

LOVE AND LONERGAN'S COGNITIONAL-INTENTIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY:
AN INQUIRY ON THE QUESTION OF A
"FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS"

by

Jeremy W. Blackwood, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2012

ABSTRACT
LOVE AND LONERGAN'S COGNITIONAL-INTENTIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY:
AN INQUIRY ON THE QUESTION OF A
"FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS"

Jeremy W. Blackwood, B.A., M.A.

Marquette University, 2012

This dissertation addresses a controversial question among those who study the work of Bernard J.F. Lonergan, SJ (1904–1984): To what extent and with what intent did Lonergan affirm a fifth level of consciousness? He used the spatial image of “levels of consciousness” to express the relations among key operations of the conscious human subject, and the image remains common currency for those familiar with his work. However, the precise number of levels shifted and developed throughout Lonergan’s career, beginning with three, moving to four, and finally including some mention of a fifth. As the level of love, this fifth level would seem to play a central role in theology, but if one affirms both the theological centrality of love and the importance of Lonergan’s analysis of human subjectivity, then the lack of a full, systematic presentation of the fifth level of human subjectivity hampers the development of systematic theology. Lonergan’s own comments on the topic did not give that full understanding, as evidenced by the controversy among Lonergan scholars, and there is a demand for a sustained effort to understand and evaluate Lonergan’s understanding of the relation of the fifth level of love to human subjectivity.

The first half of this study examines Lonergan’s own work on the matter. In a chronological arrangement, Chapters One, Two, and Three engage both published and unpublished primary materials in which Lonergan developed his thought on love and its relation to intentional consciousness. The second half of this study moves beyond Lonergan’s contribution and into the contemporary controversy. Chapter Four synthesizes Lonergan’s development. Chapter Five addresses and evaluates major works in the controversy in the light of Lonergan’s whole development on the matter. Chapter Six suggests an account of the fifth level of consciousness that brings to theology a systematic understanding of the relations between love and subjectivity. Ultimately, it is affirmed that human subjectivity is constituted, in part, by a fifth level of consciousness that is a realm of interpersonal relations, which, when fully authentic, is the subjective locus of self-transcending human subjects in community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jeremy W. Blackwood, B.A., M.A.

First, I want to acknowledge the man who is responsible for introducing me to the writings of Bernard Lonergan when I was an undergraduate: Michael P. Maxwell, Jr. Along with him, I must express my gratitude to my other undergraduate theology and philosophy professors, R. Michael Clark, David Denz, Andrew P. Hohman, Donna Proctor, and the late Denis Kelly.

Two longtime friends deserve mention for helping to shape my life for many years: Kevin Brydon and Stephen Storey. I would also like to thank many of the friends I've made at various points in my graduate studies, both here at Marquette and abroad: Maggie Bender, Maria Bengtson, Tom Cappelli, Anne Carpenter, Gregory Floyd, Joseph Gordon, Jonathan Heaps, David Horstkoetter, Nathan and Lisa Lunsford, Paul and Stephanie Monson, Nicholas Olkovich, Matthew Peters, Christopher and Laura Samuel, Matthew and Jennifer Sanders, Claudia and Samuel Satchell, Brian Sigmon, Eric and Ellen Vanden Eykel, Juliana Vazquez, John Volk, Mark Wilson, and Stephen Wolfe.

Various members of the Lonergan community have been influential for this work, from initial opportunities in the field to continued support and suggestions. I especially want to thank Patrick Byrne, Kerry Cronin, John Dadosky, Paul LaChance, Fred and Sue Lawrence, Mark Morelli, Neil Ormerod, Jean Soto, Michael Vertin, and Jeremy Wilkins. Greg Lauzon deserves a special note of thanks for his work on the Lonergan archives.

The Marquette University community has been helpful and supportive in many different ways. I would like to thank the librarians in the Research and Instructional Services division, especially Molly Larkin and Mary Frenn. I am also grateful to the

exceptional Marquette University Theology faculty, especially Deirdre Dempsey, Danielle Nussberger, and Andrei Orlov, for their encouragement and helpful suggestions either early on or more recently. A special note of thanks is owed to Robert Masson, who was a very supportive and encouraging advisor throughout my graduate studies. Likewise, a special note of gratitude must go to David M. Coffey, whose class was the occasion of my first graduate-level work with Lonergan.

Acknowledgements are certainly owed to the members of my dissertation committee, Ralph Del Colle, D. Stephen Long, and Susan Wood. They are also fine representatives of the exemplary faculty with whom I've been fortunate to spend my graduate studies these past eight years.

Robert M. Doran, my dissertation director, deserves more gratitude than I can express. He has freely offered guidance and encouragement since his arrival at Marquette University. His confidence in me was clear early in our relationship, and I am grateful to have worked so closely with and gotten to know a man whom many believe to be an outstanding example of what it means to be a theologian in a contemporary context.

I must also acknowledge my family. My mother, Deborah Marlott, worked hard to help a bright but difficult child become the best man he could. Her husband, Jeffrey Marlott, contributed greatly to my formation, as did my grandparents, Frank and Suzanne Williams. I could not have done this without such blessed beginnings.

Closer to home, the most important human presence in my life throughout this process was that of my wife, Rachel. Never have I received so much from someone who was so very different from me. Thanks to her, my marriage provided my most concrete

lesson in what it means to be part of an “us,” and her patience, humor, and love have humbled me during my studies.

Finally, prayerful gratitude must go to our Triune God, Father, Son, and Spirit. My faith in You I never stop seeking to understand, but Your mystery ever continues to amaze me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem in Lonergan	2
The Problem in Lonergan Scholarship	5
This Character of this Study	8
Outline.....	9
A Methodological Note.....	11
A Note about the Lonergan Workshop Question Sessions.....	12
A Note about Archival References	12
1. THE GENETIC FOUNDATIONS OF LONERGAN'S UNDERSTANDING OF LOVE: 1943–1964.....	13
1.1. 1943.....	14
1.1.1. “The Concept of Love”.....	14
1.1.2. “The Primary Reason and Cause of Marriage”.....	17
1.1.3. Summary.....	19
1.2. 1946–1949.....	20
1.3. 1951–52.....	22
1.4. 1957.....	25
1.4.1. The Social Situation of Individual Subjectivity.....	25
1.4.2. The Analysis of Intentional Consciousness and the Intimations of a New Level.....	26
1.4.3. Theology and Discussions of Higher Levels	28
1.4.4. Summary	31
1.5. 1958.....	31
1.6. 1959.....	36

1.7. 1962 and 1963.....	38
1.7.1. “Time and Meaning”.....	38
1.7.2. “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer”.....	39
1.7.3. “The Analogy of Meaning”.....	42
1.8. 1964.....	44
1.8.1. “ <i>Existenz and Aggiornamento</i> ”.....	44
1.8.2. “Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing”.....	46
1.8.3. <i>De Deo Trino: Pars systematica</i>	49
1.8.3.1. The Presence of the Beloved in the Lover.....	49
1.8.3.2. The Presence of the Divine Persons and the Just to One Another.....	52
1.9. Summary of Phase One: 1943–1964.....	54
2. DEVELOPING THE SHIFT TO INTERIORITY: 1965 TO NOVEMBER, 1972.....	57
2.1. 1965.....	58
2.2. 1968.....	59
2.2.1. “The Subject”.....	60
2.2.2. “Horizons”.....	61
2.2.3. “Natural Knowledge of God”.....	68
2.2.4. Seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion,” Boston College.....	70
2.2.5. “Theology and Man’s Future”.....	73
2.3. 1969.....	75
2.3.1. Method in Theology Seminar, Regis College.....	75
2.3.2. “Faith and Beliefs”.....	81
2.3.3. “The Future of Christianity”.....	85
2.5. 1971.....	94

2.6.2. Lectures Later in the Year.....	106
2.7. Summary of Phase Two: 1965–November, 1972.....	109
3. THE EMERGENCE AND CLARIFICATION OF THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS: DECEMBER, 1972, TO NOVEMBER, 1984	113
3.1. December, 1972.....	114
3.2. 1973.....	118
3.2.1. Interview for <i>Concern</i> Radio Show	119
3.2.2. The Larkin-Stuart Lectures, Trinity College, University of Toronto	121
3.3. 1974.....	124
3.3.1. Lonergan Workshop, Boston College.....	124
3.3.2. After the Workshop.....	131
3.4. 1975.....	134
3.4.1. Before the Workshop	134
3.4.2. Lonergan Workshop.....	137
3.5. 1976.....	139
3.5.1. Before the Workshop	140
3.5.2. Lonergan Workshop.....	141
3.5.3. After the Workshop.....	142
3.6. 1977.....	143
3.6.1. Before the Workshop	144
3.6.2. Lonergan Workshop.....	145
3.7. 1978.....	147
3.7.1. Before the Workshop	148
3.7.2. Lonergan Workshop.....	150
3.8. 1979.....	153

