

Envisioning a Systematic Theology¹

© Copyright 2009 by Robert M. Doran

In this paper I propose to do three things. First, I will present a vision for a contemporary systematic theology based in Lonergan's methodological and theological contributions and in my own previous work. Second, I will indicate something of the tentative beginnings of such a theology, by speaking briefly of a work that is in progress. And finally, I will call for, invite, a wider collaboration in the task of constructing a viable contemporary systematics, and in the context of that invitation will speak a bit about how I think such collaboration can take place in our time.

1 A Vision

Systematic theology, or systematics, is one of eight functional specialties within theology. Its determinate relations to the other seven functional specialties – research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, and communications – have begun to be specified by Bernard Lonergan in his *Method in Theology*, though I'm sure Lonergan would be the first to admit that his work on method, however brilliant the basic insight into functional specialization may be and however long it took him to reach those insights (most of a lifetime, it appears), is still sketchy and incomplete. The overall task of systematics is to offer a coherent understanding of the realities named in the constitutive meaning of the community that gathers in the name of Christ Jesus, the community that we call the Church, and to do so on the level of our time, and so in a dialogue of mutual self-mediation with contemporary natural and human science, historical scholarship, philosophy, and extra-ecclesial communities of persons of good

¹ This paper was presented at the West Coast Methods Institute, Loyola Marymount University, in April 2007. I had come down with a case of laryngitis, and so John Dadosky read the paper for me.

will, and with constant attentiveness to the major issues affecting humankind: war and peace, environmental devastation, interreligious conflict and dialogue, the ethical complications brought on by emerging scientific insight, and so on. In all of this, the principal function of systematics, as Lonergan insisted in all of his methodological writings on the question, is to provide an imperfect, analogical, and fruitful understanding of the mysteries of Christian faith. This understanding of the mysteries evolves over the course of the centuries, primarily through the mutual self-mediation of the community of the Church and other contemporary developments, and at any given time in the history of theology a systematic theology will articulate as best it can a synthetic understanding of the realities that constitute the contemporary dogmatic-theological context.

First, then, something should be said about this dogmatic-theological context. In Lonergan's view, basic doctrinal parameters within which further development is possible are firmly established in only some of the areas of the Church's constitutive meaning: namely, with regard to Trinitarian and Christological doctrine and with regard to the doctrine of grace; but there are other areas that call for development even with respect to basic doctrinal commitments; in one discussion session at the 1962 Institute on 'The Method of Theology,' Lonergan singled out Church and sacraments as areas calling for such doctrinal determination, but, it seems to me, we may add such theological elements as revelation, creation, redemption, and eschatology; and even within Christology, there is a great deal of work to be done on the historical causality of Jesus. It is not the case, of course, that there are no doctrines, both ecclesial and theological, to be submitted to systematic understanding in the latter areas. It is rather the case that in these areas there has not yet occurred in the doctrinal history of the Church as clear a demarcation within which further development may unfold as that which marks the Church's doctrinal commitments regarding the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the

indwelling of the Holy Spirit in grace.² There is for Lonergan, then, as for myself, something about the doctrinal commitments that the Church has already taken in these latter areas that clearly sets parameters within which further development, both doctrinal and systematic, may legitimately occur, and outside of which what might pass for development is really deformation. As John Courtney Murray is reported to have said with respect to the conciliar dogmas regarding Trinitarian and Christological matters, ‘Having come this far, we cannot but come this far before we move on.’ A similar statement with respect to the other issues that I have mentioned can of course be made, but it would lack the fullness or ‘thickness’ of meaning that attaches to the Church’s Christological and Trinitarian commitments and to the doctrinal developments that have occurred with respect to the outpouring of God’s grace in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, some of the mysteries of faith have been formulated in dogmatic pronouncements, and I agree with Lonergan that systematics must for the most part begin here. In this respect, even ecclesiological and sacramental dogmas have been formulated; we may point readily to the dogma of infallibility and the mystery of transubstantiation. But it must be added that at least two of the mysteries of faith that have been included from the beginning in creedal affirmations have not been dogmatically formulated, namely, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead and the redemption wrought through the

