

## An Attempt at Communicating History Functionally

Robert Henman

### Introduction

In the first E-seminar on Research,<sup>1</sup> I gathered data of what I viewed as a neglect of the term implementation in the indices of Lonergan's written works. In the second seminar on Interpretation I attempted an analysis of the specialty communications and its relationship to the explanatory horizon.<sup>2</sup> These two efforts raised questions for me about what has been going forward in Lonergan Studies over the past six decades. I begin with a quote from page 187 of **Method in Theology** where Lonergan offers the following statement for critical historians and critical history: "What starts the process is the question for historical intelligence." With that in mind I take up in this seminar the specialty of functional history in an effort to provide a brief overview of the nature of follow up to Lonergan's achievements.

There are four possible divisions in the past six decades since Lonergan first began to make his philosophical thought available to the academic community. A first period begins with 1949 with the appearance of the last of the five *Verbum* articles in *Theological Studies*.<sup>3</sup> A second division begins in 1957 with the publishing of the text **Insight**.<sup>4</sup> A third division in 1969 begins with the publishing of *Functional Specialties in Theology* in *Gregorianum*.<sup>5</sup> A final division begins in 1972 with the publishing of **Method in Theology**.<sup>6</sup> These four periods differ as historical data in that each subsequent work provides the possibility of a new context for a renewed understanding of Lonergan's philosophical thought.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.sgame.org/BlogEngine/post/2011/01/15/Implementation-and-Functional-Research.aspx> for the complete article.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.sgame.org/BlogEngine/post/2011/05/30/Functionally-Interpreting-Communications-by-Robert-Henman.aspx> for the complete article.

<sup>3</sup> *Theological Studies*: Chapter I: VII (1946); Chapter II: VIII (1947); Chapter III: VIII (1947); Chapter IV: X (1949); Chapter V: X (1949).

<sup>4</sup> Bernard Lonergan, **Insight: A Study of Human Understanding**, Darton, Longman & Todd, Gr. Br., 1957.

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Lonergan, *Functional Specialties in Theology*, *Gregorianum* 50, 1969 pp. 485 – 504.

<sup>6</sup> Bernard Lonergan, **Method in Theology**, Darton, Longman & Todd, London, 1972.

Because the publishing of **Insight** and **Method in Theology** made Lonergan's thought more available and in more detail in terms of its import to the academic community I will focus this brief article on only two of the time divisions: first from 1957 to 1972 and the second from 1972 to the present. A detailed analysis of these time periods would be the work of years and of volumes by historians.

### **The First Period: 1957-1972**

The last of the Verbum articles was published in *Theological Studies* in 1949. The articles had attracted some attention from Catholic circles of philosophers and theologians not all of which was positive.<sup>7</sup> The student response at the Thomas More Institute encouraged Lonergan and he began writing **Insight** in 1949. It was published in 1957. It attracted attention in as much as Lonergan was suddenly being invited to lecture week long and often more, on various topics at universities in North America and abroad.<sup>8</sup> Following the publishing of **Insight** the next 15 years would bring forth a following which was for the most by catholic philosophers and theologians. Courses were developed and taught in universities in various countries. Articles would be written and a Festschrift in 1964 would appear as **Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan** edited by Fred Crowe. It would include 22 articles on various aspects of

---

<sup>7</sup> Pierrot Lambert & Philip McShane, **Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas**, Axial Press, 2010. See pages 82-98 on responses to the Verbum Articles. It is interesting to note that the students of the Thomas More Institute in Montreal were more open to Lonergan's achievement than some of the catholic philosophers and theologians of that same period.

<sup>8</sup> In 1980 I was studying for an MA in Philosophy at St. Mary's University in Halifax where Lonergan had delivered his 1958 lectures later published as **Understanding and Being**, edited by Mark & Elizabeth Morelli, CWL 5, 1990. I attended a public lecture by Fr. William Stewart, S.J. on Lonergan's "philosophy". A question from the audience asked if Lonergan's cognitional view was similar to Kant's. Stewart hesitated and finally responded; "Yes." He offered a brief comment on how they were similar. I was immediately confused and later spoke to Stewart privately about this. My question was sidetracked by Stewart's discussion of his work in the field of drama and for the same reason he refused to direct my thesis. I mentioned Philip McShane as someone I had studied with and whom might direct my thesis. Stewart pointed to his shelves and his copy of **Wealth of Self** by McShane and said; "Well, he's (McShane) a popularizer and into science. Lonergan is a theologian."