3.9. 1980.....	154
3.10. 1981.....	156
3.11. 1982.....	159
3.12. Conclusion	163
4. “WHAT WAS GOING FORWARD” IN LONERGAN’S DEVELOPMENT ON LOVE: A HISTORY OF LONERGAN’S DEVELOPMENT	165
4.1. Four Threads in the Development.....	167
4.1.1. The Potency of Individual Subjectivity for Disproportionate Actuation.....	167
4.1.2. The Interpersonal Actuation of the Potency	171
4.1.3. The Concretely Historical Actuation of the Potency	174
4.1.4. The Actuation of the Potency As Changing the World of Human Meaning	178
4.1.5. Summary	181
4.2. A Historical Note on Development in Lonergan	182
4.3. The Key Insight.....	186
4.4. Conclusion: Two Key Questions	191
5. THE SCHOLARLY DISCUSSION ON LOVE AND THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN LONERGAN	195
5.1. The Initial Discussion	195
5.1.1. Robert M. Doran I.....	196
5.1.2. Michael Vertin	199
5.1.3. Patrick Byrne	205
5.1.4. Tad Dunne.....	210
5.1.5. Robert M. Doran II	216
5.2. The Second Discussion	222
5.2.1. Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer.....	222

5.2.2. Jeremy W. Blackwood	225
5.2.3. Robert M. Doran III	229
5.3. The Scholarly Discussion in Light of Lonergan’s Development.....	234
6. LOVE AS A FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS	239
6.1. Problems from Lonergan and the Secondary Conversation	239
6.1.1. A Fifth Level “of Consciousness” as (not?) a priori.....	240
6.1.2. The Fifth Level of Consciousness in Both Supernatural and Natural Terms	245
6.1.3. Ontology, Relationality, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness ...	246
6.1.4. The Fifth Level and the Cosmos.....	247
6.2. Addressing the Problems	248
6.2.1. A priori and “of Consciousness”.....	248
6.2.2. Natural and Supernatural	251
6.2.3. Ontology and Relationality.....	252
6.2.4. The Fifth Level of Consciousness and the Cosmos	253
6.3. Evaluating Lonergan.....	253
6.4. A Systematic Statement.....	255
6.5. Concluding Statement.....	261
CONCLUSION.....	263
Potential for Future Applications and Dialogue	265
Final Statement	268
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	271

INTRODUCTION

Fr. Lonergan himself has begun to talk about the level of love as a fifth level distinct from the fourth. If he is serious about that, we must anticipate a further advance that will take us as far beyond *Method* as that book took us beyond *Insight*.

– Frederick E. Crowe, “An Exploration of Lonergan’s New Notion of Value”¹

Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J., (1904–1984) was a Canadian Jesuit philosopher and theologian who taught and wrote at, among other places, the Gregorian University in Rome, The College of the Immaculate Conception in Montreal, the Jesuit Seminary in Toronto, and Boston College and Harvard University in the United States. Although his name is well known in many theological circles, the substance of his work has not received the widespread attention of a Karl Rahner, an Henri De Lubac, or even a Stanley Hauerwas. Still, Lonergan has a devoted following among certain philosophers and theologians, who find in him convincing arguments about the necessity and possibility of carefully-wrought theological and philosophical positions grounded on accounts of human subjectivity and who make use of his own accounts to develop and deepen their own.

That group of thinkers, however, is not without its controversies, particularly when it comes to understanding Lonergan’s own positions on topics for which he gave no fully systematic account. This dissertation investigates one of those controversies, the

¹ Frederick E. Crowe, “An Exploration of Lonergan’s New Notion of Value,” in *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989), 57.

controversy over the so-called “fifth level of consciousness.” Discussion of the issue involved several scholars and has spanned nearly twenty years, and it was time for a focused, extended, and full account of Lonergan’s thought on the matter, reaching back to positions early in his career that developed into the concept of the fifth level of consciousness and extending up to the end of his career to determine, as clearly as possible, his final thoughts on the matter.

THE PROBLEM IN LONERGAN

Bernard Lonergan developed an analysis of human subjectivity for which he used the image of ‘levels of consciousness.’ The image developed and shifted, and the number of levels grew as he progressed through his career. Beginning with the affirmation of three levels, he moved to the affirmation of a fourth before suggesting that there could be further levels beyond that.

In his book *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*,² the analysis was cognitional. He examined the basic procedures of empirical science in order to discern the performative steps through which human beings go in their search for understanding. Grounded on this study, he emphasized the elements of the gathering of data, the act of grasping what can be understood in the data, and the act of determining the correctness of that grasp, thus producing the Experience—Understanding—Judgment triad for which Lonergan came to be known.

² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992). [The *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* will hereafter be abbreviated CWL.]

Even in *Insight*, Lonergan seemed to be heading toward a distinct and differentiated fourth level of moral evaluation. This issue gained focus in the fourteen years leading up to *Method in Theology*, and in that text there was a clear differentiation of a fourth level of moral deliberation above the three levels of cognitional process. This shifted the analysis from a purely cognitional one to a cognitional-*intentional* analysis that was oriented, not just to knowing, but to the whole range of human intentional operations. Each of the levels was understood as sublating those below it and as sublated by those above it, meaning that each of them was retained in its own integrity but was also drawn up into a larger horizon beyond that of which it was capable strictly on its own terms.³ First-level experiential operations are drawn up into a larger horizon of intelligibility at the second level, second-level operations of understanding are drawn up into a larger horizon of affirmed actuality at the third level, and third-level operations of affirmation are drawn up into a still larger horizon of moral deliberation and choice at the fourth level.

Lonergan's stress on the intentional aspects of consciousness was complemented during and after *Method in Theology* by a parallel stress on the affective side of consciousness. He began to affirm the important role of feeling, suggesting that additional levels of consciousness beyond the (now) basic four could be affirmed: a 'bottom' level consisting of the psychic negotiation of affect and images and a top-most level consisting of interpersonal commitment, community, and love.⁴ He also began to

³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Subject," in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 80

⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 400–402.

draw out the ramifications of intentionality's being accompanied by an affective or felt quality that changed not only between conscious operations, but also between different psychic and emotional states.

Unfortunately, this later work is increasingly scattered and unsystematic as its late date increases, with some of it found in published work but more explicit statements found in unpublished notes and in audio recordings of question-and-answer sessions at Lonergan Workshops and other materials. It is therefore very clear that Lonergan affirmed the basic four levels and had worked out their systematic integration, but it is far less clear in just what would consist the systematic integration of the later statements.

Besides the cognitional-intentional stress and the later affective emphases, there is also the further question of Lonergan's understanding of love. It plays a role in the later portions of *Insight* and it has a significant role throughout *Method in Theology*, but while many of Lonergan's post-*Method* writings refer to love and make use of it, he remains without a fully systematic account of love that would consistently relate it to his systematic interrelation of the levels and affectivity. Instead, his later writings tend to situate love with respect to whatever the top level was at that stage of his writing. Earlier, he refers to love as connected to the fourth level of moral deliberation, but he later connected it to the possible level above that of moral deliberation. The problem arises to the extent that he did not ever consistently articulate a final systematic understanding of the number of levels, and he therefore could not articulate a systematic account of love because it pertained to the topmost level and its systematic interrelation with the lower levels. This situation, then, gave rise to the problem to be investigated in this dissertation, which I have chosen to formulate in the following two questions: (1) Did Bernard

Lonergan understand love to be a sublating operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations? (2) Did Bernard Lonergan understand that sublating operator, operation, or set of operations to be conscious?

THE PROBLEM IN LONERGAN SCHOLARSHIP

The contemporary situation generates two further questions: (3) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to sublation? (4) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness? Those questions have been discussed in the secondary literature, but conversations about Lonergan's position and attempts to evaluate it have both been episodic. Various proposals have been put forward, with none seeming to garner wide support.

The initial focus on the fifth level as a problem came in Robert M. Doran's 1993 article, "Consciousness and Grace."⁵ Doran originally took the position that the fifth level was the key to the transposition of sanctifying grace from the context of a metaphysical theology into the context of a theology grounded on the categories derived from Lonergan's cognitional-intentional analysis.⁶ The first reply to Doran came from Michael Vertin, who, in his 1994 article "Lonergan on Consciousness: Is There a Fifth Level?" disagreed with Doran and offered a fundamental distinction between two meanings for

⁵ Robert M. Doran, "Consciousness and Grace," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11 (1993): 51-75. [*Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* will hereafter be abbreviated *MJLS*.]

