

1-1-2012

## Authentic Human Development and Vector Forces in Education: Drawing on the Thought of Bernard Lonergan, S.J. in Addressing Some Key Issues in Educational Philosophy

Andrew Dwight

*Compass Foundation, Australia*, [andrew.dwight@compass.org.au](mailto:andrew.dwight@compass.org.au)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>

---

### Recommended Citation

Dwight, Andrew (2012) "Authentic Human Development and Vector Forces in Education: Drawing on the Thought of Bernard Lonergan, S.J. in Addressing Some Key Issues in Educational Philosophy," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 1: No. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol1/iss1/4>

This Scholarship is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarly and Peer-Reviewed Journals at ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact [epublications@regis.edu](mailto:epublications@regis.edu).

## Authentic Human Development and Vector Forces in Education: Drawing on the Thought of Bernard Lonergan, S.J. in Addressing Some Key Issues in Educational Philosophy

Andrew Dwight  
Director of Continuing Education  
Compass Foundation, Australia  
([andrew.dwight@gmail.com](mailto:andrew.dwight@gmail.com))

### Abstract

Our basic response as humans to a world we did not create is not thought but intentionally oriented by affectivity. Our understanding of the nature of this intentionality has profound implications for our educational design and practice, from the level of curriculum development through to individual teaching moments. The work of Bernard Lonergan seek to understand the constituent elements of the primordial drive that leads to our sense of understanding, understanding that for Lonergan necessarily involves our agency. This paper considers Lonergan's articulation of the operations as we engage in our world, as well as some implications such an understanding has for teaching.

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Allow me to begin boldly. Our vision of being and becoming human undergirds all our educational design (whether explicitly or implicitly), conscious or unconscious. Our developed curriculum, our syllabi, and our pedagogical imagining all are reflections of who we are, what we value, and importantly, who or what we want our students to become. From Augustine to Heidegger, and beyond, many have noted that the primordial orientation of persons to the world is not that of thought, belief, nor even survival. These all have a place; however, it is love – a word at best dangerous in its interpretation. Love is basic. The human person is an embodied agent of love and desire; we humans are *intentional*. Our primordial orientation is not that of stimulus-response, but self-transcendence, a 'seeking' rather than a 'salivating.' We are always 'aimed' at something, and our 'aiming' is determined by our affectivity. It is our loves, our longings, our loyalties that constitute our practices and hence provide a rich understanding of our identity. It is my fundamental contention that the nature of this intentionality is profoundly important for the task of educating well. I will consider, while exploring this concept, over the course of two papers, how the Canadian Jesuit, Bernard Lonergan, sought to understand the nature of our human intentionality

relates to the starting point, the 'ground' if you will, of our educational design thinking and practice.

Bernard Lonergan's field of vision is much greater than that of educational philosophy. Indeed, on the strength of his book, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, *Time Magazine*, which devoted two articles to him, reported that he was "considered by many intellectuals to be the finest philosophic thinker of the 20<sup>th</sup> century."<sup>2</sup> Born in Quebec, Canada, in 1904, Bernard Joseph Francis Lonergan entered the Jesuit Novitiate when he was 18. His doctoral work was based on the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, and was completed at the Gregorian University in Rome. Fluent in the languages of theology, history of ideas, of mathematics, sciences, economics, and more, the sheer immensity of his work, both in breadth and depth, is daunting—even to the wise. I must add, that I am certainly not claiming to be wise. As such, I shall not be attempting to elucidate the flow of argument and constituent subtleties in the key works of Lonergan. Instead, I shall focus my reflection on Lonergan through a lens of educational questions, particularly regarding that which is appropriate to an undergirding educational philosophy.

As a practicing educator from elementary to university level, I have continually been on a journey seeking a grounding for a deeper and wider approach to the question of human meaning and the consequent nurturing, developing and enabling that is—education.. The works of Lonergan, particularly his two major tomes (*Insight* and *Method in Theology*), have provided me with the beginning of such a ground – a ground that opens a universal understanding of human activity, provides context for the personal<sup>3</sup> development of meaning, all the while affirming the existence of a reality beyond subjective creation, a reality that shapes us even as we intend to engage and shape it ourselves. Furthermore, this ground allows for an alternative stance to that seen in many of the current approaches to educational thinking. For example, the pragmatic justification, birthed in Dewey, whilst presenting a helpful rejoinder to more dogmatic approaches, is turned on its head in Lonergan, and the elevation of experience as teacher is both deepened and challenged at a cognitional and epistemological level. Likewise, the constructivist mentality, evidenced in the early work of the influential Lev Vygotsky or Carl Rogers, is located more comprehensively in the transcendental approach of Lonergan. Lonergan's approach also reworks the notion of values education that is increasingly prevalent in modern educational discourse. In Lonergan, the fears of Gramsci that eventually gives birth to the negative intentionality of rights language undergirding much of the deconstructionist, feminist, and post-colonial critiques is replaced by a positive intentionality that understands relational self-emptying love and responsibility as being the foundation of all human understanding and action.<sup>4</sup>

### The Task

From the widest possible perspective, Lonergan's work seeks to challenge and critique the philosophical paradigms and assumptions of his day. Also, at the same time his work offers an alternative in the hope of bringing fruitful transformation to human living. In surveying the philosophical ground of the first part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Lonergan writes:

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.<sup>5</sup>

This indeed describes the task of Lonergan, with his thoughts, most thoroughly expounded in his *Insight* and *Method in Theology*, and continued throughout his lifetime, functioning as a fine example of supreme dedication to the knowing, assimilation, and transformation of human doing expressed throughout recorded history.<sup>6</sup> Recognising the incoherence of the various responses of modern culture, Lonergan's aim, as stated in the preface to *Insight*, was "to seek a common ground on which men of intelligence might meet,"<sup>7</sup> a common ground unobtainable with many contemporary philosophical approaches.<sup>8</sup> This common ground could not be based on the answers of various previous, disparate attempts at understanding. Rather (and this is of profound importance to Lonergan's project), it required an unconditional embracing of humanity's ability and compulsion to question and decide, what he would term "authentic self-appropriation".<sup>9</sup> Lonergan writes:

As there is a post-Cartesian affirmation of philosophy that rules theology out of court, so there is a post-Kantian affirmation of science that tosses overboard even Kant's modest claims for philosophy, and there is a still later totalitarian violence that with equal impartiality brushes aside theology and philosophy and science. But at that empty conclusion to the sequence of ever less comprehensive syntheses, man still exists and man still is called upon to decide. Archaisms urge him to imagine that he lives in an age of liberalism, or rationalism, or faith. Futurists paint for him a utopia that cannot disguise its own mythical features. But the plain fact is that the world lies in pieces before him and pleads to be put together again, to be put together not as it

stood before on the careless foundation of assumption that happened to be unquestioned but on the strong ground of the possibility of questioning and with full awareness of the range of possible answers.<sup>10</sup>

It is in this quotation, and particularly in the last sentence, that we can see something of what I would suggest is intrinsic to an authentic approach to educational thinking, the ‘soil,’ if you like, for our hopefully fruitful thinking. There is an openness implied, an openness hinting at the possibility of engaging with a wide variety of current educational approaches, an openness that affirms much yet is willing and able to critique simultaneously. This openness is a central factor of Lonergan’s developed method, and will provide an interesting, yet subtle, counterposition to any attempt at dogmatic foundationalism, relativism, or even what could be considered a major aspect of the ethic of many modern philosophy of education approaches—namely tolerance.

We humans do shape our world. We continually reconstruct something from the fragmented pieces of our history, all the while trying to incorporate a burgeoning awareness of the character of the cosmos that holds us. Education – conceived as broadly as possible – must be structured around the question of value; are we making and shaping *well*?<sup>11</sup> Where Lonergan stands apart from Descartes, and Kant, and positivism, and all forms of relativism, is in his focus on the *method* of the knower, the *activities* of knowing, as the primary discriminator of such a determination, rather than the necessity of the known, whether objective or solipsistic in origin.

These two papers are the *beginning* of an elucidation of a philosophy of education informed by the work of Lonergan. It is a consideration of what is required to be *recognized, understood, and decided upon*<sup>12</sup> in terms of the stance the educator must take before the realm of education. They consider the unfolding of an investigation that seeks to navigate the tension of dogma and open possibility, the tension of finality and inadequacy, all in the interests of participation in the nurturing of human development, both intended for the good of the individual and the good of society.

## A Beginning Rubric

In his book *Guides for the Journey*, David Creamer summarised Lonergan as demonstrating that

...authentic human development is dependent upon the successful integration of two seemingly conflictual vector forces; “one from below upwards, creating, and one from above downwards, healing”.<sup>13</sup>

It is this quotation that shall function as the guiding rubric for our ensuing foray in Lonergan’s elucidation of understanding. These two ‘vector forces’ acting from above and from below is able to embed the structuring of most any philosophic approach to education. It is from the self-appropriation<sup>14</sup> of the dynamic structure of these two forces that truly good human action, ‘authentic human development’ in the words of Creamer, can emerge.

In an essay found in *A Third Collection*, Lonergan expands on the nature of these two vectors:

Development may be described, if a spatial metaphor is permitted, as “from below upwards:” it begins from experience, is enriched by full understanding, is accepted by sound judgment, is directed not to satisfactions but to values, and the priority of values is comprehensive, not just of some but of all, to reveal affective conversion as well as moral and intellectual.

...[D]evelopment...works from above downwards: it begins in the affectivity of the infant, the child, the son, the pupil, the follower. On the apprehension of values rests belief. Belief follows the growth in understanding of one who has found a genuine teacher and has been initiated into the study of the masters of the past. When confirming one’s growth in understanding comes experience made mature and perceptive by one’s developed understanding. With experiential confirmation the inverse process may set in.<sup>15</sup>

**Educational Praxis:**

Of course, the two movements in education; the creating/catching and the healing/teaching, cannot be considered as mutually isolated or even opposed in any way – indeed it is precisely the opposite. In Lonergan's integration of the two, we have a way of incorporating the intentions of Michael Oakeshott and his emphasis on *paradosis* (handing on) and *paideia* (formation), and the constructivism of Vygotsky, or Rogers (although these are based on too much of a Platonic anthropology of 'eternal recollection' for my liking).

These two movements draw on one another and functions cooperatively in the learning process. In light of this, here are some questions you might ask yourself as you engage in the educational design process at either curriculum, syllabus, or pedagogical levels:

- What are the elements in your speciality that are necessarily part of the healing/teaching process?
- How might the attitude of 'listening well' as a creative/catching act be enhanced in your practice – as well as encouraged in the academic life of your students?
- If this 'listening stance' is encouraged, how might the process of creatively moving forward in your particular speciality - for both the individual and learning community – be nurtured? - How might you be more intentional in inculcating a creativity that is embedded in the healing/teaching of the scholarly community of which you seeking to invite your students into?

This first paper will explore the first of those two moves from below upwards.

The second paper will consider what is generated by such a move – namely a critical but realistic account of meaning. Before explicating the downward vector, we shall investigate the biases that can affect authentic appropriation of the dynamic structure of the upward movement. Fullness encompassing these details will be found in the necessary conditions of our knowing, working vertically in the unfolding and guiding of our cognitional activity that intends and knows *being*,<sup>16</sup> but also functioning horizontally, in an intersubjective manner to embed the knower in relation<sup>17</sup> – itself an extremely important corrective to an educational philosophy that considers the knower as fundamentally an

autonomous individual. Relating the vector forces more directly to the educational moment, one could consider the upward 'creative' movement as that which is 'caught,' and the downward movement, functioning in a 'healing' manner, as that which is 'taught.'

The role of the educator provides the optimal conditions for the nurturing of the knower to authentically 'catch' the upward dynamic, to assist in providing an environment that can affect the development of the intellectual, moral and affective aspects of the learner's knowing. Additionally, the educator is tasked with the communication and inculcation of a developed tradition of values and judgments (which for Lonergan result in beliefs) in an atmosphere of love. As we shall see, love is foundational to the knowing process. The educator works to encourage development from below upwards, whilst at the same time modelling the move from above downwards. These two movements are not separate, and indeed coalesce in the unity of consciousness, in the 'I' that both responds to affectivity in feeling, and moves from experience in thinking and knowing.<sup>18</sup> Growth must start from tradition (exemplified by the downward force) whilst at the same time that tradition must submit to the developing critique of the creative decisions enabled by the dynamic upward process that is emerging from ever widening experience. It is at the end of *Insight* where explicitly theological topics are discussed that Lonergan describes the healing movement from above downward in its ultimate sense:

Grace perfects nature both in the sense that it adds a perfection beyond nature and in the sense that it confers on nature the effective freedom to attain its own perfection. But grace is not a substitute for nature, and theology is not a substitute for empirical science. It is a fuller viewpoint that both reinforces the scientist's detached, disinterested, unrestricted desire to know and reveals the concrete possibility of intelligent and reasonable solutions to human problems.<sup>19</sup>

This grace functions as a "hermeneutic of Love" leading to greater horizons of understanding, and keeping with the dual vector movement, leads to

a stance that holds the self open to possibility, whilst refusing the imposition of pre-determined

**Educational Praxis:**

Speaking explicitly of consciousness sounds like a strange language for most professors in most disciplines, the exceptions being philosophy, psychology and theology. Educational philosophy has for centuries wrestled with the grammar and language of consciousness.