Lonergan's thought.<sup>9</sup> Lonergan's contribution to this work was his article; *Cognitional Structure*. It is worth quoting from the beginning of the article why Lonergan chose this particular article to include as his response.

“I have chosen cognitional structure as my topic, partly because I regard it as basic, partly because greater clarity may be hoped for from an exposition that does not attempt to describe the ingredients that enter into the structure, and partly because **I have been told that my view of human knowing as a dynamic structure has been pronounced excessively obscure.**”<sup>10</sup> (Bold added)

This comment, in bold, echoes Stewart's response (footnote 8) to me 16 years later. Did Stewart also find Lonergan's view of human knowing excessively obscure? In Lonergan's choice of *Cognitional Structure* as “A Concluding Word” seven years after **Insight** was published, is he addressing the difficulty of his view, the ability of his audience, or both? A further question that can be raised is; Why, if Lonergan's view of human knowing is excessively difficult to access,

---

<sup>9</sup> Seventeen of the articles were contributed by acknowledged clerics, the remainder by academics in the catholic philosophical or theological tradition. See Appendix B for a complete list of the articles.

<sup>10</sup> Bernard Lonergan, **Collection, CWL 4** edited by Fred Crowe and Robert Doran, University of Toronto Press, 1988, page 205.

were so many philosophers and theologians interested enough to offer a Festschrift?<sup>11</sup> Or in a more succinct manner; what was the attraction?<sup>12</sup>

In light of the above events it raises the matter of what questions were interested persons asking in their follow up to Lonergan's work in **Insight**? The many articles, thesis and books that followed from 1957 until 1972 focus mainly on philosophical and theological questions, concerns or comparisons and contrasts of Lonergan's thought with that of other philosophers and theologians.<sup>13</sup> Underlying these multiple efforts, what are philosophers and theologians asking or to what are they responding? It would seem that even if an inadequate understanding of

---

<sup>11</sup> There were also doctoral theses emerging during this era. A first that I came across was in 1956 by Connelly, John J. "*Ordo Doctrinae* in the Summa Contra Gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas." Dissertations using Lonergan: doctoral, Gregorian Institute, 1956. A second thesis was; Larisey, Peter. "Rational Self-Consciousness: A Study of Bernard Lonergan's "The Possibility of Ethics" in *Insight*." Dissertations on Lonergan: licentiate, Collège de l'Immaculée-Conception, 1959. I have located 384 thesis listed at the Toronto Lonergan Centre and the Loyola Centre in LA. They are MA and PhD theses on Lonergan's thought the first being in 1956. They reveal the following statistics: 206 in Theology, 119 in Philosophy, 19 in Ethics, 10 in Education, 6 in Social Science, 5 in Economics, 2 in Mathematics, the remaining 17 in Pastoral and Spiritual theology. They are for the most in philosophy and theology. For a listing of the Lonergan Toronto Centre go to

[http://www.lonergan-lri.ca/sites/default/files/LRI\\_DissertationList\\_30Oct08.pdf](http://www.lonergan-lri.ca/sites/default/files/LRI_DissertationList_30Oct08.pdf) For the Los Angeles Lonergan Centre go to <http://www2.lmu.edu/lonergan/resources/theses.html>

<sup>12</sup> These are questions for an adequately self-appropriated philosopher within a larger study in functional history than I am posing here. For purposes of the e-seminar I am limiting this study to pointers. This is the strange twist related to Lonergan's work. One can not adequately critique his view of knowing without first having appropriated it and once that has occurred, a critique then becomes redundant. I would suggest that the various contexts present to catholic philosophers and theologians of this era influenced their interest in Lonergan's thought by the presence of the context of emerging historical consciousness, the demise of classical culture, and the affect these changes were having on catholic thought. See **Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S.J.** edited by Matthew L. Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1981. See Lamb's *Foreword*, pages viii-ix for his brief description of the response to Lonergan's achievements. Lamb expresses the response as "a small and unpretentious beginning". It is to the form of this beginning that this present study in functional history is attempting to bring to light.