2 ‘The degree of thematization differs in different cases. The fundamental developments are the Trinitarian doctrine in which the key element is the consubstantial; Christological doctrine: one person and two natures; the idea of the supernatural habit and act. There is then the field in which the categories are not yet fully developed. For example, categories as to the instrumental causality of the sacraments; they have to be developed more fully. There is also everything regarding history and the mystical body, and the Church; all these need further development.’ Quotation taken from question session 4 of the 1962 Regis College Institute, ‘The Method of Theology.’

cross and resurrection of Jesus, and that these are of a standing in the Church's constitutive meaning equal to that of the dogmatic pronouncements. Thus they must be included along with the dogmas among the primary focal meanings of any systematic theology that would attempt a synthetic understanding of the realities that are central to the constitutive meaning of our faith community.

If we consider the areas that need even doctrinal development, I think we may find the solution to the problem of how to move systematic theology forward in our time. And I think there is evidence in Lonergan's own notes written at the time of his breakthrough to functional specialization that he espoused a similar solution. The issues in the areas of ecclesiology, sacramental theology, soteriology, revelation, creation, and an eschatology built on the creedal affirmation of the resurrection of Jesus all have to do with history. And in the notes that he wrote in 1965 as he was working out the significance of his insight into functional specialization, Lonergan assigned as the mediated object of the functional specialty 'Doctrines' what he called 'redemption in history,' and as the mediated object of the functional specialty 'Systematics' *Geschichte*. In other words, the doctrines, ecclesial and theological, that the theologian working in the functional specialty 'Doctrines' affirms are not an unorganized list of affirmations but are already organized into some kind of integrated pattern governed by a doctrinal commitment that affirms that God works redemptively in human history. And the attempt to understand these doctrines will take the form of a theological theory of history, of *Geschichte*, of the history that is lived and written about, that history that throughout his career Lonergan understood in terms of the three approximations of progress, decline, and redemption. In order to elevate ecclesiology, sacramental theology, soteriology, the theology of revelation, the theology of creation, and an eschatology based in the resurrection of Jesus to a status in the contemporary dogmatic-theological context that matches that accorded to the doctrines of Trinity, Incarnation, and grace, there is required a development in theology of a position on the immanent intelligibility of human history.

It is for this reason that I would suggest that the overall title of a contemporary systematics might be something like *The Law of the Cross: A Systematic Theology*. An interpretation of Lonergan's thesis on the law of the cross, one that emphasizes the historical causality of the paschal mystery and of the gift of God's grace, would be presented very early on in the work, and would govern all that follows. It is also for this reason that I labored throughout the 1980s to develop further the set of general categories through which the structure of history may be understood, filling out, I hope, Lonergan's heuristic of history through a position on the normative scale of values and on the dialectical structure of personal, cultural, and social values.

There are actually two requirements, though, that a contemporary systematic theology must satisfy. One is the demand that I have just specified, namely, that such a theology would take the form of a theological theory of history. The other is that the categories employed in such a theology must either name elements in conscious intentional operations and states or be derived from interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness. The basic statement in regard to this second requirement is found on page 343 of *Method in Theology*: 'general basic terms name conscious and intentional operations. General basic relations name elements in the dynamic structure linking operations and generating states. Special basic terms name God's gift of his love and Christian witness. Derived terms and relations name the objects known in operations and correlative to states.' Thus *basic* terms and relations, whether general or special, can be identified in consciousness, and *derived* terms and relations, whether general or special, can be validated by naming the operations in which the objects intended are known or the states to which these objects are correlative. Metaphysical elements, for example, are derived, not basic, and their validation will occur insofar as one is able to specify the operation in which they are known. For example, the *esse secundarium* of the incarnation, which as we will see in a moment is a principal metaphysical element in the

basic four-point hypothesis with which I would propose beginning a systematics, is validated by pointing to the judgment in which we affirm that something

(1) in the substantial order but

(2) that does not replace the divine act of existence of the Word

is required if the incarnate Word is to be a full human being. That ‘something’ is what has been called the *esse secundarium incarnationis*. Another example can be found in the hypothesis in my *Theology and the Dialectics of History* regarding the scale of values and the relations among the various levels of the scale. It is proposed there that the scale of values – from below: vital, social, cultural, personal, religious – is isomorphic with the structure of intentional consciousness and thus that the relations, from below and from above, among the levels of value will be isomorphic with the relations, from below and from above, among the levels of intentional consciousness. To repeat, the *basic* terms and relations are located in conscious acts and states themselves: intentional operations and the dynamic elements relating the operations to one another and generating states yield general basic terms and relations, and God’s gift of love yields special basic terms.