⁶ On transposition as a project in Lonergan studies, see Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, "The Hermeneutics of Interiority: Transposition in the Third Stage of Meaning," in *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, SJ*, ed. John D. Dadosky, Marquette Studies in Theology 68, ed. Andrew Tallon (Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2009), 191–216.

the term ‘level’ in Lonergan.⁷ Vertin denied that there could be a fifth level in the “strict” sense of the term, but he held that it was possible to affirm five levels according to a “wide” sense of the term. In his 1995 article, “Consciousness: Levels, Sublations, and the Subject as Subject,”⁸ Patrick Byrne distinguished the subject’s operations from the underlying conscious self-presence of the subject. In the determination of the meaning of the term, ‘level,’ he emphasized the latter and thereby granted the possibility of a fifth level insofar as self-presence could be characterized by unrestricted being in love. Tad Dunne essentially agreed with Vertin in his own 1995 article, “Being in Love.”⁹ While he suggested that Lonergan did not intend to affirm a distinct fifth level of consciousness, as with Vertin, there was for Dunne a sense in which one could speak of a fifth level. For him, the fifth level “constitutes the subject as a term of an interpersonal relation, which the four lower levels do not,”¹⁰ and indeed, Lonergan “seems to recognize that our families, friends and communities exercise an enticement on consciousness that performs an operator function similar to the draw of God’s own self-communication in Word and Spirit.”¹¹ Doran replied to the conversation in a short article, “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace,’”¹² but the dialogue stalled and progress on the question essentially came to a halt.

⁷ Michael Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness: Is There a Fifth Level?” *MJLS* 12 (1994): 1–36.

⁸ Patrick H. Byrne, “Consciousness: Levels, Sublations, and the Subject as Subject,” *MJLS* 13 (1995): 131–150.

⁹ Tad Dunne, “Being in Love,” *MJLS* 13 (1995): 161–175.

¹⁰ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 164.

¹¹ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 165.

¹² Robert M. Doran, “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace,’” *MJLS* 13 (1995): 151–159.

The conversation was resurrected in 2007 with Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer's article, "Sanctifying Grace in a 'Methodical Theology.'"¹³ He noted that because sanctifying grace is an entitative habit, we cannot suggest a level as a transposition for sanctifying grace. Rather, sanctifying grace refers to an elevating change in the whole self, not any single part of the self. My own initial contribution to the issue drew heavily on Jacobs-Vandegeer's work. In a two-part paper presented at the West Coast Methods Institute in Los Angeles in April, 2009,¹⁴ I suggested that 1) if Jacobs-Vandegeer is correct, we need a fuller systematic account of 'elevation' in a Lonergan-informed horizon, and 2) if it is the whole self that is so elevated, we need a fuller systematic account of the number of levels in human cognitional-intentional operation. The first part of the paper offered a systematic account of elevation in a Lonergan-informed horizon by suggesting that an elevated act is an act the contents of which cannot be accounted for in terms of the act itself. The second part of the paper addressed the fifth-level question by examining two archival records from 1977 and 1980 in which Lonergan suggested quite clearly that we should understand love in terms of a fifth level. His characterization there provided materials that were used to construct a tentative systematic account of love and the fifth level in a Lonerganian¹⁵ horizon. Following quickly on this was another effort by Fr. Doran in his paper, "Sanctifying Grace, Charity, and Divine Indwelling," given in

¹³ Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, "Sanctifying Grace in a 'Methodical Theology,'" *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 52-76.

¹⁴ Jeremy W. Blackwood, "Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness," *MJLS*, n.s. 2, no. 2 (2011): 143-161.

¹⁵ I do not like the word, "Lonerganian," and neither did Bernard Lonergan. The term suggests a particular set of peculiarities that constitute a school of thought, whereas his point was exactly that these aren't simply yet another account of subjectivity but are, instead, the verifiably foundational realities constituting human being. However, my language must remain in line with current terminology in the theological discipline, and currently, theologians identify those of us who use a good deal of Lonergan's material as "Lonerganian." Therefore, I will, however begrudgingly, use the term.

June of that year. Here, Doran affirmed my own position and began setting it within the context of Lonergan's whole theology of grace and drawing connections to various other loci in Lonergan scholarship. Since then, Doran has incorporated some of this material into his work on Trinitarian theology.¹⁶

At this point in the conversation, it has become clear that there is significant debate within Lonergan scholarship as to, first, what Lonergan's understanding of love was in relation to the structure of intentional and affective consciousness, and, second, what Lonergan's ultimate affirmation was and what weight should be given to it with respect to the number of levels and the precise systematic characterization of levels beyond the first through the fourth. The consistent linking of these two questions in Lonergan's own work and in the scholarship suggests that a sustained research and speculative systematic effort aimed at addressing Lonergan's understanding of love and its relation to the possibility of a distinct fifth level would be a significant contribution to Lonergan scholarship and, in the longer term, to theological study as a whole.

THIS CHARACTER OF THIS STUDY

The four questions I have asked orient this investigation and will provide, in later chapters, a way of gauging where we are at in our evaluation of Lonergan and the secondary conversation. Those four questions, again, are:

¹⁶ Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History, vol. 1: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012).

- 1) Did Bernard Lonergan understand love to be a subsuming operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations?
- 2) Did Bernard Lonergan understand that subsuming operator, operation, or set of operations to be conscious?
- 3) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to subsumption?
- 4) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness?

This investigation has been conducted, proximately in order to answer questions (1) and (2), but also to move into the contemporary controversy and address questions (3) and (4). A final purpose has been the construction of a systematic presentation of the fifth level of consciousness that will address the controversy and move the issue forward, allowing for continued systematic work that avoids both the pitfalls highlighted by the controversy and the pitfall of falling into controversy.

OUTLINE

The dissertation proceeds through two parts. In the first part, the focus will be on the primary material afforded us by Lonergan's own hand or voice. The material has been broken down chronologically, distinguishable by major shifts in Lonergan's formulations. Chapter One begins with his analysis of love in an early article, "Finality, Love, Marriage,"¹⁷ and offers an account of the development of his understanding of love and interpersonal relation through significant Latin and English works through the first

¹⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 17–52.

twenty years of his development. Chapter Two begins in 1965, at which point Lonergan began to use a sequence of images to depict the human subject's awakening to and development through various levels of consciousness. Throughout this segment of his development, the sequential imagery reached ever higher, eventually culminating in love and expressing love's sublation of human subjectivity into a higher interpersonal order. Chapter Three begins in December, 1972, with Lonergan's first statement that you could think of love as "a fifth level." After analyzing this initial expression and other early affirmations of a fifth level, the account narrates Lonergan's efforts to answer questions about the fifth level and related issues throughout the following ten years, up until the end of his career.

The second part turns from the past to the present and the future. It begins with Chapter Four, in which Lonergan's historical development is analyzed and a synthesizing insight, grounding Lonergan's affirmation of a fifth level, is hypothesized. Chapter Five narrates and analyzes the secondary conversation, addressing the major writers involved and evaluating their contributions. Chapter Six, finally, responds to the major issues arising from and left unsolved by Lonergan's writings and the secondary writers before offering a summary comprehensive systematic statement on the fifth level of consciousness in a Lonerganian context. That summary statement will affirm that human subjectivity is constituted, in part, by a fifth level of consciousness characterized as a realm of interpersonal relations, which, when fully authentic, is the subjective locus of self-transcending human subjects in community.

A METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Especially for readers in a Lonerganian context, a methodological note must be included. Though it is an examination of Lonergan's development on a topic, this dissertation was not afforded the benefit of following Lonergan's own procedure in his dissertation.¹⁸ In his examination of the Thomist position on grace and freedom, Lonergan was able to begin by first establishing Thomas' initial position and then making use of a series of clear insights to mark off stages in the Angelic Doctor's development on the question. Other authors have followed that procedure in tracing developments in Lonergan's thought,¹⁹ but this topic was different than both Lonergan's and theirs. He did not subject either love or the fifth level to a sustained examination over the course of his career, and he therefore did not provide much specific evidence of particular insights that shifted his thought and marked off stages in his development on the question. Rather, the evidence of his development primarily is to be found in his formulations, the examination of which required an account of the gradual shifts in formulation that took place over the course of his career.

Unfortunately, such a method highlights the fact that Lonergan's development on the question was far from a cleanly gradual progression from one position, to another, to a third, and so on. Instead, it was an inconsistently documented process, and, as a matter of his own developmental history, it was only through the prodding of interlocutors at various discussion sessions that Lonergan slowly unfolded, tried out, and settled—though

¹⁸ See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe, CWL 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000), 155–161.

¹⁹ See, for example, Michael Shute, *Lonergan's Discovery of the Science of Economics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 20–21.

not universally—on certain formulations concerning love and its relation to intentional consciousness. It is therefore only in reconstructing that unfolding and showing the progression through various formulations that we can identify what insights there may have been behind his shifts and especially behind his settling on particular formulations.

A NOTE ABOUT THE LONERGAN WORKSHOP QUESTION SESSIONS

Especially for readers outside the Lonerganian context, a further note about the Lonergan Workshop question sessions must be included. The Lonergan Workshops began in 1974 and are held every year in June at Boston College. While Lonergan was still able, the participants at the Workshop would write out questions for him to answer. Lonergan would receive these written questions, type out notes on a reply, and answer select questions in the afternoon on the day after their submission. Between 1974 and 1982, many of these questions had to do either with the fifth level directly or with issues relevant to the fifth level, and knowledge of this basic format may prove helpful to the reader when confronting the numerous Lonergan Workshop materials below.