**From your experience, what would you identify as the various elements of your own consciousness?**

Various educational philosophers such as Howard Gardener and Eric Kieran focus on elements of intelligence. These are key, of course, but **are there other elements of your own and of your students that are key in the teaching/learning process?**

**What of wonder and delight? Of fear, hope, longing? Of empathy?**

categorisation.

We move to a consideration of the move from below upwards, elucidating a process (whilst not self-evident or even automatically achieved), that is discoverable by reflection on our own consciousness at work. For the dynamic structure of knowing, Lonergan elucidates is not *his* theory, but it rather *is* us; it is our *being* as we seek to know our world and act in it and for it.

### **The Upward Move: Creating**

Lonergan's monumental book, *Insight*, is a journey of reflection on human consciousness at work. He jauntily sums up the modest aim of the book when he writes,

[T]horoughly understand what it is to understand, and not only will you understand the broad lines of all there is to be understood but you will possess a fixed base, an invariant pattern opening upon all further developments of understanding.<sup>20</sup>

The ensuing tome is a study of human understanding, an unfolding of its philosophic implications, and a critique of approaches that seek to limit its scope. As Lonergan describes, it is a "campaign against the flight from understanding".<sup>21</sup>

### **Self-Appropriation**

We shall start with a detailed overview of Lonergan's somewhat abstruse concept of self-

appropriation. Lonergan's account of knowing begins and builds from the human acts of attention or memory, and the consequent and supervening act of understanding is what he terms 'insight.'

**Educational Praxis:**

As for Lonergan, 'understanding has long been an abiding interest of education and indeed of the philosophy of education.

**Whose responsibility is understanding?**

Your teaching practice will often betray your implicit answer to such a question.

**If understanding is a developed state, then what do you think the as yet unarticulated process of 'creating and healing' – the upward and downward vectors – imply for your pedagogical approach as an educator?**

**What may be some of the issues that compete with such a notion of 'understanding' or tend to detract from its traditional importance to education?**

Lonergan insists that insight is not to be understood as some mysterious and hidden intuition. Rather, this act of understanding is the central event in what Lonergan terms *cognitional activity*, and occurs "easily and frequently in the moderately intelligent, rarely and with difficulty only in the very stupid."<sup>22</sup> The very notion of insight may seem simple, obvious and little worthy of attention. However, Lonergan maintains that a grasp of insight's conditions, its working and its results confers nothing short of "a basic yet startling unity on the whole field of human inquiry and human opinion."<sup>23</sup> Faintly echoing something of Husserl's phenomenology, Lonergan's primary interest is not with knowledge's existence, but rather, its nature; it is the structure of the knowing, not the known itself, that Lonergan initiates. He offers an account in *Insight* of knowledge, and in doing so, is issuing "an invitation to a personal, decisive act." That act is an act of 'self-appropriation' whereby one's own rational self-consciousness clearly and distinctly takes possession of itself as rational self-consciousness.<sup>24</sup> The structure of knowing is not a 'thing' that can be transferred from one to another, it is not an external object that can be just as easily taken in and discarded. Self-appropriation is not a *thing* to be *known*, nor can it be achieved by grasping. Rather, self-appropriation of one's cognitional activity is a development *of* the subject,

**Educational Praxis**

If Lonergan is indeed correct here, if wonder is the fundamental primordial drive (not Descartes' doubt, nor some form of 'postmodern' scepticism) then certain demands are placed on our participation in the nurturing of the developmental act of self-appropriation by our students. For authentic self-appropriation to occur, for educational development to proceed, wonder is *necessary*.

**- What role does wonder, awe, delight play in your curriculum, syllabus or pedagogical design?**

**How do you foster passion in your teaching practice?**

Dr Brian Cox, speaking to the Cilian Murphy in the extras to the movie *Sunshine* makes this profound assertion, "Why it is that someone would choose...science as a profession? What would make you give your life, I suppose, to science, spend all your time doing it? And I said to him, the thing is that right at the base, when you really get down to it, the motivation is that you find the universe beautiful. It's almost a spiritual reaction to it. And it is incredibly beautiful..., the closer and closer you look, [doing particle physics], the more elegant and the more remarkable the universe seems".

and *in* the subject that is oneself; it is a *process* that is ever changing, building and appropriating. *Self-appropriation is authenticity in approach*, and is truly effectual only when *pursued* with a diligence that embraces its slow and careful progress.

*What* is appropriated, the *nature* of this approach, is one's own experiencing, one's own intelligent inquiry and insights, and one's own critical reflection, judging and deciding.<sup>25</sup> These 'appropriations' form the levels of the *dynamic cognitional structure* that is the 'fixed base' the 'invariant pattern' from which a constantly developing understanding, the cumulative process of progress proceeds. The recognition that this dynamic structuring of cognition is the starting point, the foundation, of knowing is a necessary beginning, for without basing oneself here, one can doubt that understanding correctly is "knowing." Lonergan writes:

Under pressure from that doubt, either one will sink into the bog of a knowing that is without understanding, or else one will cling to understanding but sacrifice knowing on the altar of an immanentism, an idealism, a relativism.<sup>26</sup>

The suitable response is to acknowledge that not only is self-appropriation the beginning, but that a

criterion of the *known as real* is also necessary. This is where *insight* returns. It becomes the key that unlocks the basic pattern whereby the fundamental nature of reality can be revealed.