Derived terms and relations are validated by indicating the operations in which the objects that they name are known or the states to which these objects are correlative or proportionate, whether those states and that proportion be natural or the effect of grace.

I just mentioned a basic four-point hypothesis, and perhaps I can introduce what I am talking about by noting a peculiar feature of the quotation that I have just cited from *Method in Theology*: there is no mention of ‘special basic relations.’ This core methodological statement from *Method in Theology* specifying the character of basic and derived terms and relations tells us what would be general basic terms, general basic relations, and special basic terms, and then proceeds to discuss derived terms and relations, both general and special. The reader is left to wonder, What, if anything, constitute special basic relations? I suggest that we can answer that question by pointing to some of the elements of a four-point hypothesis that Lonergan presented at the end of

his mammoth systematic treatise on the Trinity, and also that doing so will enable us to suggest a development upon the traditional psychological analogy for understanding the Trinitarian processions.

The hypothesis is found in the chapter on the divine missions in volume 12 of Lonergan's Collected Works, *The Triune God: Systematics*. The hypothesis relates four created supernatural realities, respectively, to the four divine relations. Each of the created *entia supernaturalia* is a participation in, and imitation of, one of the divine relations. Given that the divine missions are identical with the divine processions joined to a created contingent term that is a consequent condition of the mission, the interrelation of the created terms allows us to understand what we may call 'The Trinity in History,' which is precisely what I hope to entitle the first volume of the systematic theology whose overall title is *The Law of the Cross*.

According to the hypothesis,

(1) the *esse secundarium* of the assumed humanity of Jesus, proposed in a Thomist hypothesis which enables us to understand how the divine Word incarnate is also a complete human being, participates in and imitates divine paternity;

(2) sanctifying grace, later identified by Lonergan with a dynamic state of being in love without qualifications, conditions, restrictions, or reservations, participates in and imitates divine active spiration;

(3) the habit of charity that is the first and basic consequence of sanctifying grace participates in and imitates divine passive spiration; and

(4) the light of glory participates in and imitates divine filiation.

In perhaps more accessible terms,

(1) in the Godhead the Word does not speak but is spoken; the incarnate Word speaks, but only what he hears from the Father; thus the secondary act of existence that makes the incarnate Word a complete human being is a created participation in and imitation of the Father, of divine paternity;

(2) the dynamic state of being in love without restrictions is a created participation in and imitation of the Father and the Son as together they ‘spirate’ the Holy Spirit;

(3) the habit of charity is a created participation in and imitation of the proceeding Love spirated by the Father and the Son; and

(4) the light of glory is a created participation in and imitation of the divine Son as he brings the children of adoption back to the Father.

In terms of the methodological prescription found on page 343 of *Method in Theology*, the *esse secundarium* and the light of glory are both derived terms, but the created participations in, and imitations of, divine active and passive spiration, which are metaphysically identified as sanctifying grace and the habit of charity, can be articulated in terms of religiously differentiated consciousness, in which case this articulation would make of them special basic terms; and the relations between sanctifying grace and the habit of charity will give us, I propose, ‘special basic relations,’ just as the relation between active and passive spiration is in effect constitutive of the divine Trinitarian relations in their entirety. I have proposed in recent articles and lectures that a new psychological analogy for the Trinitarian processions may be found in the relations between sanctifying grace and the habit of charity when these are articulated in terms of religiously differentiated consciousness, that is, as ‘being in love in an unrestricted fashion’ and the acts of love that proceed from that gifted state and that coalesce into an ever firmer disposition or orientation of converted, self-transcendent living.³

I could say much more about the general character of what I would view as a relatively satisfactory effort in systematics in our time, but I must limit myself to one

³ 2009: This analogy has taken firmer articulation since this paper was presented. The starting point lies in consciously being on the end of unconditional love. From this there flows a set of judgments of value constitutive of a universalist faith. From these two together there flows the being in love that is charity. This analogy may be found in a number of documents on this website.

further item and then pass on to other matters. The rest of my prescriptions can be found in my recent book *What Is Systematic Theology?*⁴

The one further item that I would like to highlight has to do with what I call the genetic sequence of systematic theologies, and with how the theology that I envision would embody what I mean by genetic development over the centuries.