A NOTE ABOUT ARCHIVAL REFERENCES

This study draws on many materials available on the *Bernard Lonergan Archive: Resources in Lonergan Studies* web site (<http://bernardlonergan.com>). Archival materials are listed by their archival serial number in the notes, with further information provided as needed. Full references can be found in the Bibliography, ordered by archival serial number.

1. THE GENETIC FOUNDATIONS OF LONERGAN'S UNDERSTANDING OF LOVE: 1943–1964

The first period of Lonergan's development on love spanned the years from the beginning of his career up to the end of 1964. The initial focus was given in a 1943 article in *Theological Studies*, "Finality, Love, Marriage," which linked individual subjectivity to the social sphere and drew on the upward tendency of love in individual consciousness. That upward tendency, Lonergan argued, gave marriage a finality that allowed it to be the first step in a series of unions, culminating in the mystical body of Christ, that would provide the solution to an otherwise inevitable downward spiral of social decay. The situating of individual subjectivity and love in a social context would arise once again in Lonergan's notes for a course on grace in 1951–52, in chapters 7 and 20 of *Insight* in 1957, in the Halifax lectures on *Insight* in the following year, in the article "Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing" in 1964, and finally in the same year's Trinitarian treatise, *De Deo Trino: Pars systematica*.

With love firmly placed within this overarching social context, several other details of Lonergan's understanding of love were also worked out. First, in the *Verbum* articles, written between 1946 and 1949, Lonergan elaborated on the procession of love in the will and the presence of the beloved in the lover, and this position came to illuminate his understanding of the union of lovers in love. Related materials were further developed in the Cincinnati education lectures of 1959, "Time and Meaning" in 1962, "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer" and "The Analogy of Meaning" in 1963, and again *De Deo Trino* in 1964. Second, what in FLM had been an underlying "field of natural spontaneity" would develop into a "primordial intersubjectivity" out of which arise the

operations of intentional consciousness, while the union between lovers discussed in FLM and the *Verbum* articles became the deliberate interpersonal union at the apex of subjectivity in 1963 and following years.

1.1. 1943

1943's "Finality, Love, Marriage" laid the groundwork for Lonergan's understanding of love.¹ The article emphasized the role of love in tying individual subjectivity to the social sphere, and it situated that link as key to the rectification of social ills through marital love and the mystical body of Christ.

1.1.1. "THE CONCEPT OF LOVE"

The second section of FLM, "The Concept of Love," was a scholastic analysis incorporating Lonergan's original contribution of vertical finality, which had been outlined in the previous section.² He indicated that there are four simultaneous aspects of love: (1a) the desire for the good in the will of a subject, (1b) the ground of a subject's process of willing toward the good, (2a) the ground of union between subjects willing a common good, and (2b) the ground of union between subjects in achieving a commonly

¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 17–52; originally published as "Finality, Love, Marriage," *Theological Studies* 4 (1943): 477–510. ["Finality, Love, Marriage" will hereafter be abbreviated FLM.]

² Lonergan, FLM, 18–22. For more on vertical finality, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Supernatural Order," in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011), 53–255.

willed common good.³ This analysis presented love as both individual and social: one and the same love with all four simultaneous aspects serves both as motivation and as ground of process in an individual subject through her faculties *and* as ground of union between subjects in process toward and achievement of an end. The former is individual, the latter is social/historical.

Lonergan then combined this analysis with his observation that, while spontaneous natural desires simply follow biology, desires pertaining to knowledge and virtue have to be cultivated, and the complexity and number of our desires “gives rise to an inner tension” precisely because we desire before we have cultivated proper desiring.⁴ Although the ideal should have priority over concrete facts as we discern the surds present in concrete facts, we instead tend to let less-than-ideal concrete fact overcome the ideal by rationalizing failures and avoiding repentance.⁵ This dialectic between our ideal aspirations and desire and our less-than-ideal achievements and rationalizations becomes social when the products of faulty achievement and rationalization become accepted as facts that contest against the realizability of the ideal and restrict the social constructions of the human world despite our desire for the ideal.⁶

If our desiring has not been cultivated, this tension will cause problems for all four aspects of love. Inordinate desiring (1a) will issue forth in a disrupted and inordinate process of willing (1b), and if inordinate desiring and commensurately disrupted willing in single subjects’ faculties are not rectified through repentance, then they will issue forth into inordinate processes among several subjects pursuing a common good or supposed

³ See FLM, 23–24. This numbering sequence is mine, not Lonergan’s.

⁴ Lonergan, FLM, 26.

⁵ Lonergan, FLM, 26.

⁶ Lonergan, FLM, 26–7.

good (2a). Finally, if several subjects are inordinately pursuing a common good or supposed good, then whatever union is achieved in the consummation of that end (2b) will likewise be disrupted. In such an environment, the desires (1a) and further acts of will (1b) by individual subjects become ever further burdened by the social reinforcement(s) that have been built upon disrupted and inordinate individual and social processes (2a) and unions (2b), making each choice less and less between the ideal and the less-than-ideal and more and more between two instances of the less-than-ideal.

Left alone, any such process of disruption beginning at the level of individual potency would yield ever diminishing returns in the social/historical realm, resulting in progressively less reasonable achievements of progressively inferior goods by both the social order and the individuals within that order.⁷ Yet Lonergan suggested an alternative to this descent:

Just as there is a human solidarity in sin with a dialectical descent deforming knowledge and perverting will, so also there is a divine solidarity in grace which is the mystical body of Christ; as evil performance confirms us in evil, so good edifies us in our building unto eternal life; and as private rationalization finds support in fact, in common teaching, in public approval, so also the ascent of the soul towards God is not a merely private affair but rather a personal function of an objective common movement in that body of Christ which takes over, transforms, and elevates every aspect of human life.⁸

⁷ This position had remote grounds in Lonergan's early work on the metaphysics of history, *Panton Anakephalaiosis* (published as "PANTON ANAKEPHALAIOSIS," *MJLS* 9, no. 2 [1991]: 139–172).

⁸ Lonergan, *FLM*, 27.

1.1.2. “THE PRIMARY REASON AND CAUSE OF MARRIAGE”

In the third section of FLM, marriage and authentic love were presented as the solutions to a social situation disrupted by inordinate desire (1a), willing (1b), cooperation (2a), and attainment of ends (2b). Marriage was seen as the instrument of the intervention of Christ through the married subjects’ conformation to the image of Christ.⁹ A beloved that ought to be loved will make a lover more lovable; a beloved that ought not to be loved will make a lover less lovable. Such changes in the lovableness of a lover will raise or lower the quality of the union(s) of love and friendship in which the lover participates, and this ultimately affects the broader social situation, which is constituted by many such unions.

These unions, in turn, are constituted by mutually habitual love, and mutual or common habits are grounded on a common end.¹⁰ Such a common end “presupposes a coincidence of views, profound or superficial, on the meaning of life, on what makes life worth while and sets a goal to human striving,” as well as a common conscience or moral evaluation because “one’s ideas on life, one’s moral conscience, one’s deeds, the expressed ideas of others near one, and their deeds, all are linked together in a field of mutual influence and adaptation for better or for worse. . . .”¹¹ This link is manifested insofar as the lower (individual subjectivity) is not just a potency for the higher (the

⁹ In one subject there are elements of natural spontaneity, reasonable elements, and elements of the work of God through grace, and “as the higher perfects the lower, so the lower disposes to the higher; and it is in this disposition of natural spontaneity to reinforce reason, of reason to reinforce grace . . . that is to be found the ascent of love that gives human marriage a finality on the level of Christian charity and perfection” (Lonergan, FLM, 30). This upward tendency from lower to higher within the subject extends beyond the individual and penetrates into the social order.

¹⁰ Lonergan, FLM, 32.

¹¹ Lonergan, FLM, 35–36.

social order), but is also capable of intensifying the higher.¹² Marriage, with its divisions of labor setting each part into the scheme of a larger whole, and with the intensity of its intimacy, becomes “a rejection of the world's dialectical rationalizations, a focal point in the stream of history for the fostering of growth in the mind and heart of Christ, a pursuit of the highest human and eternal ends.”¹³

Lonergan highlighted that this spiritual advancement is a supernatural end of a natural thing, a position not commonly accepted in the neoscholastic context, but one which Lonergan was at pains to articulate as ‘vertical finality’ during this time period.¹⁴ He distinguished three kinds of finality: absolute finality, the orientation of all created being to God; horizontal finality, the orientation of all created things to the ends proportionate to their nature; and vertical finality, an orientation of a created thing to an end beyond the proportion of its nature. The orientation of married persons toward spiritual development is such a vertical orientation, for proper imitation of Christ is beyond the proportion of human nature. In fact for Lonergan, marriage is specially united to such a vertical end, for “all Christians are called to the imitation of Christ, to the summit of Christian perfection; but from marriage there is a dispositive upward tendency giving a new modality to that high pursuit, for husband and wife are called not only to advance but to advance together.”¹⁵ Marriage, for the Lonergan of 1943, was even more dispositive toward the advancement that heals the larger social situation than was a single individual, precisely because marriage is already a social situation.

