se is neither objectionable nor avoidable in Christian theology. In the process, it also defends a realist conception of truth against some recent theological criticisms, and argues that a commitment to a modest version of metaphysical realism and realism about truth is not only philosophically tenable, but also theologically preferable to non-realist views.

**RECENT EVENTS**

2nd Annual International Conference for Collaborative Philosophy, Theology, and Ministry

*February 22-23, 2019*


**Session 1A Scripture and Theological Hermeneutics:** Adam Plescia (Christ the King Seminary) “Divine Violence: The Reception History of Holy War Texts in Early Christian Exegesis;” Jonathan Bernier


Session 1C Doctrine(s) of Creation: Advancing Positions: Randall Rosenberg (Saint Louis University) “The Principle and Foundation of St Ignatius Loyola in the Concrete: The Doctrine of Creation and the Dialectics of History;” Matthew Thollander (Christ the King Seminary) “Does God have a History? Robert Jenson on the Relation between God and Creatures;” Robert van Alstyne, SJ (Regis College, University of Toronto) “Why is time greater than space? Superessentiality, Polarity, and Gift”


Session 2B Political Theology and Economics, Old Questions, Changing Landscapes: Héctor Acero Ferrer (Institute for Christian Studies) “Imagining Borders, Imagining Relationships: The Contribution of Paul Ricoeur to a Renewed Understanding of Border-Setting;” Joshua Harris (The King’s University, Edmonton) “Aristotle on Money as a Social Form;” Andrew Vink (Boston College) “Neoliberalism as a Theological Problem”

Session 2C Collaboration in/as Comparative Theology: Reid Locklin (University of St. Michael’s College, University of Toronto) “Religious Experience as Annihilation of the Mind? Tracing a Conversation, Testing an Hypothesis;” Glenn Willis (Misericordia University) “Co-opted by Cooperation: Buddhism’s Displacement of Catholicism at a Mercy University;” Michael VanZandt Collins (Boston College) “Not the American Nightmare: Hans Urs von Balthasar, Janelle Monáe, and Aesthetic Form”

Session 3A Delight, Development, and Defiance: Exploring Hierarchy and Aesthetic Form: Luke Togni (Marquette University) “Passing the Seraphic Torch: Hierarchy from Dionysius to Bonaventure;” Oleg Bychkov (St. Bonaventure University) “‘He Who Sees Does Not Desire to Imagine’: The Shifting Role of Art and Aesthetic Observation in Medieval Franciscan Theological Discourse in the 1300’s;” Anne Carpenter (St. Mary’s College) “Not the American Nightmare: Hans Urs von Balthasar, Janelle Monáe, and Aesthetic Form”


Session 3C From Drifters to Pilgrims, The Road of Missionary Discipleship: Kathryn M. Goller (Diocese of Buffalo) “Forming Young Disciples in a Missionary Key;” Kaitlin Garry (Diocese of Buffalo) “The Sacred Ground of the Other: The Praxis of Accompaniment;” Amanda Chacko (Diocese of Buffalo) “The Four Dimensions of Integral Formation”

Gregorian University) “Psychology and the Christian Vocation: Psychic Conversion and Leadership in a Synodal Church;” Joseph Mudd (Gonzaga University) “In Persona Christi?: Priesthood, Ontology, Authenticity”


Session 4C Theology as Contemplation: Theoretical Resources for a (Future) Methodical Theology: Ryan Hemmer (Marquette University) “Re-Purposing the Theorem of the Supernatural;” Jennifer Sanders (University of St. Thomas) “Systematics, Communications, and the Inner Word: The Summa Theologiae as a Contemplative Study for Speaking about God;” Eric Mabry (Christ the King Seminary) “Manifestatio Boni: Divine Beauty, Arguments from Fittingness, and the Psychological Analogy—Realigning the treatises De Trinitate and De Incarnatione”

Lonergan Graduate Seminar, Regis College, 2019

January 25, 2019

Presentation: John Dadosky, “Further Along the Fourth Stage of Meaning: Lonergan, Alterity, and ‘Genuine’ Religion;” Response: Jonathan Bernier, LRI Director, Regis College

Lonergan Graduate Seminar, Regis College, 2019

March 15, 2019


COMING UP

2019 Australian Lonergan Workshop

Friday, May 3-Sunday, May 5, 2019

St. Mary's College, University of Melbourne, Swanston Street, Parkville.

Workshop theme: "How Lonergan's thought has helped me to meet the challenges of our day, and how it will help me in the future" Presenters: Dr Stephen Ames, Honorary Fellow, School of Historical and Philosophical Studies, University of Melbourne; Professor Fred Lawrence, Theology Department, Boston College – via video and video conference; Associate Professor Jeremy Wilkins, Theology Department, Boston College – via video and video conference. The Workshop Program can be found at www.lonergan.org.au. For inquiries about video conferencing contact the Australian Lonergan Workshop Committee via email at alwcommittee@fastmail.com.au. Be sure to keep the time difference mind.
Subscriptions

Online current and past issues available at http://www.lonerganresearch.org/. 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 Matthew Thollander, below.
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