Lonergan continues:

If to convince oneself that knowing is understanding, one ascertains that knowing mathematics is understanding and knowing science is understanding and the knowledge of common sense is understanding, one ends up not only with a detailed account of understanding but also with a plan of what there is to be known.<sup>27</sup>

This known, as we shall soon see, is the *real*. Authenticity in approach, namely self-appropriation, offers access to the real, not in an objectivist, or naïve realist way, but in a way that stands in stark contrast to recent subjectivist or idealist offerings. Through self-appropriation metaphysics is made possible, for its object, that of *being* (that which exists), is revealed by the dynamic structure of the cognitional process (which will be elucidated shortly). There is indeed a universe that is proportionate to humanity's intellect; there is a universe that is actually knowable. Furthermore, Lonergan demonstrates that an ethics can be derived from the immanent compound structure of one's knowing and doing, and an "explanation of the origin of all ethical positions and...a criterion for passing judgment on each of them" is enabled.<sup>28</sup>

Self-appropriation however, with its consequent promise of the real, metaphysics and ethics, is not simply a matter of the will – we cannot simply *decide* to grasp it. For the will, as we shall see, is only a higher integration within the cognitional structure. "[A]s capacity for sensitive hunger stands to sensible food, so will stands to objects presented by intellect,"<sup>29</sup> writes Lonergan. All real knowledge requires that we embrace, that we make our own, the fundamental structure of experience, understanding, judging and deciding. This is the self-appropriation that is so basic to Lonergan. The *drive* to embrace all this is primordial; it is the *wonder* that is prior to any insights, concepts, or words. It is a wonder that presupposes all experiences and images.<sup>30</sup> The drive is not the will, but the pure question, what Lonergan describes as a detached, disinterested, and unrestricted desire to know.<sup>31</sup> It is an "eros of

the mind,”<sup>32</sup> a release from the dominance of the biological drive and from the routines of everyday living.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, although the question is prior, presupposing experiences, the pure question is about the *concretely* given or imagined. One never just wonders; our wonder and our wondering are always about *something*.

### Cognition: Structure and Operations

In light of this beginning, the insight, or the *supervening understanding*, that ensues from authentic self-appropriation of the dynamic cognitional

structure has certain characteristics: insight first comes as a release to the tension of inquiry, and in doing so betrays the exhilaration of the desire and drive to know; secondly, insight comes suddenly and unexpectedly, it is not a guaranteed result of an act of will; thirdly, insight is a function of inner conditions, not of outer circumstances; fourthly, insight pivots between the concrete and the abstract; and fifthly, insight passes into the habitual texture of one’s mind.<sup>34</sup> While the first two characteristics require little explanation, the third stands in contrast to much of the modern western philosophical tradition. For unlike sensation, insight is not automatic.<sup>35</sup> The development and content of sensation is in some way immediately correlated to outer circumstance, but insight depends first on the habitual orientation of asking the question ‘Why?’ and then proceeds to work from this wonder. The fourth characteristic, whereby insight is that which pivots between the concrete and abstract, provides the link between sensation, or more generally, experience, and the understanding of that experience. Insight is a mediator, it is insight *into* the concrete world of the sense and imagination, yet “what is known by insight, what insight adds to sensible and imagined presentations, finds its adequate expression only in the abstract and recondite formulations of the sciences.”<sup>36</sup> Finally, by passing into the habitual texture of one’s mind, one has ‘crossed the divide’ as it were. Once one has understood, there is no further ‘unknowing.’ Herein lie the possibility of learning, for as insight is added to insight, learning occurs, “inasmuch as the new does not extrude the old but complements and combines with it.”<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, the process of learning is marked by

a period of darkness as one gropes towards understanding of what one doesn’t quite know.

#### **Educational Praxis**

This ‘insight added to insight’ description of learning highlights the centrality of *metaphor* to the learning process.

One of the things I most enjoyed (and for which I was often laughed at!) when I was teaching was coming up with analogies, often on the spot (the role of improvisation is worthy of consideration at a later date), to teach tricky scientific concepts. From talking about the circulatory system and its links with the respiratory system through the ideas of delivery and garbage trucks, the bug on a bbq model of atomic thermodynamics to the idea of enzymes being the dating agency of the body, metaphor provided the means of forming new understanding. To put it in more formal language, the linking of a subject with an unexpected predicate enabled the assertion of an identity between two different things leading to new understanding. New knowledge for the students was generated from that which they already had some understanding. This is where the true power of language resides. For in the linking of two seemingly disparate concepts, we are not simply subsuming information under more general categories, but instead are creating a new level of knowledge, understanding a new reality.

Aristotle wrote of this transformative power of metaphor, linking the act of composition with imagination by saying,

“We all naturally find it agreeable to get hold of new ideas easily: words express ideas, and therefore those words are the most agreeable that enable us to get hold of new ideas. Now strange words simply puzzle us; ordinary words convey only what we know already; it is from metaphor that we can best get hold of something fresh” (*Rhetoric* III, 1410b)

If all we ever have is recognition, we end up bored. If we only ever experience surprise, we will find ourselves in a state of constant terror. Yet if we can combine the surprise with the recognition, we end up with delight.

**- How do you build insight upon insight? How do you incorporate metaphor into the learning process?**

In light of this overview, let us now move to a more detailed consideration of exactly *what* it is that Lonergan is calling us to self-appropriate. Elsewhere, Lonergan described his work in *Insight* as being a study of operations, with the fundamental operation examined being that of understanding. Already hinted at, this fundamental operation is composed of three integrated levels of operations: experiencing, understanding, and judging, all operations most easily considered as relating in terms of group theory.<sup>38</sup> To these three levels are added a fourth,

deciding.<sup>39</sup> These four levels form a dynamic interlocking “pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results” – a *method* as defined by Lonergan in *Method in Theology*,<sup>40</sup> a method that is an answer to the question, at least in terms of the first three levels, ‘what am I doing when I am knowing?’ *That* we know is assumed by Lonergan, because if we are to claim that we don’t know, we at least *know* that we do not know:

Am I a knower? The answer yes is coherent, for if I am a knower, I can know that fact. But the answer no is incoherent, for if I am not a knower, how could the question be raised and answered by me? No less, the hedging answer, ‘I do not know’ is incoherent. For if I know that I do not know, then I am a knower; and if I do not know that I do not know, then I should not answer.

Am I a knower? If I am not, then I know nothing, my only course is silence.<sup>41</sup>

Lonergan proposes that all operations of knowing occur by means of a dynamic intermeshing pattern of *experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding*. This is the essence of his cognitional theory. The upward move of human development, the first of the two vector forces being considered here, is that which results from the authentic unfolding of this pattern, a pattern that progressively enables the affirmation of the real, and furthermore, embeds the known in human activity and authentic human activity in the good.<sup>42</sup> It is to an elucidation of these four levels that we now turn.