<sup>13</sup> Three of the articles by Eric O'Connor, Patrick Heelan and Philip McShane in **Spirit as Inquiry** can be classed as venturing into the scientific domain partly in terms of topic but more so in terms of method. In all 3 cases these articles were written by persons with a background in mathematics or physics or both.

Lonergan's view of human knowing existed or its import not fully appreciated that some semblance of an order into philosophical and theological chaos was glimpsed even if in embryonic form. That said, an underlying question, or more appropriately a quest, to work out the issues of a culture in transition, found a home in the thought of Bernard Lonergan. The transition that Lonergan inaugurated within himself was brought on not only through philosophical and theological means. He also had to venture into the experience and method of the sciences, both natural and social, as they were known at the time while he was preparing and writing **Insight**.<sup>14</sup> Has that been the tradition of philosophers and theologians to bring the experience of science into their philosophical and theological reflections?<sup>15</sup>

What might be concluded from this brief analysis is not so much a systematic development of connected questions but an underlying quest which nurtured the interest in Lonergan's thought. Was this quest expressed in a manner that would assist in a systematic direction of follow up to Lonergan's work?<sup>16</sup> At this point it might be of value to reflect on what Lonergan's quest or question may have been over this period. It has been recorded in various places that Lonergan was searching for a method in theology even prior to the writing of **Insight**.<sup>17</sup> This was apparent to some of the authors who published on Lonergan's work shortly after **Insight** appeared. We have two quests going forward at the same time. Are they complimentary? In as much as a developing understanding of intellectual consciousness serves method and what would eventually be functional specialization, they do. Even as late as 1972 in

---

<sup>14</sup> **Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas**; op. cit., page 96. See also Philip McShane; **Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations**, Exposition Press, NY, 1975. Page 106 for a symbolic expression of the integral development of the sciences. F (p, c, b, z, u, r)

<sup>15</sup> See **Insight**, chapter XV, section 6 and 7 on development where Lonergan explains how each science emerges out of the subsequent science and that the former must be understood if the higher science is to be properly understood. This has not been the method of philosophy or theology in the past.

<sup>16</sup> I would suggest that the areas of psychology involving motivations and the normal aberrations associated with a culture in transition were and still are operative in academic life. A fuller study of this zone would reveal more than just the absence of the scientific bent in philosophers and theologians.

<sup>17</sup> **Language, Truth and Meaning**, edited by Philip McShane, University of Notre Dame Press, Ind., 1972, page 310. 3 volumes were planned to publish the Florida Conference papers. Only 2 appeared. The appearance of **Method in Theology** in 1972 may have been a factor in this decision by the editor of the volumes.

the Florida Conference published papers Lonergan took occasion again in **Language, Truth and Meaning**,<sup>18</sup> to explain his position. (See **Appendix C** for list of Contents) It would seem that Lonergan had concerns about the understanding academics had of his basic position and how that influenced their understanding of his further analysis.<sup>19</sup> That said, it raises the question of whether or not the two quests were complimentary.

Perhaps enough has been said on the period following the appearance of **Insight** to raise some questions about the form of follow up that occurred. I must leave further deliberations to other historical accounts and the specialty dialectic. Let us turn now to the period following the publishing of Lonergan's account of his 1965 discovery of the 8 functional specialties.