¹² Lonergan, FLM, 36.

¹³ Lonergan, FLM, 37.

¹⁴ See above, at 14 n 2.

¹⁵ Lonergan, FLM, 29.

1.1.3. SUMMARY

What we find in FLM is, first, a series of potencies and acts. The desire for the good in an individual subject (1a) is a potency for the good, which is in turn actuated, brought to its term, by an individual process of willing the good (1b). Multiple subjects performing such processes of will are united in their pursuit (2a) and as such are in potency to the union accomplished in the achievement of the end (2b). As individual potency becomes individual act and thereby brings that individual subject into union with other subjects pursuing the same end, the series of individual actuations of the individual potencies is simultaneously the potentiating of their communion for the act that is the achievement of the end. All four of these are simultaneous aspects of love, but while (1a) and (1b) are individual potency and act, (2a) and (2b) are social/historical potency and act. In FLM, then, love had to do with the entire process from individual potency to individual act, and with individuals in act as social/historical potency for social/historical act.

While errors may begin at the individual level, the link between individual subjectivity and social reality carries individual error into the wider social realm. With that social realm, in turn, contextualizing individual subjectivity, there is set up a feedback loop in which individual errors lead to social problems and social problems increase the likelihood of individual errors.¹⁶ Love, and particularly marriage, are the keys to escape from this downward spiral; they are already unions of individual subjects

¹⁶ This distinction would evolve into the distinction between basic sin and moral evil in *Insight*. (See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992], 689).

because “love unites; it makes lovers parts of a larger unit with each to the other as another self, a *dimidium animae suae*.”¹⁷ Thus united together, such subjects and their unions form “the matrix of conditions that supplies an upward tendency to advance in human and supernatural perfection.”¹⁸ That perfection, in its own turn, is the mystical body of Christ, in which “we are all ‘severally members one of another’ (Romans 12.5), parts of a larger unit in which we are to love our neighbors as ourselves (Matthew 22.39).” This mystical body supplies the solution to the error-upon-error cycle by supporting good instead of evil, right instead of error, and repentance instead of rationalization, in a social format that, again, “takes over, transforms, and elevates every aspect of human life.”¹⁹ Fundamentally, “human development is a personal function of an objective movement in the space-time solidarity of man, and married life a series of steps upward through love of one's neighbor to the love of God.”²⁰

1.2. 1946–1949

These social changes had their origin in an individual psychological experience of love, the mechanics of which Lonergan elaborated in his study of Aquinas’s understanding of the procession of the inner word. There, he presented an operational distinction between love in the will and knowing in the intellect,²¹ which is not only vital

¹⁷ Lonergan, FLM, 32.

¹⁸ Lonergan, FLM, 44.

¹⁹ Lonergan, FLM, 27.

²⁰ Lonergan, FLM, 45.

²¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, ed. by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1997); originally published as “The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas,” *Theological Studies* 7 (1946): 349–92; 8 (1947): 35–79, 404–44; 10 (1949): 3–40, 359–93.

for grasping the difference between the Thomist and Scotist positions on faculty psychology, but also for understanding Lonergan's position on love. This same point will recur almost twenty years later in Lonergan's elaboration of love in his Trinitarian theology, and in later chapters I will suggest that it also plays a role in the structural relation that obtains between the third, fourth, and fifth levels of consciousness.

In Lonergan's reading of Thomas, although knowing and loving are structurally similar, the fundamental distinction between them is that love, in the will, does not proceed in a way strictly parallel with the operation of intellect: it is not "that as the inner word proceeds from the act of understanding, so within the will some distinct term proceeds from the act of love."²² Instead, Lonergan agreed with Aquinas's contrary position, affirming the "dependence of love on inner word."²³ As Lonergan understood him, Aquinas argued that the procession of the Holy Spirit showed that the beloved is present in the will of the lover as the term of the movement of the will.²⁴ In virtue of final causality, the goal determines the movement toward that goal, so an end is in the pursuer to the extent that it is pursued, and a thing is in the lover to the extent that it is loved.²⁵ The pursuit, the love, is itself the presence of the pursued, of the beloved, in the lover.²⁶

²² Lonergan, *Verbum*, 109. Loving and knowing are similar in that they both stand as act to potency ("The act of understanding is to the possible intellect, the act of loving is to the will, as act to potency, as perfection to its perfectible" [Lonergan, *Verbum*, 205]), and they are both examples of *emanatio intelligibilis*, which Lonergan defined as follows: "an activity of rational consciousness, the production of a product because and inasmuch as the sufficiency of the sufficient grounds for the product are known. Just as we affirm existence because and inasmuch as we know the sufficiency of sufficient grounds for affirming it, so also we mean and define essences because and inasmuch as we understand them. In similar fashion by *processio operati* and *emanatio intelligibilis* a rational act of love proceeds from a judgment of value" (Lonergan, *Verbum*, 188).

²³ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 109–110.

²⁴ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 209.

²⁵ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 210.

²⁶ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 210.

This account illuminates the position maintained in FLM. There, the marital union that forms part of the solution to the diminishing returns of a disrupted social situation is in an upward tendency toward the mystical body of Christ, the ultimate solution to the social problem. From the *verbum* articles it becomes clear that the presence of the beloved to the lover is in virtue of the loving itself, not in virtue of the loving producing the presence as something secondary: love *is* the union that is the solution to the social deterioration.

1.3. 1951–52

In the “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace” composed for his 1951–52 course, Lonergan situated love and community in an analysis of what he called “the positive doctrine of Scripture” on grace, which he articulated in ten points:

To those whom God the Father loves (1) as he loves Jesus, his only-begotten Son, (2) he gives the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit, so that (3) into a new life they may be (4) born again and (5) become living members of Christ; therefore as (6) just, (7) friends of God, (8) adopted children of God, and (9) heirs in hope of eternal life, (10) they enter into a sharing in the divine nature.²⁷

²⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace,” in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011), 581. Some elements of his explanation of these ten points provide links both back toward FLM and forward toward his Trinitarian theology and his later understanding of love in an intentionality context. Point (1) links to the mystical body; point (2) involved indwelling (recall the *verbum* articles), the interpersonal (recall FLM), and a change in the beloved (recall both FLM and the *verbum* articles) and is in reference to Romans 5:5 (“And hope does not disappoint us, because God has poured out his love into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, whom he has given us”), which will become a recurring touchstone for Lonergan’s understanding of God’s gift of divine love to us. Points (3), (4), and (5) together emphasized friendship and argued that the whole economy of friendship and the diffusion of love is accomplished in virtue of the divine plan for the whole (§2.5.a.). Points (6), (7), and (8) flow together, as well: we are made

Lonerger's added point (11) noted that all of the elements from the "positive doctrine of Scripture" are linked together—the being made just, the new creation, the relationship with Christ, God, and one another, and the destining for inheritance are tied together through what Lonergan calls "a nexus"²⁸: our being loved makes us just, makes us new, makes us friends of God, and draws us up into the economy of the whole divinely-ordered creation.²⁹ This is all accomplished through formal effects, which are the contents of true judgments that can be made as a result of that which grounds the formal effects. Anything contingently stated about God "is a transcendent formal effect of an extrinsic term" to the extent that it is contingent,³⁰ but "not everything that is stated contingently about the divine persons is stated by appropriation."³¹ Such proper references to God, because they are not by appropriation, are to the divine essence, but "the divine essence can be considered in two ways: first, as absolute and common to the three divine persons; secondly, as being really identical with one or other real trinitarian relation—with paternity, sonship, active spiration, or passive spiration."³²

At first blush, "since every finite substance is something absolute, it seems appropriate to say that it imitates the divine essence considered as absolute," but there are four created graces that "are intimately connected with the divine life"—the grace of

just by disposing faith, by baptism, and by our incorporation and our being made a new creation in Christ; God loves us and we love God with God's own love, constituting our mutual friendship; and adoption either supposes or effects a common nature, with the consequence of inheritance (583–611).

²⁸ "Supplementary Notes," 611–613.

²⁹ "Supplementary Notes," 617. What follows is an extremely condensed account of Lonergan's argument running from 617 to 665. For more on friendship and union in love, see Lonergan's notes for his 1947–48 course on grace (16000DTE040, §31.12.c.a¹).

³⁰ "Supplementary Notes," 627–629.

³¹ "Supplementary Notes," 631.