### Experiencing

The first of the four – experience – is the *empirical* level of conscious attention to data. This is the level of presentations, a level providing the data on which intelligence can operate. As Lonergan describes, this data is merely given. It is open to understanding but in itself it is not understood; it simply is. The data is in itself, as Lonergan writes, “ineffable.” There are there two modes of empirical level of experience in the cognitional process: the first being the direct mode beginning with the data of *sense*, and the second being the indirect mode which begins with the data of *consciousness*. The direct mode, characterised by the operations of our senses, is the basis for the

empirical sciences. It includes colours, shapes, sounds, odours, tastes, the hard and soft, rough and smooth, hot and cold, and so on. The indirect mode is experience of the interior senses. It consists of acts of hearing, seeing, tasting, imagining, understanding, reflecting. As data, these acts are experienced. But whilst they are experienced, they are not described, or compared, or defined, for such subsequent activities are the result of the higher levels of the cognitional process; they are the work of inquiry, insight, and formulation and as such require reflection and judgment.<sup>43</sup>

### Educational Praxis

- How do you incorporate a range of experiences into your teaching practice?
- Are there alternate experiences, often from ‘left-field’, that can broaden the base for the appropriation of understanding by the students?

### Understanding

The *intellectual* level of consciousness presupposes and complements the empirical level. Its formulations are characterised by the act of *understanding*, and its formulations yield: concepts, definitions, objects of thought, suppositions and considerations. On this level, intelligibility, regarding data is sought—an intelligibility that reveals what Lonergan terms the classical and statistical phases of empirical method, the notion of a thing, and explanatory abstraction.<sup>44</sup> The level of intelligence is where the unification and organisation of data is attempted and the apprehension of relations occurs. The intelligibility is the content of a direct insight, an answer to the question ‘What is it?’ Beginning with the grasp of the individuality (its distinctive, unique actuality) of data, the question ‘Why?’ generates the comprehension and formulation of a system, a law, a relationship *between* this information presented by the level of experience.<sup>45</sup> The question ‘How often?’ prompts an understanding of an ideal frequency from which an actual frequency will diverge in a non-systematic way.<sup>46</sup> Understanding on this level is the process of generalization and abstraction that leaves behind the individuality of the data and seeks similarity. However, these formulations as conceived are not the end of knowing, for together, experience and understanding only constitute *thinking*.

For concepts are just thinking; thinking is not knowing; it is only when we reach judgment that we attain human knowledge of anything whatever...whether of creature or Creator.<sup>47</sup>

Indeed, “every answer to a question for intelligence raises a further question for reflection.”<sup>48</sup> Because our understanding can be mistaken, because we can *mis*understand, a further, *rational* level is required.

### Judging

The correctness of our thinking is determined and our understanding is verified on the level of *judgment*. Having first experienced, and then asked the question, ‘What is it?’ judgment becomes the answer to the question, ‘Is it so?’—a question that generally requires a yes or no answer.<sup>49</sup> We may have a neat and tidy summation of the relationship and intelligibility of the data as presented, but it is not until we can affirm the actuality of the conception that knowledge can be attained. As such, the notion of judging involves personal commitment. The judgment, ‘It is so’ is the responsibility of the one who judges—no one can do it for him or her. Rather than devolution into solipsism, the personal nature of the judgment affirms a reality that exists beyond the individual. Lonergan states, “the real is the verified; it is what is to be known by the knowing constituted by experience and inquiry, insight and hypothesis, reflection and verification.”<sup>50</sup>

The real world for Lonergan is not simply the object of our thinking, but the object of judgments and decisions (which we will consider shortly) made in light of our understanding of the experience presented to our consciousness.<sup>51</sup> In light of such, Lonergan describes the ‘yes’ answer to the question for reflection of judgment as the grasp and acknowledgement of a *virtually unconditioned*. This technical term, ‘virtually unconditioned,’ is distinguished from the formally unconditioned, which has no conditions whatsoever, (this is God). The virtually unconditioned does have conditions, but they are fulfilled. This may also sound quite abstract; however, what is really being asked is how we distinguish between what is merely a bright idea, and what is a correct idea. Lonergan's careful analysis reveals what he calls the immanent law of

cognitional process, which is that an insight is correct if there are no further appropriate questions; its conditions are fulfilled.<sup>52</sup> It is important to recognise, however, that it is not enough to say that the virtually unconditioned has been reached when no further questions occur *to me*. There may be other causes for the absence of further questions. There may have been a rash judgment made, a ‘leaping before one looks.’ Or indeed there may be biases of one kind or another that block further questions.... Reaching the virtually unconditioned is not a given; Lonergan writes:

Were there some simple formula or recipe in answer to such questions, then men of good judgment could be produced at will and indefinitely. All we can attempt is an analysis of the main factors in the problem and an outline of the general nature of the solution.<sup>53</sup>

Nevertheless, he affirms that good judgment *is* possible. Correct insights are predicated on the initial development of correct problems such that every judgment on an insight is reliant on a multitude of previous accurate insights, the process of learning opens the possibility of breaking what could be a vicious circle. This process is the gradual accumulation of insights bearing on the various domains. Particularly regarding the development of a child into adulthood, during the learning process one's judgment is in a state of suspension whilst being developed and formed. On its own, however, this does not overcome the problem. What is required is an understanding that prior insights are not correct just because we judge them to be. Prior insights occur within a self-correcting process reliant on the desire to continually ask questions such that deficiencies in the insights are exposed, and further refinement of the insight is invited. By no means is such a process automatic, and indeed it is easier in some realms than in others. The preciseness of mathematics allows for easier recognition of the virtually unconditioned than is possible in the realm of commonsense judgments. Nevertheless, ‘certitude of knowledge’ is possible.<sup>54</sup> Lonergan summarises the elements of grasping such knowledge as being the virtually unconditioned in the following:

There occurs a reflective insight in which at once one grasps (1) a conditioned, the prospective judgment that a given direct or introspective insight is correct, (2) a link between the conditioned and its conditions, and this on introspective analysis proves to be that an insight is correct if it is invulnerable and it is invulnerable if there are no further pertinent questions, and (3) the fulfilment of the conditions, namely, that the given insight does put an end to further pertinent questioning and that this occurs in a mind that is alert, familiar with the concrete situation, and intellectually master of it.<sup>55</sup>

### Deciding

Following the level of judgment is the *responsible* level of consciousness. This is the level of *decision* regarding what good action ought to be done. It is open to reality inasmuch as it is good and of value. Here we see that the endpoint of the process is ethical—not simply cognitional. In *Method*, Lonergan refers to Pascal's famous remark that the heart has its reasons which reason does not know. Lonergan locates this in his fourth level of the cognitive process when he writes:

The meaning then, of Pascal's remark would be that, besides the factual knowledge reached by experience, understanding and verifying, there is another kind of knowledge reached through the discernment of value and the judgments of value of a person in love.<sup>56</sup>

As the question that guides the intellectual level revolves around the 'What is it?' and the question for the level of judgment is 'Is it so?' the questions guiding the level of decision include 'Is it of value?' and 'Should I do it?'