### **The Second Period: 1972-2011**

**Method in Theology** was published in the wake of his article on functional specialization in the journal, *Gregorianum* in 1969 and the Florida Conference of 1970. Enthusiasm for his work was developing. In 1974 Fred Lawrence of Boston College, inaugurated a Lonergan Conference that would be the first of an annual conference which still meets each year at Boston College. It has on rare occasions been held in other areas to celebrate particular catholic or Lonergan themes and events. This conference has drawn attention worldwide and scholars present papers on various subjects not always centered on Lonergan's work but related in some way. Since that time annual conferences have been held around the world inviting participants to deliver papers and engage in discussions relevant<sup>20</sup> to Lonergan's work. Many of these articles,

---

<sup>18</sup> **Language, Truth and Meaning**, *Ibid.* pages 306 and following.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*; pages 2-3. Quote from Fred Crowe's; *The Exigent Mind*; "He(Lonergan) has said as much in *Insight*, he has repeated it for years in his lectures, and his claim is ignored, sometimes as much by his disciples as by opponents, both of whom turn more readily to the objective products of his thoughts than to their own operations."

<sup>20</sup> Some papers and discussions that have been delivered at these conferences if set up against the central ideas of Lonergan's achievements and within the systematic framework that he promotes would come under scrutiny in terms of their relevancy and would not be accepted for presentation. A form of Christian piety may be at work here that feeds the fragmentation of current philosophical and theological academia. I noted also that some authors published in one area one year and later on published in another zone. Being an expert and up to date in one field is a monumental achievement that is devalued by this form of scholarship. Lonergan spent years reaching that ability by learning the lower sciences first and his achievement would seem to be rare.

but not all, are published in the **Loneragan Workshop** papers.<sup>21</sup> This Journal first appeared in 1978 and to date has published 186 articles not counting Lonergan's articles of which there have been a small number. (See Appendix A for a breakdown of article topics)

In 1983, **Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies** was established to offer an opportunity for academics working on Lonergan's thought to publish peer-reviewed articles. To date, it has published 173 articles again not counting Lonergan's articles, published posthumously, or book reviews. A Lonergan Newsletter was begun in 1980 as a way of circulating information of books, theses, conferences and ongoing events to interested persons and groups. Numerous articles by people worldwide have been published in other journals. Numerous theses, as I have referred to in note 11 above, have been carried out worldwide. Textbooks in great numbers have been written and published on Lonergan's thought or its application. There are now more than a dozen Lonergan Centres worldwide and his texts have been translated in other languages making them available to other cultures.<sup>22</sup> In the late 1980's members of the Lonergan Estate decided to publish Lonergan's complete works in a set of volumes known as the **Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan** (CWL). To date 16 volumes have been published by the University of Toronto Press with a possible 25 planned. In this brief study on functional history it is not possible to analyze the full focus of individual works but some conclusions can be drawn.

In an early part of this paper I stated that Lonergan's quest, even prior to the writing of *Insight* was to develop a method in theology. But it has become clear that in doing so he was also developing a method to implement the metaphysics he had developed in **Insight**. Functional specialization would serve both purposes not separately but at one and the same time. Further more, and Karl Rahner raised this possibility at the Florida Conference, functional specialization

---

<sup>21</sup> It is worth quoting Fred Lawrence's *Editor's Note* to the first edition of the **Loneragan Workshop** Papers providing the reader with the mindset of those times. "...the intent of the Workshop...is to provide a forum for communication and ongoing collaboration among persons who have found Lonergan's suggestions about self-appropriation helpful in venturing out "on their own."" Notice the use of "ongoing collaboration" and "out on their own" in the same sentence. How is one to understand this form of direction?

<sup>22</sup> It is worth noting that there is very little dialogue with the secular sciences by Lonergan scholars. If one checks the footnoting of articles on Lonergan, there is minimal referencing to the mature natural sciences of physics or chemistry. My thanks to Dr. Terrence Quinn for informing me of his observation.

could also function within the sciences.<sup>23</sup> Within the context of development it not only would serve the sciences but need be functioning in the sciences if theology was to have the full backup of the lower sciences. There have been a few articles and theses on functional specialization, but very little has been done in a collaborative systematic fashion.<sup>24</sup> Again, reviewing all the published material would be a vast undertaking and outside the scope of this article. But even a small sampling of the articles manifests a few things worth making note of. There is an enormous amount of diversity in topics.<sup>25</sup> Within this diversity the only common denominators are references to Lonergan or the usage of Lonergan's thought or comparison of his thought to that of other thinkers which seemed to occur more often after the appearance of the article on Functional Specialization published in *Gregorianum* in 1969.<sup>26</sup>

I take as an example of comparison an article by Joseph Fitzpatrick, *Strawson and Lonergan on 'Person'* published in **Method** October 1984, Vol. 2, # 2. Fitzpatrick attempts to

---

<sup>23</sup> Karl Rahner, *Some Critical Thoughts on 'Functional Specialties in Theology'* in **Foundations of Theology** edited by Philip McShane, University of Notre Dame Press, 1972, page 194. See also *Bernard Lonergan Responds*, page 233 for Lonergan's response to Rahner.