³² "Supplementary Notes," 633.

union, the light of glory, sanctifying grace, and charity³³—and Lonergan uses the intimacy of these graces’ connections to the divine life to argue that they have a relation to the divine essence considered, not as common to the three persons, but as identical with one or another real trinitarian relation: “Thus the grace of union imitates and participates in a finite way the divine paternity, the light of glory divine sonship, sanctifying grace active spiration, and the virtue of charity passive spiration.”³⁴ These four graces then ground the mystical body, the interrelated subjects who are the recipients of God’s own self in these graces,³⁵ but while “in an organic body, a member is not subsistent in the proper sense and is uniquely ordered to the good of the whole[, in] the mystical body, on the other hand, a member remains subsistent, and members are not for the sake of the body but the body is for the sake of the members.”³⁶ The mystical body is thus a union of individuals into a higher synthesis that, by the very nature of the synthesis, does not threaten individuality while still maintaining itself as a higher synthesis.³⁷

This material deepened the argument from FLM, developing further the understanding of the mystical body and love specifically in relation to grace. By placing the unions of love and the mystical body in explicit relation to grace and the triune life,

³³ “Supplementary Notes,” 631–633.

³⁴ “Supplementary Notes,” 633. This is the first known appearance of the so-called “four-point hypothesis.”

³⁵ This is founded most proximately on point (3). For more on intimate personal love and the gift of self, see 16000DTE040, §31.12[*bis*].a.

³⁶ “Supplementary Notes,” 649, citing Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943), 231: “Every form of this mystical union is to be rejected in which the faithful would in any way so go beyond the order of creation and improperly encroach upon the divine that even one attribute of the eternal Deity could be predicated of them as properly theirs.”

For a contemporary, but more pastoral argument, see Lonergan’s address delivered to the Jesuit Seminary in Toronto in November 1951 (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Mystical Body of Christ,” in *Shorter Papers*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Robert M. Doran, and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 20 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007], 106–111).

³⁷ See also 16000DTE040, §28.2.a. & b.

Loneragan elevated their interpersonal character, insofar as three of the persons in the union that is the mystical body are divine. While FLM had emphasized the potency of individual subjectivity for social activity and the potency of social activity for a supernatural end, in his “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace” Lonergan spelled out metaphysically the divine operation by which that supernatural interpersonal end is realized through divine proceeding love.

1.4. 1957

Loneragan’s tome, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, developed three major components of his understanding of love: the situating of individual subjectivity within the social order, the beginnings of a distinct existential and moral level of consciousness, and the added theological dimension of the entire conversation. All of these, moreover, were situated within a horizon that was shifting to an intentionality analysis.

1.4.1. THE SOCIAL SITUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTIVITY

Beginning with FLM in 1943, Lonergan’s work with love had been intrinsically tied to analyses of the social situation, and this trend continued in *Insight*. The text argued for the social context of individual subjectivity in section 3 of Chapter 7:

If he never forgets his personal interest still [man’s] person is no Leibnizian monad; for he was born of his parents’ love; he grew and developed in the gravitational field of their affection; he asserted his own independence only to

fall in love and provide himself with his own hostages to fortune. As the members of the hive or herd belong together and function together, so too men are social animals, and the primordial basis of their community is not the discovery of an idea but a spontaneous intersubjectivity.³⁸

It is out of that basis and within that context that intelligence and reasonableness have their role, and yet the basis is not simply superseded by the work of intelligence and reasonableness but accompanies it and plays a part in it throughout the progress—and the decline—of a community.³⁹ Still, there *is* a new creation when civilization rises out of intersubjectivity. Such a rise changes the notion of the good: it is no longer simply that which is desired (which is the case in more purely intersubjective situations) but there now “has to be acknowledged a further component . . . [consisting] in an intelligible pattern of relationships that condition the fulfilment of each man's desires by his contributions to the fulfilment of the desires of others, and similarly protect each from the object of his fears in the measure he contributes to warding off the objects feared by others.”⁴⁰

1.4.2. THE ANALYSIS OF INTENTIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE INTIMATIONS OF A NEW LEVEL

The focus of Lonergan’s examination of such socially situated subjectivity was cognitional. His interest was limited to conscious acts that pertain to knowing, and this, among other factors, resulted in his developing and making explicit in this text only the

³⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 237.

³⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 238. Note the similarity to FLM, where the level of reason is “embedded in a field of natural spontaneity and infused virtue” (Lonergan, FLM, 30).

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 238.

three levels of experience, understanding, and judgment.⁴¹ Yet even while confined to these levels, Lonergan's analysis was already heading for a breakthrough that wouldn't become explicit until more than one year after the book's publication. In *Insight* the good was the intelligent and reasonable, and thus it could be (and was) discussed in a context determined by the cognitional focus of the book. At the same time, the two possibilities were intermittently and somewhat inchoately apparent in *Insight*: first, that the good was a distinct intentional object, and second, that, as a distinct intentional object, the good required a fourth level above that of cognitional judgment.⁴²

For example, what Lonergan would later identify by the term sublation, he here outlined in the following account of the relations that obtain between the successive levels of consciousness:

There is an intersubjective component to expression that emerges and is transmitted apart from insights and judgments. There is a supervening component of intelligence that admits various degrees of explicitness and deliberateness. There is a still higher component of truth or falsity that may emerge at the term of a series of insights as insight emerges at the term of a

⁴¹ The phrase "judgment of value" does appear on page 730, but in *Insight* it was confined to "a judgment on the value of deciding to believe with certitude or with probability that some proposition certainly or probably is true or false." It did not indicate a distinct fourth level of moral evaluation.

⁴² The realization about a fourth level had roots prior to *Insight*. Note, for example, the nature of the discussion about the levels of cognition and the levels of the good in "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," where the consideration of the good could be said to supervene upon the consideration of the intelligible and the real (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988], 108–113).

series of imaginative representations. Finally, there can be the entry of a volitional component, and its relevance is a fourth variable.⁴³

Loneragan was clearly suggesting that the “volitional component”—the component concerned with the will and thus, the good—was an element beyond experience, understanding, and judgment. Further hints that Lonergan was already beginning to realize that the good required a further, higher, level of consciousness are found in his suggestions that the realm of the good is to be known by understanding the “extension of intellectual activity that we name deliberation and decision, choice and will,”⁴⁴ that the realm of doing is beyond the realm of knowing,⁴⁵ and that he envisioned a “fuller invariant structure that adds reasonable choice and action to intelligent and reasonable knowing.”⁴⁶

1.4.3. THEOLOGY AND DISCUSSIONS OF HIGHER LEVELS

The role of such higher levels came to the fore in *Insight* when Lonergan took a more directly theological turn in his analyses of the social situation. This move was combined with an emphasis on love, where love provides a solution to social ills by being a constitutive component of the higher level itself, not unlike the role love played through marriage in FLM.

⁴³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 594. For Lonergan’s later use of ‘sublation’ with respect to levels of consciousness, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999), 316–317. That material will be discussed in Chapter Two (see below, at 104–106).

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 619.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 622.

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 754.

In one sense, for the Lonergan of *Insight*, “the goodness of will is the love of God.”⁴⁷ This manner of speaking retained much of the earlier, faculty-psychology horizon, even if it appeared at the end of a paragraph highlighting vertical tendencies derived, not from a faculty-psychological analysis, but from an intentionality analysis.⁴⁸ He was straddling the two realms here, pushing into intentionality analysis while still using the terms of faculty psychology, and his language was situated within a study of the social situation that was grounded on his intentionality analysis and was, at the same time, ultimately theological. What is important is the close link between the will or decision-making, and love. Lonergan insisted that the will must adopt a “dialectical attitude” like “the dialectical method of intellect” if it is to work toward the rectification of the social surd.⁴⁹ For the intellect, that dialectical method “consists in grasping that the social surd neither is intelligible nor is to be treated as intelligible.”⁵⁰ The attitude of will that parallels this method is the returning of good for evil, for “it is only inasmuch as men are willing to meet evil with good, to love their enemies, to pray for those that persecute and calumniate them, that the social surd is a potential good.”⁵¹

Why is it true that only to the extent that evil is met with good in love can the social surd be rectified? What is so special about love that it would have this effect? In

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 711.

⁴⁸ “An unrestricted desire to understand correctly heads towards an unrestricted act of understanding, towards God. A will that is good by its consistency with knowledge is headed towards an antecedent willingness that matches the desire to know both in its essential detachment from the sensitive subject and in its unrestricted commitment to complete intelligibility, to God. A sensitivity and an intersubjectivity that have their higher integration in knowing willing are headed towards objects and activities that can be no more than symbols and signs of what they cannot comprehend or appreciate. The whole world of sense is to be, then, a token, a mystery, of God, for the desire of intelligence is for God, and the goodness of will is the love of God” (Lonergan, *Insight*, 711).

⁴⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721.

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721.

⁵¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721–722.