Lonergan writes that the "goodness of being" is only found by "considering the extension of intellectual activity that we name deliberation and decision, choice and will."<sup>57</sup> Decision resembles judgment (indeed in *Insight*, Lonergan conflates the two) in that both are enacted through the selection of one member of a pair of contradictories. As judgment either affirms or denies in the form of answer yes or no, decision either consents or

refuses.<sup>58</sup> Additionally, both are concerned with actuality, with judgment focussing on the actuality that already exists, and decision considering the actuality that will potentially be conferred by a course of action not yet existing.<sup>59</sup> It is on this fourth level that consciousness *is* conscience, and it is conscience that drives decision—not the will.<sup>60</sup> Lonergan describes the importance of decision as related to the judgment of value, in the following way:

The judgment of value presupposes knowledge of human life, of human possibilities proximate and remote, of the probable consequences of projected courses of action. When knowledge is deficient, then fine feelings are apt to be expressed in what is called moral idealism, i.e. lovely proposals that don't work out and often do more harm than good. But knowledge alone is not enough and, while everyone has some measure of moral feeling for, as the saying is, there is honor among thieves, still moral feelings have to be cultivated, enlightened, strengthened, refined, criticized and pruned of oddities. Finally, *the development of knowledge and the development of moral feeling lead to the existential discovery, the discovery of oneself as a moral being, the realization that one not only chooses between courses of action but also thereby makes oneself an authentic human being or an unauthentic one. With that discovery, there emerges in consciousness the significance of personal value and the meaning of personal responsibility.*<sup>61</sup>

There is a necessary intersubjectivity here, for the judgment of value necessarily prescind from the notion of the primacy of the ego; the scope of what is needed for decision is the whole of human life; an 'ecological' or even more appropriate, a 'creational' horizon. And as we shall consider shortly, it is this level that begins the move from above down, the healing move, for the creational framework embeds all our doing and knowing.<sup>62</sup> It is for this reason that the prior and more fundamental means of education (particularly with regard to children still accumulating insights), is from above downward. This fourth, *responsible*, level for Lonergan flourishes with the principle for self-control, whereby the decision for authentic appropriation of the operations of the other three

levels is made. As such, it is responsible for the proper functioning of the first three levels and is successful insofar as we are attentive rather than inattentive in experiencing, intelligent and not unintelligent in our understanding, and reasonable rather than unreasonable in our judging.

Consequently, the notion that there is such a thing as pure intellect, or pure reason, is exposed as flawed, for these cannot operate without the guidance and control from responsible decision. The idea that our will can arbitrarily and with indifference choose between good and evil is shown to be erroneous.<sup>63</sup>

### Wonder, Desire, Love: The Operators

The unfolding of these four integrated, yet successive stages: experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding, with each presupposing, complementing and subsuming the previous, is driven by the *eros* of the human spirit, a wonder that continues to ask the question, a wonder that is the human response to the mystery of the realization of being. That is to say, if we are to know the good, we must know the real, and to know the real, we must know the true. Knowing the true, we have to grasp what is intelligible, and to know the intelligible, we must first attend to data. And so, as Lonergan rather poetically states, “from slumber, we awake to attend.”<sup>64</sup> All operations on these levels are intentional and conscious, and the progression through these levels has the effect of expanding our consciousness into new dimensions. On all four levels, we are aware of ourselves, but in the move from level to level, driven by the affectivity of wonder, “it is a fuller self of which we are aware and the awareness itself is different.”<sup>65</sup> In our empirical consciousness we exist as much of the rest of the animal kingdom. Yet our position as responsible agents move beyond the stimulus-response structure of biological behaviour. We begin from, yet transcend this level, subsuming it in higher activities. The data of sense and consciousness induce inquiry, and that inquiry seeks not more data, but intelligible unity whereby data is organised and relationships sought. There is then provoked the desire to understand, and as reflectively and critically conscious, detachment and disinterestedness is incarnated and we become aware of ourselves in a fuller sense, in our self-surrender, the “single-minded concern for

truth”.<sup>66</sup> Yet this dimension of a truth seeking consciousness is further subsumed by a level in which we emerge as *human* persons, as *Homo sapiens*, the ‘wise ones’. For Lonergan, this is the level where we

...meet one another in a common concern for values, [where we] seek to abolish the organization of human living on the basis of competing egoisms and...replace it [with] an organization [based on] man’s perceptiveness and intelligence, his reasonableness, and his responsible exercise of freedom.<sup>67</sup>

On this level, we are not just ‘knowers’ we are agents in relation. We are only authentically human in as much as we *act* on decisions driven by affectivity. In its fullness, this process, this expanding cognitional method, is referred to by Lonergan as *transcendental* in that its results are not confined to some particular subject area. Rather, they regard all areas of human activity. This method is:

...concerned with meeting the exigencies and exploiting the opportunities presented by the human mind itself...[A] concern that is both foundational and universally significant and relevant.<sup>68</sup>

Together they form “a rock on which one can build”<sup>69</sup> for the pattern of this transcendental method is normative; the levels have a prior existence and reality in the spontaneous and dynamic functioning of the cognitive process. Engagement in the process is not an activity of the will, for will is itself an outflow of part of the process. Rather, the process is the very embodiment of cognition, and indeed, human *doing*. Indeed, to deny the actuality of this process as being foundational, one would have to engage in the very process; to deny the process requires the use of the process. Not only do these four levels of a “generalized empirical method”<sup>70</sup> function normatively, they function critically, for if these are self-appropriated they will expose internal contradiction, helping to facilitate the heuristic function of transforming the unknown into the known.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that the dynamics unfolding at the various levels does not *necessarily* unfold in such a way as has been described. Lonergan talks of the ‘transcendental precepts’ that emerge from the generalized empirical method: Be attentive; Be intelligent; Be reasonable; Be responsible.<sup>71</sup> There is an imperative quality to them; we are in some sense, *called* into embracing them to be authentic. This calling is Love. Lonergan describes it as a love that is ‘self-emptying’ a love that divests itself of the primacy of ego, a love that is the very expression of the Grace described by Lonergan in a previous quotation. To return to an earlier notion, this describes self-appropriation:

The dynamic cognitional structure to be reached is...the personally appropriated structure of one’s own experiencing, one’s own intelligent inquiry and insights, one’s own critical reflection and judging and deciding. The crucial issue is an experimental issue, and the experiment will be performed not publicly but privately. It will consist in one’s own rational self-consciousness clearly and distinctly taking possession of itself as rational self-consciousness. Up to that decisive achievement, all leads. From it all follows. No one else, no matter what his knowledge or his eloquence, no matter what his logical rigor or his persuasiveness, can do it for you.<sup>72</sup>

It is possible for us to ignore data, or to refuse to act reasonably and make erroneous judgments, and even decide to do the wrong thing. Indeed it is the refusal of self-transcendence or self-appropriation that Lonergan terms alienation. As self-transcendence promotes progress, alienation turns progress into cumulative decline.<sup>73</sup> However, for Lonergan, it is only self-sacrificing, self-emptying love that can reconcile an alienated woman or man to their true being. This role of love shall be considered further as we discuss the healing from above that is the other ‘arm of the scissors’ to the upward move of human development in the next paper.