<sup>24</sup> **Papal Infallibility: An Application of Lonergan's Theological Method**, edited by Terry Tekippe, University Press of America, 1984. This was at least an attempt at functional specialist work but it did suffer from a lack of functional collaboration. Ivo Chloé has written a review of this text. See at <http://www.sgeme.org/Articles/sgeme-017-implementations-of-lonergans-method-a-critique.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> I took as a sampling 8 Lonergan scholars, all of whom began work in Lonergan's thought in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and listed the articles each published in the two Lonergan journals. The majority of the articles are in philosophy and theology, but in often unrelated sub-fields over the 3 decades from 1978 to the present. A few focused on a similar topic for the period surveyed.

<sup>26</sup> It would also be helpful to understand Philip McShane's comment in the *Introduction to Language, Truth and Meaning*, concerning comparison. "The third type of article (comparison) should especially be valuable in broadening the context of the chapters in Fr. Lonergan's book, *Method in Theology*", page 1. One might expect at this early stage of response to Lonergan's *Gregorianum* article on Functional Specialization that such a response be normative. I am not critiquing the quality of articles on comparison, but I am raising the question of the role of comparison in a process of development. Comparison occurs occasionally when new scientific insights emerge but are soon assimilated into a process of verification because the mature sciences operate with a standard model providing an agreement on former discoveries reducing the need for comparison. After 6 decades it is still common in Lonergan scholarship. If a form of comparison "broadens" the context it would expose a refined distinction between two types of comparison.

reveal a basic agreement between Strawson and Lonergan regarding the use of language and that this agreement will help in overcoming the “oddities” of knowing in the linguistic tradition. Fitzpatrick’s analysis does offer part of what it set out to achieve, a similarity between aspects of two different thinkers. That similarity rests on a particular interpretation of Strawson and it would have been interesting to have heard Strawson’s response. I set forth a few questions concerning this form of scholarship: 1) Has Fitzpatrick’s article opened up dialogue with the linguistic tradition? 2) Was his comparison a refinement of any particular aspect of cognitional theory? And 3) Have any other Lonergan scholar(s) attempted to follow up on Fitzpatrick’s work?

I am not attempting to make a case for eliminating such scholarship from academia but it would seem appropriate to ask these questions within a value context. What is the value of such a form of scholarship that has pervaded Lonerganism over the past three decades? It would be worth perhaps adding Lonergan’s thoughts on this which I quote from the same edition of **Method**. *First of all, then, I do not see any relevance in any antiquated philosophy, and I consider antiquated any philosophy with a cognitional theory inadequate to account clearly and accurately for the procedures of common sense, of mathematics, of the natural sciences, of the human sciences, and of human studies.* (Page 8) One could legitimately ask why these two separate dialogues occur in the same edition. Was the editor making a point? Was the editor even aware of Lonergan’s remark in relationship to Fitzpatrick’s effort? To avoid *haute vulgarization*<sup>27</sup> regarding my quoting of Lonergan on this point, one might reflect on the character and value of comparison for the future of philosophy and philosophies.

It has been 39 years since **Method in Theology** appeared. What has been achieved towards implementing the metaphysics that Lonergan developed?<sup>28</sup> The central question is; what did Lonergan want to achieve? He offered an account of cognitional activity in **Insight** and

---

<sup>27</sup> Bernard Lonergan, **Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964**, CWL 6, University of Toronto Press, 1996, page 121 on Lonergan’s position on *haute vulgarization*. This preoccupation with “quoting” may be related to the comfort ability with description as opposed to explanation. See **Insight**, page 528-529 for the need to move beyond description to explanation if a metaphysical control of meaning is to occur.