To cut to the chase, respecting the limits of this relatively short paper, precisely because of the Trinitarian theologies of Aquinas and the early Lonergan, theologies that begin with the processions, move to the relations, progress to the persons, and end with the missions, we are now able to come full circle, I believe, and begin a systematics of the Trinity somewhere else: namely, with a synthetic position that treats together both the divine processions and the divine missions. For the missions are the processions in history. The ‘somewhere else’ where we begin does not depart from the starting point found in Aquinas and the early Lonergan, but sublates it into a more comprehensive dogmatic-theological context that has emerged partly as a result of their work, and especially of Lonergan’s work. The four-point hypothesis itself is part of what I am proposing as a starting point, not part of a conclusion, as it is in Lonergan’s systematics of the Trinity. And it aims at an obscure understanding not only of the divine processions but also of the divine missions and of the created consequent conditions of the missions precisely as these provide a new set of analogues from which we can gain an obscure understanding of the divine processions and relations, and as these constitute the realm of religious values that my earlier work on the scale of values relates to the dialectical structure of history through the other levels of value: personal, cultural, social, and vital. Theology is an ongoing enterprise, and what was not possible for Aquinas, simply because of the historical limitations of the dogmatic-theological context of his time, and what Lonergan arrived at toward the end of his systematics of the Trinity, may well be

4 Robert M. Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

the starting point for another generation, precisely because of Aquinas's own gains in understanding and Lonergan's firmer rooting of these gains in interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness. Just as the way of discovery in Trinitarian theology through the early centuries of the Christian church ended with Augustine's psychological analogy, which then became the starting point of the way of teaching and learning, so Lonergan's particular embodiment of the way of teaching and learning ended with the four-point hypothesis, which now informs the starting point of a new venture along the same kind of path, the *ordo doctrinae*. If we are beginning a systematics in its entirety where Lonergan ended his systematics of the Trinity, it is only on the basis of the development found in his own Trinitarian theology that we are able to do so. He began with the processions. We begin with the processions and missions together, affirming with Lonergan's assistance that they are the same reality, except that the mission adds a created contingent external term that is the consequent condition of the procession being also a mission.

In other words, the basic hypotheses that will have a profound effect on the remainder of the systematic theology that I am envisioning are more complex than those found at the beginning of Aquinas's or Lonergan's Trinitarian systematics. That greater complexity is a function of a theological history decisively influenced by Aquinas and Lonergan. This history now permits us, from the very beginning, to add to the natural analogies employed in understanding the divine processions and relations the graced participations in those relations, and so to begin a Trinitarian systematics with the processions and missions as one piece. These graced participations constitute the realm of religious values in the theory of history constituted internally by a normative scale of values. That theory of history displays the historical significance and influence of these participations in and imitations of the divine relations. From above, grace conditions personal integrity and authenticity, which itself is the condition of possibility of genuine and developing cultural values. The latter, in turn, influence the formation of integrally dialectical communities at the level of social values, and only such communities

functioning in recurrent schemes of a good of order guarantee the equitable distribution of vital goods to the entire community. The resultant of such an analysis will be a doctrine of social grace. As recent theology has enlightened us about social sin, so now it is time to propose a theology of social grace. I am suggesting a way of going about that task, a way that also connects with Lonergan's redefinition of 'the state of grace.' For Lonergan the state of grace is not an individual but a social reality. It is the divine-human interpersonal situation that resides in the three divine subjects giving themselves to us. That gift itself, Lonergan writes, while 'intensely personal, utterly intimate,' still 'is not so private as to be solitary. It can happen to many, and they can form a community to sustain one another in their self-transformation and to help one another in working out the implications and fulfilling the promises of their new life. Finally, what can become communal can become historical. It can pass from generation to generation. It can spread from one cultural milieu to another. It can adapt to changing circumstances, confront new situations, survive into a different age, flourish in another period or epoch.'⁵

2 A Report

The first volume of the systematic theology that I am envisioning has been begun, and I have entitled it *The Trinity in History*. In some ways it is the most important volume in the enterprise, since it will articulate precisely the basic terms and relations, both general and special, that will govern the entire work.