FLM, the answer had been that the divisions of labor and the intensity of intimacy in marriage become “a rejection of the world's dialectical rationalizations, a focal point in the stream of history for the fostering of growth in the mind and heart of Christ, a pursuit of the highest human and eternal ends,”⁵² but *Insight* shows further development, drawing on material realized in the 1951–52 notes. Here, “love of God above all and in all so embraces the order of the universe as to love all men with a self-sacrificing love.”⁵³ Good will

is at one with the universe in being in love with God, and it shares its dynamic resilience and expectancy. As emergent probability, it ever rises above past achievement. As genetic process, it develops generic potentiality to its specific perfection. As dialectic, it overcomes evil both by meeting it with good and by using it to reinforce the good. But good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.⁵⁴

Good will, then, is united to the whole universe such that the place of the willer in the universe moves toward the order intended in the creation, from the level of probability up through genetic development, from development up through meeting evil with good, all of which is done with the “dynamic joy and zeal” that are part of the order of the universe in its dynamic, developmental movement. Good will is the participation of the willer in an integration beyond her own capacities, and to the movements toward a fourth level already in *Insight*, we can add Lonergan’s observations that faith, hope, and charity constitute a higher integration as a solution to the social surd: the “advent of the

⁵² Lonergan, FLM, 37.

⁵³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721–722; see “Supplementary Notes,” 599–601.

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 722.

absolutely supernatural solution to man's problem of evil adds to man's biological, psychic, and intellectual levels of development a fourth level that includes the higher conjugate forms of faith, hope, and charity."⁵⁵

1.4.4. SUMMARY

In *Insight*, Lonergan argued for the pervasively social context of individual subjectivity, for the emergence of a realm of the consideration of the good that, in terms of individual subjectivity, was somehow above or beyond the realm of experiencing, understanding, and judging, and for the divine solution to the problem of evil as incorporating an element that made the individual subject, through a higher integration, more a participant in the intended good of order of the universe.

1.5. 1958

Lonergan's Halifax lectures on *Insight* confirmed and elaborated on some of the points made above.⁵⁶ These lectures lend support to the suggestion that in *Insight* he hinted at, but did not fully develop, the notion that the realm of the good and the moral was a distinct fourth level. Here, one year after the publication of *Insight*, we find the statement, "Just as there is the structure of knowing that is isomorphic with the structure of being and the structure of philosophies . . . so there is a structure of doing that is a

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 762–763.

⁵⁶ The lectures have been published, with some editorial changes, as Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990).

prolongation of the structure of knowing. . . .”⁵⁷ As in *Insight*, at the time of these lectures Lonergan was obviously aware that the realm of doing goes beyond the realm of knowing, but he had not yet fully recognized that this required the affirmation of a distinct fourth level of consciousness.⁵⁸

The moral aspect of the social question found in *Insight* was strongly reaffirmed in the Halifax lectures in Lonergan’s statement that “positively to do good is to become good oneself, to move from organization on the level of objects of appetite, just as one moves from knowledge organized about intuition, to a self that is in harmony with what objectively is good. . . .”⁵⁹ This restated Lonergan’s affirmation in *Insight* that one’s willing, if it is what it ought to be, actually draws one into line with the objective reality of the ordered good of the universe. Although he did not explicitly state here that there is a higher integration operative, it is clear that good willing produces a self “in harmony with” the objectively good universe willed as a whole by God.

Finally and most significantly, Lonergan’s discussion of love up to and including *Insight* had almost exclusively occurred in the context of either a faculty-psychological analysis (FLM, the 1951–52 notes) or an analysis of the social situation (much of *Insight* and parts of FLM and the 1951–52 notes). To this point, he had not fully made the turn to an analysis of love that would situate it within the context of the intentionality analysis first promulgated in *Insight*. However, in a question session from the evening of August

⁵⁷ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 374.

⁵⁸ Lonergan acknowledged that “when your judgments move on to action, you have, fourth, *rational self-consciousness*. Then your rational reflection is about yourself” (Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 16). However, the editorial note states, “[rational self-consciousness] is Lonergan’s usual term in his *Insight* period for what he will later call responsible (fourth-level) consciousness, though the term is sometimes used for the total range of consciousness” (Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 401). This leads me to shy away from identifying this as the first expression of a distinct fourth level of consciousness as such; he was still working out the character of rational self-consciousness.

⁵⁹ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 234.

14, 1958, Lonergan showed that he was beginning to work out the ramifications of love with reference to that context. When asked about suffering, Lonergan ended his reply by noting that

the situation that is the human condition leads us on further to what we name the supernatural life, to a life in which God loves us in the full sense of love. Love involves a quasi identification. When two people are in love their thoughts are about *us*—what are *we* going to do, what do *we* need? It is all spontaneously so. There is a quasi identification involved. And in the fact that God became man as our savior, there is that same manifestation of love, and it is that aspect of love, of God’s love for mankind in the full sense of loving—a self-giving to which we respond with a self-giving—that there is in charity something away beyond any ethical structure that can be based upon the pure desire to know. It presupposes an advance made by God as a lover, in the full sense of loving, and it means our response, and it means our response in which we love one another because we love God—and if we don’t love one another we don’t know God, in the words of St. John’s epistle.⁶⁰

In this statement, we see all the elements that have been present in the earlier works: the human condition is in potency to supernatural life; such life is an actualization of that potency that involves a quasi-identification; the quasi-identification is tied to the social-historical order; and the historical communication of God leads to changes in the behavior of human beings. Even more important, however, is the turn toward an analysis

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377. Lonergan was referring to 1 John 4:7–8: “Beloved, let us love one another, because love is of God; everyone who loves is begotten by God and knows God. Whoever is without love does not know God, for God is love” [NAB].

from the point of view of the subject: “When two people are in love their thoughts are about *us*.” The language was now shifting, with a turn being made to a new mode of explicating and speaking about the same realities that had been previously affirmed. In this question session, the shift was far from being a perfect or clean break, but the change is clear: this was not the metaphysical faculty-psychological manner in which these same points had previously been discussed: it was beginning to be an intentionality analysis.

Following this response, Lonergan was asked, “whether, in view of the last few remarks [on suffering], it is possible to structure love on the same three levels, the corresponding levels of intellectual operations?”⁶¹ His reply foreshadowed where his account of love would head in the coming years. First, he said, there is the good as the object of desire, the good on the experiential level. Next, there is the good of order, the good as intelligible, which occurs in the family, in the ordered interaction of fathers, mothers, and children, each with their own respective roles and knowledge of their roles, and similarly there is the good of order in the state, in the community.⁶² Finally, there is the good of value, the good at the level of the actual, the real, paralleling judgment. This was the same understanding of the good that had obtained in “The Role of a Catholic

⁶¹ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377.

⁶² Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 378 and 379. At the time of these Halifax lectures, Lonergan understood the good of order in both the family and the community to be “a flow of benefits, a flow of operations, suitable habits of knowing and willing and choosing and doing in individuals, suitable institutions, where institutions are understood as, as it were, the form uniting the individuals involved in this way of life” (Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380). Here were the very early roots of what would become a portion of Lonergan's stock characterization of love over the next several decades: there is the domestic love in the family, love in the loyalty of civil community (both mentioned here), and the love of God (mentioned immediately below). The editorial notes from the Collected Works edition of “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer” will mention the first full-fledged appearance of this triad in 1963, but it is clear that here in 1958 Lonergan at least had a handle on its roots (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996], 172; see below, at 40 n 82).

University in the Modern World” several years before,⁶³ but in elaborating further, Lonergan shifted beyond the good and toward love. The pure desire to know “sets up exigencies that are beyond our capacity for fulfilment in our present state.”⁶⁴ While grace both heals moral impotence and corrects the disruptions that have entered the social order, it is also the introduction of “something like quasi identification—the love of God in that sense of self-donation, like entering into the married state, living together, sharing one’s life with another, and the quasi identification that that involves.”⁶⁵ The divine self-gift in the incarnation is the first expression of God’s love to us, followed by the divine self-gift of the Holy Spirit in justification.⁶⁶ This divine self-gift, Lonergan tells us, sets up a further good of order in this world, which is the mystical body of Christ and his church. So, just as this self-giving of God is something that lies beyond any possible exigence or conclusion, any possible exigence of human nature or conclusion of man’s thinking about the world . . . so this mystical body of Christ is a further, higher integration of human living. It is the transition from the *civitas terrena* that can be constituted by a pure desire to know, to the *civitas Dei* that is founded on the love of God and the self-revelation of God.⁶⁷

⁶³ Lonergan, “The Role of a Catholic University,” 108–113. This foreshadowed much of the social analysis seen in *Insight* and offered a brief account of a parallel between the levels of knowing, the levels of the good, and levels of community. In that article, the levels of knowing were the empirical, the intellectual, and that of judgment; the levels of the good were the object of desire, the good of order, and the object of judgments of value; and the levels of community were “intersubjective community,” “civil community,” and “cultural community,” which were explicitly tied to “experience and desire” (intersubjective community), “intellectual insights and the good of order” (civil community), and “judgments of value” (cultural community) (see 108–9 of that text). These three levels of community are similar to the first three levels of the scale of values, which would not appear for another 21 years (on the scale of values, see Lonergan, *Method*, 31–32).