### **Educational Praxis**

It is becoming something of a clichéd commonplace to talk about how the overwhelming access to information is changing the focus of education away from mastery of information to critical thinking. But in saying so, we have not actually said much at all, for critical thinking requires a selection of information in order to critically engage with the process of critical selection of information, in order to critically engage...the circularity ends up becoming a source of paralysis for the enthusiastic student. As Lonergan suggests, the critical issue is not *information*, but *formation*.

**- What are you trying to inculcate in your students? Why?**

**- What kind of persons/learners/scholars are your students becoming through *your* interaction?**

**- What role does the question of ‘drive’ play in your teaching practice, and how is the character of ‘drive’ in your discipline best appropriated?**

**- What is the nature of the wonder that drives the experiencing, understanding, judging, and decision making for your particular domain of interest?**

**- How can you, with greater intentionality, facilitate the ‘transcendental precepts’ of being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable, and being responsible?**


### **Conclusion**

This first of two papers has sought to present a broad outline of what Lonergan terms an upward vector. His generalized empirical method is a picture of *us* as *we* intend towards a world that is other than self, beyond oneself. We have looked not at the details of the known – the pursuit of much of modern philosophy – but the structure of the knowing as it is found in our intelligent and rational self-consciousness. To remind ourselves of the grand vision, I shall repeat an earlier noted statement of Lonergan:

T]horoughly understand what it is to understand, and not only will you understand the broad lines of all there is to be understood but you will possess a fixed base, an invariant pattern opening upon all further developments of understanding.<sup>74</sup>

Herein lies the beginning of a task through which Lonergan addresses some of the important elements in education. As we develop a deeper concept of understanding, we begin to appropriate a means to engage the process of understanding that our students are seeking to appropriate as we

teach, as well – excitingly – a means of carrying on that understanding beyond our immediate interaction.

In the next paper, we shall consider the necessary outcome of self-appropriation, namely *meaning*, as well as the potential impediments to authenticity. Finally, we shall look at the downward vector, which functions to guide, nurture, cajole, and heal the upward movement that creates. 

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In this article and in future articles of a predominantly philosophical or theoretical nature, insets called “Educational Praxis” have been added to the text to help readers relate complex ideas to the practical aspects of teaching and learning.

<sup>2</sup> *Time Magazine*, April 27, 1970: 10.

<sup>3</sup> As in ‘of persons.’ I feel this is more appropriate than human for the reason that ‘human’ can easily lose the sense of the particular – the historically contingent that the description ‘of a person’ can engender.

<sup>4</sup> I recognize the danger of such a seeping statement, particularly regarding its nuanced relevance to many scholars potentially reading this article. For present purposes, I use the language of ‘negative intentionality’ to refer to the notion of rights language as a means of mitigating potential power differentials in all manner of educational discourse.

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Lonergan, S.J., *A Second Collection*. eds., William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 99.

<sup>6</sup> The word ‘recorded’ has the widest possible reference. *Insight*, in particular, seeks to account for, in general terms, human activity all the way back to ‘primitive’ mythic culture.

<sup>7</sup> Bernard Lonergan, S.J., *Insight*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1992), 7. Throughout his work, Lonergan uses the masculine form when referring to humankind in general. While recognising the need to move to more gender inclusive language, when directly quoting Lonergan, I shall remain faithful to the original text.

<sup>8</sup> See Alisdair McIntyre’s developing argument across three of his books: *After Virtue*; *Whose Justice, Which Rationality*; and *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry*, for a well conceived justification of the impossibility of ‘inter-communication’ between different rationalities. Lonergan would agree with the impossibility if we seek to begin from the known and the knowable. However, as we shall see, in locating his transcendental method *prior* to the development and consequent judgment of rationalities, common ground is found not in our answers to the questions that concern us, but in our approach.

<sup>9</sup> At the very least, this is an important addition to the conversation around discourse and power that so preoccupies modern scholarship in the humanities. With Foucault being likely the most cited author in the last 10 years in the humanities, we have in Lonergan’s focus on the process of human insight the potential for truly collaborative *creative* discourse. And given the potential problematic of discourse selection in the classroom, we also can begin to discern the possibility of *creative* learning in community.

<sup>10</sup> *Insight*, 552.

<sup>11</sup> For the purposes of these papers, I shall usually consider the terms ‘education’ and ‘development’ as synonymous. Described in the simplest and most ‘naïve’ terms, the formal process of *education* will be conceived as the relational and recursive process of guiding, nurturing, and shaping the *development* of persons.

<sup>12</sup> Important terms, as we shall see, for a Lonerganian approach.

<sup>13</sup> D. G. Creamer, *Guides for the Journey: John Macmurray, Bernard Lonergan, James Fowler*. (Lanham: University Press of America, 1996), 92. He quotes from Bernard Lonergan, S.J., *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.* ed., Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 107-108.

<sup>14</sup> A significant and profound term of Lonergan that we shall consider shortly.

<sup>15</sup> *A Third Collection*, 180-181.

<sup>16</sup> Used here in the sense of the content of metaphysics. Lonergan writes that “the dynamic structure of our knowing grounds a metaphysics....” (*Insight*, 626).

<sup>17</sup> This also is an extremely important corrective to the modern conception of the knower as fundamentally an autonomous individual. See, for example, volume two of John Macmurray’s Gifford lectures on *The Form of the Personal*, titled *Persons in Relation* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1970), for further articulation of such an anthropology.