In this volume I propose to set forth what I would call the 'unified field structure' of a contemporary systematic theology. That unified field structure is an open set of conceptions that embraces the field of issues presently to be accounted for and presently foreseeable in systematic theology. For an elaboration of the unified field structure, I turn

⁵ Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003) 130-31.

to two developments: first, to Lonergan's four-point hypothesis, already mentioned, and second, to the theory of history to be found in Lonergan's own work and in my book *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. The four-point hypothesis provides the basic *special* basic terms and relations; the *Grund und Gesamtwissenschaft* of intentionality analysis that grounds the theory of history provides the *general* basic terms and relations; and the theory of history itself provides the first set of derived general terms and relations. Also included, however, in the unified field structure will be a set of derived special terms and relations, and these will be constituted by a position on the constituents of what the New Testament calls the reign of God. Necessarily included in this first volume, then, will be a section that embraces the work that I have found most helpful from a methodological point of view regarding the public ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus as these are narrated in the New Testament: the work in particular of Ben Meyer, N.T. Wright, and Raymund Schwager. Also included will be a position on the significance of the mimetic theory of René Girard for understanding precisely what is meant by the reign of God and what is meant by its opposite. All of this work will culminate in a position based on interpreting Lonergan's thesis on the law of the cross and a Christological reading of the mind of Jesus aided in great part by two recent papers by Charles Hefling, one on the consciousness and knowledge of Jesus and the other on Jesus as the locus of divine revelation.

As I write this report, four chapters of this first volume are completed in at least draft form.⁶ Chapter 1 is entitled 'The Starting Point,' chapter 2 'Initial Issues,' chapter 3 'Mimesis,' and chapter 4 'Sacralization and Desacralization.' Chapter 1, I think and hope, is finished, but the other three still need some work.

Chapter 1, 'The Starting Point,' consists of the article that I published in *Theological Studies* in December 2006, 'The Starting Point of Systematic Theology,'

⁶ 2009: The structure of these chapters has been somewhat altered since I wrote and presented this paper.

supplemented by material contained in a lecture that I delivered at Marquette University in October 2006 entitled ‘Being in Love with God: A Source of Analogies for Theological Understanding.’⁷ In this chapter, I present Lonergan’s four-point hypothesis and indicate the need to link it with a theological theory of history. I also suggest that the hypothesis provides us with a new form of the psychological analogy for understanding the divine processions, an analogy from within the order of graced experience itself. And I propose that systematic theology itself has evolved to the point where it can begin with a position that integrates the divine processions with the divine missions from the outset of the systematic enterprise.

Chapter 2, ‘Initial Issues,’ takes up the problems caused by linking the processions with the missions from the outset of the systematics, as happens if the four-point hypothesis is taken as part of the starting point. It then introduces the notion of ‘autonomous spiritual processions’ as a way of understanding what is meant by *emanatio intelligibilis*, the key notion that must be grasped if any psychological analogy, including that proposed here, is to be understood. The contemporary significance of *emanatio intelligibilis* is discussed in two sections. The first relates the notion to language and its relation to understanding, and at this point I rehearse a position that I developed earlier in my article ‘Reception and Elemental Meaning.’ But to speak of *autonomous* spiritual processions raises issues in the mimetic theory of René Girard that must be addressed head-on at this point. It is in terms of the resolution of these issues that the ‘imitation of the divine relations’ of which the four-point hypothesis speaks can be rendered extremely fruitful, I believe.

Chapter 3, ‘Mimesis,’ thus attempts to sublimate Girard’s mimetic theory into interiority analysis by relating it to my understanding of psychic conversion, and then to

⁷ The latter article was published in *Irish Theological Quarterly* in 2008: ‘Being in Love with God: A Source of Analogies for Theological Understanding,’ *Irish Theological Quarterly* 73 (2008) 227-42

draw on Girard for some basic clarifications that will influence the remainder of the systematic theology that I am attempting to elaborate. And chapter 4 goes on from this sublation to identify the locus of the genuine sacred in history as well as the sources of misplaced or deviated transcendence. It is at this point that I will be prepared to turn to Meyer, Wright, and Schwager for help in unfolding the biblical notion of the reign of God and, drawing on this work, to proceed to establish the law of the cross as the basic law of Christian existence in history. Then I will return to the four-point hypothesis, understand the law of the cross in the Trinitarian categories that the hypothesis renders possible, and establish these categories as the categories that fill out the heuristic notion of ‘religious values’ in Lonergan’s statement of the scale of values. I will review my own position on the scale of values and on the relation of religious values to the other levels of value, thus relating the four-point hypothesis to the general structure of history and providing what I would regard as an adequate unified field structure for a contemporary systematic theology whose mediated object is *Geschichte*, a systematics that attempts to understand Christian doctrines that have already been organized around the theme of ‘redemption in history.’