<sup>28</sup> Implementation too often seems to be a simple notion of mentioning Lonergan. As I recently read, and the author shall remain anonymous, she or he ensures that they put the name Lonergan in every article they put to pen. I leave reaction to my readers.

he offered a method to implement that account in **Method in Theology**. Lonergan did not achieve implementation. He offered a way to do so. Has the history of follow up implemented Lonergan's account of cognitional activity? It would seem not. The reasons for that have been indicated in a suggestive manner above, the more central matter is; what is the connection between Lonergan's discoveries and the scholarship that followed? Is there a connection? Lonergan promoted the explanatory horizon for anyone wishing to be involved in the intellectual life. He developed what he considered a method of helping academics to get into that zone. If that method has not been utilized why not since so many of his followers believe he has offered a shift in the entire intellectual and cultural endeavour? Lonergan's definition of method as "a normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results" is often quoted by Lonergan scholars. If we acknowledge that functional specialization is not yet functioning, and invoke intelligence, critical realism, to assess why Lonergan's definition is so often quoted, what data has been correctly understood to provide agreement with Lonergan?

### **Conclusion**

I have attempted to raise a few questions here in this very brief article about the nature of follow up to Lonergan's achievements. My secondary and concomitant effort is to express what I have come to understand by functional history. I have attempted to go behind the scenes of the events and suggest foundational questions that have motivated a response to Lonergan's achievements but also to suggest what may be neglected questions or zones of enquiry. For in as much as the many articles, theses and books on Lonergan's work often raise valid questions and concerns, without a proper method of procedure, they may suffer from a lack of possible development. That said, it is necessary to discover underlying questions which are being neglected in order to deepen the reflective task which might shift the response to Lonergan's achievements to a more cumulative and progressive form.

In the spirit of writing history "better than it was"<sup>29</sup> I add the following. What has been achieved over the past 6 decades? Those, who have found a home in Lonergan's achievements,

---

<sup>29</sup> I add this phrase borrowed from Philip McShane as what I am slowly coming to appreciate as a central factor in performing functional history. If functional history is to contribute to the cumulative and progressive results of functional specialization, new questions need to emerge

have become aware that a solution to the fragmentation of the Axial Period is possible, one that is beyond the use of force, beyond classical religious ineffectiveness, and beyond mythic and fragmented consciousness. That awareness I also hope will move us eventually to appreciate the need for scientific enquiry and a method to implement that horizon. As we look back over the past six decades of follow up to Lonergan's achievements in economics, in resolving the philosophical problems of the sciences and his crowning achievement, functional specialization, have we implemented, even in embryonic form, any seeds of his achievements?

Interest is a form of unformulated curiosity and the drive to understand theoretically can transform that curiosity into a systematic explanatory account that eventually can lead to implementation. How can scholarship *harness an interest* into ourselves or into Lonergan's work? How can our achievements, as inadequate as they may be, be passed on to the next generation as more than just interest? In the next seminar on functional dialectics I take up an analysis of comparison as it has occurred in Lonergan scholarship in an effort to explore its contribution to implementation and its role and function in functional specialization.

---

out of the present context and it is reflection on that context that makes this possible. New questions are the forward lean.

**APPENDIX A** Classification of Articles in **Method & Workshop** Volumes<sup>30</sup>

**Loneragan Workshop Volumes** for a listing of article titles see

<http://bcloneragan.org/publications/loneragan-workshop-journal/back-issues/>

**Articles Comparing/Contrasting Lonergan's Thought: 28**

**Articles Explaining/Applying aspects of Lonergan's Thought: 144**

**Other Directed/Unrelated: 8**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Philosophical Articles: 92**

**Theological Articles: 75      Ethics: 10**

**Science: 2      Economics: 2      Political Science: 2**

**METHOD: Journal of Lonergan Studies** for a listing of article titles see

<http://bcloneragan.org/publications/method-journal-of-loneragan-studies/back-issues/>

**Articles Comparing/Contrasting Lonergan's Thought: 36**

**Articles Explaining/Applying aspects of Lonergan's Thought: 128**

**Other Directed/Unrelated: 2**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Philosophical Articles: 131**

---

<sup>30</sup> Classification of these articles was arrived at for the most by a review of titles and authors. A full reading of all 346 articles by researchers competent in many fields and working in collaboration would obviously shift the numbers. Many of what I have denoted as theological would be in the category of philosophical theology or method in theology. I have in my possession early editions of both journals and drew on the listings on the Boston website for the complete title listing.