<sup>18</sup> In truth, the educator does not and cannot stand external to the very process which is being imparted. The educator *is*, and *must be* an authentic functioning example of the unification of both vector movements. There is no ‘Archimedean’ point, nor abstracted domain – there is only exemplified character demonstrating the integration of healing and creating, listening and engaging. If this is truly grasped, then the situation of a professor teaching ethics while committing adultery with the TA would be seen for the intrinsic absurdity that it is.

<sup>19</sup> *Insight*, 767.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 22. On the same page, and no doubt in an attempt to makes things clearer, Lonergan restates the aim as being a “development...that heads through an understanding of all

understanding to a basic understanding of all that can be understood”.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 3. And hence, the common ground “on which men of intelligence might meet.”

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 621.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>31</sup> Similar to the Kantian notion, it is perhaps best seen in practice as simply getting as much of the ego out of the way as possible, and instead to honestly and faithfully *listen*.

<sup>32</sup> *Insight*, 97.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 28-31.

<sup>35</sup> In yet another undermining of Platonic ‘recollection’, insight is not a matter of simply removing the distractions of our external world to discover an ‘internal’ truth. Herein lies a necessary caution regarding the recent focus on ‘discovery-based learning’ variants in pedagogical practice. Yes, insight and understanding are personal – none can do it for you – but insight, as the downward vector implies, also requires the acceptance of external input – a guiding of process of self-appropriation that must be deeply relational.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 30. This is not to deny the place of insight into common sense. Indeed, Lonergan devotes chapters to developing just that. The discriminator here is the phrase, ‘adequate expression.’ Lonergan acknowledges that the account of insight is able to be illustrated from common sense, but that it is “impossible for common sense to grasp and say what precisely common sense happens to illustrate.” (*Insight*, 14-15).

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>38</sup> Bernard Lonergan, S.J., *Topics in Education: the Cincinnati Lecture of 1959 on the Philosophy of Education*, eds., Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 131.

<sup>39</sup> Lonergan’s three levels as expressed in *Insight* underwent revision throughout his career. In *Method in Theology* (New

York: Herder and Herder, 1972), Lonergan differentiated *decision* from the level of *judgment*, and included *love* as a fifth level. There is also an indication that there is a level before *experience*, that of *dreams* (see *Method*, 9). For the purposes of his paper, I shall focus on *experience*, *understanding*, *judgment* and *decision*.

<sup>40</sup> *Method*, 4. Earlier, Lonergan writes, “Method is not a set of rules to be followed meticulously by a dolt. It is a framework for collaborative creativity.” (*Method*, xi)

<sup>41</sup> *Insight*, 353.

<sup>42</sup> This fundamentally embeds ethics in the *character* of the person engaging in the ‘knowing’.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>44</sup> See Chapter 3 of *Insight* for an in-depth explanation of these and related aspects of understanding arising from empirical method.

<sup>45</sup> This last sentence involves a move over a vast amount of material in Lonergan. The notion of what it is that is experienced, as a *thing*, or as *data* is a complex one. *Things* are defined as concrete intelligible unities and as such are all alike, an involved notion in itself. But even as this, there are different kinds of things. Things are similar as they relate to us, and they are similar as they relate to each other. The notion of things as relating to each other is complex, as from this arises the notion of a “succession of higher viewpoints” or an emerging and developing understanding of levels on which things are similar to each other. This leads us to be able to understand, or relate things as they are on the subatomic level, which can proceed to the chemical, then biological, then the sensitive level and finally to the intelligent level which we are considering here. But not only do those things relate in ways that can be described on these levels, but they can, through a development of the notion of *emergent probability*, lead to the notion of “conditioned series” that give rise to schemes in which things operate, schemes of recurrence. In all, that which is formed from the questions ‘What is it?’, ‘Why?’ and ‘How often?’, is complex and rich, offering a deep understanding of that which is, at the same time as deepening and widening the notions of ‘things’ offered throughout the history of philosophy.

<sup>46</sup> The answers to these questions constitute the majority of the first part of *Insight*. Their details are intricate, and their derivation is, in my view, nothing short of brilliant. Taking into account contemporary thought in mathematics and quantum mechanics in particular, Lonergan accounts for understanding in such a way that leaves no room for mechanism, positivism, idealism or relativism.

<sup>47</sup> *Second Collection*, 31.

<sup>48</sup> *Insight*, 298.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*; *Topics*, 147.

<sup>50</sup> *Insight*, 277.

<sup>51</sup> Creamer, *Guides*, 67.

<sup>52</sup> *Insight*, 309.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>54</sup> Synonymous with the *proper confidence* of Lesslie Newbigin in his development of the work of Michael Polanyi. (See: L. Newbigin, *Proper Confidence*. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995]). From a different standpoint, John Dewey seeks after a similar end when he speaks of 'warranted belief.'

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 312.

<sup>56</sup> *Method*, 115.

<sup>57</sup> *Insight*, 619.

<sup>58</sup> Reflecting that the 'knower' is an 'actor,' and 'agent.' Similar in concept to that described in John Macmurray, *The Self as Agent* (New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1991).

<sup>59</sup> *Insight*, 636. Here, there are certain similarities with Aristotle's recognition that logic deals with "that which cannot be other" (Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*. Bk1, Pt2), and rhetoric and dialectic considering truth making as that which is yet to be.

<sup>60</sup> *Method*, 268-269.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 38. Italics mine.

<sup>62</sup> James Smith writes that we are fundamentally desiring beings, and that it is our practices responding to our desires that form us as knowing beings. In describing humanity as *Homo liturgicus*, Smith is describing an understanding contiguous with Lonergan. (J. K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009]). It is also interesting to note the similarities to John Macmurray, who writes that "all meaningful knowledge is for the sake of action, and all meaningful action for the sake of friendship." *The Self as Agent*, 15.

<sup>63</sup> *Method*, 121.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>70</sup> *Insight*, 96.

<sup>71</sup> *Method*, 302.

<sup>72</sup> *Insight*, 12-13.

<sup>73</sup> *Method*, 55.

<sup>74</sup> *Insight*, 22.

## Bibliography

Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*.

Creamer, David. G. *Guides for the Journey: John Macmurray, Bernard Lonergan, James Fowler*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1996.

Lonergan, Bernard, S.J. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

---. *Method in Theology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1973.

---. *A Second Collection*, edited by William F. J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

---. *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

---. *Topics in Education: the Cincinnati Lecture of 1959 on the Philosophy of Education*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Macmurray, John. *Persons in Relation*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1970.

---. *The Self as Agent*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1991.

Newbigin, Leslie. *Proper Confidence*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Smith, James. K. A. *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

*Time Magazine*, April 27, 1970: 10.