3 An Appeal

I am convinced that today no single individual can write a systematic theology. The work must be that of a community, and I would like to close this presentation by appealing for the assembly of a community that would continue this work, refine it, correct it where needed, and move it forward. And I wish to suggest a way in which that could be done, by and large, on an ongoing basis from the comfort of our own homes and offices.

Over the greater part of the last decade of his life, Bernard Lonergan envisioned establishing what he called the ‘Institute for Method in Theology.’ The purpose of the Institute would be

- to develop and implement the generalized empirical method whose ‘basic terms and relations’ he had presented in his books *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* and *Method in Theology*,
- to bring that work into dialogue with other movements in the Church and the academy, and
- to promote the collaborative creativity that his method would foster and facilitate.

When in 1984 I first proposed the idea of what became the Lonergan Research Institute to Fr William Addley, S.J., Provincial of the Upper Canada Province of the Society of Jesus, these purposes were uppermost in my mind. And during my five years as Director of the LRI (2001-2006) I managed to articulate a broadly accepted mission for the Institute: to preserve, promote, develop, and implement the work of Bernard Lonergan.

Still, it was clear before long that, prior to developing and implementing, the Institute had to guarantee the preservation of that work, through the publication of Lonergan’s Collected Works, the digital preservation of his recorded word, and the archival preservation of his papers. In fact, these tasks consumed the resources of the Lonergan Research Institute through the first twenty years of its existence, and, if the LRI survives, these tasks will continue to consume its resources, thus leaving the work of development and implementation to other groups and individuals.⁸

It is now time, I think, to plan for realizing Lonergan’s dream. Because of his insistence, though, on the crucial relation of theology with other disciplines, his concern was not limited to theology narrowly conceived. The books that he started to collect for his prospective Institute included a number of volumes in the human sciences and

⁸ 2009: In actual fact, the Marquette Lonergan Project, established after I presented this paper, is assisting in the tasks of preserving and promoting (www.bernardlonergan.com), as well as launching a new website for developing and implementing (www.lonerganresource.com).

philosophy. For this reason, I propose some such name as ‘Institute for Interdisciplinary Method.’

The digital age rather completely changes the nature of such an enterprise and greatly facilitates it. By and large, we can begin not by establishing another major Center in some one geographical space housing its own separate library, but by networking the various Lonergan Centers and projects around the world into a better organized collaboration, pooling intellectual resources, and perhaps eventually establishing policies and plans that exceed the limited missions of the individual Centers. Thus, rather than establishing one geographical Center, we can focus on a formalized networking, a planned coordination of collaborative projects, and an electronic linking of both written documents and recorded lectures, conferences, and workshops. The Institute would exist primarily in cyberspace, not in a building.

Still, one small center (small “c”) to coordinate efforts and serve as a clearinghouse is probably required. I’m exploring several possibilities along these lines, but the principal point that I want to make in the present context is that I would currently identify three major ongoing projects that the Institute might think of coordinating: the collaborative construction of a contemporary Catholic systematic theology, the development of Lonergan’s macroeconomic theory, and the work of interreligious understanding and dialogue. It is, of course, the first of these that is most relevant to the issues discussed in the present paper, though the other two are not unrelated. I would welcome ideas on how we might put together such a cyberspace Institute, and on what other functions the Institute might perform. By no means need the projects of the Institute be limited to those that I have mentioned. This is one of the positive advantages of working primarily in cyberspace. Room for initiative is nearly unlimited, and it is perhaps time for us as a community devoted to developing and implementing Lonergan’s work to join in a collaborative employment of the means that contemporary technology has placed at our disposal, precisely in order to pursue those goals.