**Theological Articles: 25**

**Ethics: 2**

**Science: 1**

**Political Science: 2**

**Economics: 3**

**Law: 2**

**APPENDIX B Table of Contents to *Spirit as Inquiry*<sup>31</sup>**

*Introduction*

*In Appreciation*

8 - Walter Burghardt, SJ / *From a Theologian*

11- Frederick C. Copleston, SJ / *From a Historian of Philosophy*

13 – R. Eric O’Connor, SJ / *From a Mathematician*

16 – Frederick E. Crowe, SJ / *The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan’s Intellectualism*

34 – Patrick Heelan, SJ / *A Realist Theory of Physical Science*

43 – Edward M. MacKinnon, SJ / *Cognitive Analysis and the Philosophy of Science*

69 – Ernan McMullin / *Insight and the Meno*

74 – Philip McShane, SJ / *Insight and the Strategy of Biology*

89 – Michael Novak / *Lonergan’s Starting Place: The Performance of asking Questions*

102 – Joseph Thomas Clark, SJ / *“The Form of Inference” – Revisited*

109 – William A. Stewart, SJ / *Abstraction: Conscious or Unconscious?*

120 – Dom Sebastian Moore / *The Discovery of Metaphysics- One Man’s War*

125 – Jean Langlois, SJ / *The Notion of Being According to Lonergan*

134 – David Burrell, CSC / *Analogy and Judgment*

---

<sup>31</sup> It is worth noting in this text that only one of the titles implies comparison. (Ernan McMullin-p. 69) This practice of comparison seemed to appear more often during and after the Florida Lonergan Congress. The second volume of the Florida papers contained 7 out of 11 articles that were comparison in nature. Was comparing easier than explaining or expanding into the sciences? Were Lonergan scholars aware of their procedure? If not, why?

147 – Emerich Coreth, SJ / *Dialectic of Performance and Concept*

155 – Andrew J. Reck / *Interpretation*

164 – Justus George Lawler / *The Poem as Question*

171 – Paul Vanier, SJ / *Towards an Effective Philosophy of Education*

180 – Henri Niel, SJ / *The Old and New in Theology*

189 – P. Joseph Cahill, SJ / *A Primary Affirmation*

197 – Michael J. Lapierre, SJ / *Redemption in the Understanding of Faith*

205 – Robert L. Richard, SJ / *Contribution to a Theory of Doctrinal Development*

*A Concluding Word*

230 – Bernard Lonergan, SJ / *Cognitive Structure*

*Bibliography*

*Contributors*

## **APPENDIX C** Table of Contents to **Language, Truth and Meaning**

*Introduction*

Philip McShane

*The Intention of Truth in Mythic Consciousness*

Garrett Barden

*Immediacy and the Mediation of Being: An attempt to answer Bernard Lonergan*

E. Coreth

*Knowing and Language in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan*

Joseph Flanagan

*Lonergan and Dewey on Judgement*

Robert O. Johann

*The Logic of Framework Transpositions*

Patrick Heelan

*Wilhelm Dilthey's Critique of Historical Reason and Bernard Lonergan's Meta-methodology*

Matthew Lamb

*Self-knowledge in History in Gadamer and Lonergan*

Fred Lawrence

*Lonergan and the Subjectivist Principle*

Schubert M. Ogden

*From Problematics to Hermeneutics: Lonergan and Ricoeur*

David M. Rasmussen

*Being for Lonergan: A Heideggerian View*

William J. Richardson

*The New Context of the Philosophy of God in Lonergan and Rahner*

Bernard Tyrrell

*Bernard Lonergan Responds*

*Notes*