⁶⁴ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380.

⁶⁵ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380.

⁶⁶ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380–381.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 381.

Once again, subjectivity is potency for something beyond its own proportion; the actuation of that potency involves identification; the communication that is God's part of the identification is historical; and there are ramifications in terms of the constitution of the human world. All of this material is clearly in line with earlier developments, but it is pressing on toward a new way of understanding the issues and formulating their interrelation.

1.6. 1959

In the lectures on education at Xavier University in 1959, Lonergan again took up the topic of the human good, suggesting that its structure paralleled the ordering of experience, understanding, and judgment, and in relation to this he presented a brief but detailed account of differing types of presence.⁶⁸ That account differentiated material presence, the presence of subjects to one another, and the presence of a subject to him- or herself: "Being present to myself is not the presence of an object to the subject; it is the subject being there, conscious."⁶⁹ Such presence to self can be of various kinds, but

⁶⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe, CWL 10 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1993), 81–82. On the ordering of the good, in addition to "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," see *Topics in Education*, 41: "We have distinguished particular goods, the good of order, and value. Our acquaintance with the particular good is mainly a matter of *experience*. But to know about the good of order, you have to *understand*. It is intelligence, understanding, insight, that is chiefly relevant to knowing the good of order. And it is when one reflects on different orders, different possible setups and systems, that one comes to the notion of value, and such reflection is on the level of *judgment*. You will recall from *Insight* that experience, understanding, and judgment are three fundamental levels of consciousness. They run parallel to a fundamental division in metaphysics, according to which finite being is composed of potency, form, and act, whether substantial or accidental."

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 82.

“when you move on to doing, willing, choosing, you get a fourth level of consciousness, *self-consciousness*.”⁷⁰

It appears that this is the first explicit statement that there were four—not three—levels, making it clear that what before had been suggestively identified as an “extension of” or something “beyond” the realm of the three levels of experiencing, understanding, and judging, could and should be identified as a distinct level in its own right, with that term and, so to speak, all the privileges pertaining thereto. The process of coming to the recognition of a distinct fourth level was for Lonergan no simple matter. His work on *Insight* had clarified for him the three levels of experiencing, understanding, and judging, but he also struggled to situate moral decision-making and the good into the framework they provided. Beginning already in *Insight*, his language danced around the issue, suggesting that the realm of the moral went beyond the realm of cognition, but not fully stating that the realm of moral decisions was a distinct fourth level. I am going to suggest that fifteen years later, a parallel process was at work in Lonergan’s recognition of a distinct fifth level, where the sweep of his development passes through a stage of inchoate, suggestive statements that appear to indicate that the realm of love goes beyond the fourth and must be a distinct fifth level, but with a delay in his explicit statement that love is, in fact, a fifth level beyond the other four.

⁷⁰ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 82, emphasis original.

1.7. 1962 AND 1963

In 1962 and 1963, Lonergan developed his affirmation of a distinct fourth level by emphasizing the interpersonal and the intersubjective. After illustrating what he understood intersubjectivity to be, he suggested that not only was there a primordial intersubjectivity prior to the operations of intentional consciousness, but there was also a higher interpersonal realm constituted by deliberate commitment, which could be discussed, in part, in terms of mediation.

1.7.1. "TIME AND MEANING"

In Lonergan's 1962 lecture, "Time and Meaning," he defined intersubjectivity as "a unity of human persons that antedates, precedes, the distinction between 'I' and 'Thou.'"⁷¹ As an example, he gave the story of the time that he witnessed a small child stumble, and even though the child was much too far away for Lonergan to reach him and stop the fall, he spontaneously reached out his hand to assist the fallen youngster.⁷² A second example given was the phenomenology of a smile,⁷³ and both of these would grow to be stock examples of intersubjectivity for Lonergan, illustrating the meaning of

⁷¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Time and Meaning," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 96.

⁷² Lonergan, "Time and Meaning," 96. The tale is familiar to students and scholars of Lonergan. The specific form of presentation changed over the years, but the content is always essentially the same as that given here in this lecture: "Leading up to the Borghese Gardens in Rome, where I usually go for my favorite walk, there is a ramp. Coming down the ramp was a small child running ahead of its mother. He started to trip and tumbled; I was a good twenty feet away but spontaneously I moved forward before taking any thought at all, as if to pick up the child."

⁷³ On Lonergan's phenomenology of a smile, see Lonergan, "Time and Meaning," 96–98.

intersubjectivity as a primordial unity prior to the distinction between two different subjects.

1.7.2. “THE MEDIATION OF CHRIST IN PRAYER”⁷⁴

While that sort of intersubjectivity preceded subjectivity, one year later and barely four years after clearly affirming a distinct fourth level, Lonergan was elaborating on subjects’ existential (fourth-level) disposition in “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” and he was heading in the direction of distinguishing a higher social and interpersonal context surrounding the subject in addition to the lower intersubjective basis.⁷⁵

He first distinguished different types of mediation. Mediation in general is the transmission of what is immediate in one part to other parts, in which it is mediated.⁷⁶ Mutual mediation occurs when two parts mediate to one another, as when, in a watch, a balance wheel regulates itself and all the other parts, including the mainspring, while the mainspring moves itself and all the other parts, including the balance wheel. Control is immediate in the balance wheel, but mediated in the mainspring, while movement is immediate in the mainspring, but mediated in the balance wheel.⁷⁷ Self-mediation can be

⁷⁴ Lonergan’s seminar on “Knowledge and Learning,” given at Gonzaga University, July 15–26, 1963, contained root material that would eventually find its way into both “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer” and “The Analogy of Meaning.” While the notes for the seminar are rich, they do not provide significant contributions for this study beyond what can be found in the two published pieces. See “Mediation,” 160 n 1, and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Analogy of Meaning,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 183 n 1.

⁷⁵ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 160–182.

⁷⁶ See his four examples of mechanical, organic, psychic, and logical mediation (Lonergan, “Mediation,” 163–164).

⁷⁷ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 165.

understood through “a whole that has consequences that change the whole.”⁷⁸ The growth of an organism reveals transitional and anticipatory characteristics that are intelligible only as characteristics of an organism that, through an impulse originating within itself, is in fact mediating its own self to itself. Significantly, Lonergan added that “one can apply the notion of mediation not only to the single organism but also to the species. The species may be said to mediate itself by the individuals.”⁷⁹

This thorough account of mediation also allowed him to suggest a difference between the self-mediation of the mere organism and an intentional self-mediation. The latter consists of three aspects, found in their summations: the summation of *acts* into one’s living, the summation of *objects* into one’s world, and “the summation of *subjects* into a ‘we’ who live together and perform all the operations of life, not singly as so many isolated monads but as a ‘we.’”⁸⁰ An intentional individual, further, can also be self-conscious, mediating autonomy by seeking to make of herself what she chooses to be.⁸¹ Such self-making “occurs within community, and particularly in the three fundamental communities: in the mutual self-commitment of marriage, in the overarching commitment to the state, and in the eschatological commitment to the church, the body of Christ, the New Law which is the grace of the Holy Spirit.”⁸² While human community is

⁷⁸ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 167.

⁷⁹ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 168.

⁸⁰ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 169–170, emphasis mine.

⁸¹ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 170–171.

⁸² Lonergan, “Mediation,” 172. As noted above (34 n 62), editorial note 14 in the CWL version of “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer” is an oversimplification (Lonergan, “Mediation,” 172). Although family, community, and God are first explicitly put together in such a short form in this 1963 article, a preliminary connection between the three was established as far back as 1951 in “The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World” and showed up again in 1958’s Halifax lectures. While in 1951 the three had to do with the good of order and in 1958 they were tied to the levels of consciousness, in “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer” they were fundamental communities and would soon develop into what Lonergan would consistently consider as three fundamental loves. This suggests a high probability that for Lonergan there is a connection between the good of order, the upward dynamism of individual subjectivity, and the notions

materially merely an aggregate of human beings, formally it is “an intentional reality” not only in the sense of knowing but also in the sense of decision and commitment, and such a community self-mediates in its history, just as an individual mediates himself in his own living. Thus, in addition to the prior intersubjectivity, there is an interpersonal connection following on decision and commitment and manifested in history.

But this is not the summit of mediation. Lonergan pushed further, noting that “just as there is a self-mediation towards autonomy, and a mutual mediation illustrated by the organism or the functional whole that is not just a machine, so there is a mutual self-mediation.”⁸³ Mutual self-mediation occurs after the shift to commitment and deliberate self-constitution insofar as we are, in that self-constitution, “open to the influence of others, and others are open to influence from us.”⁸⁴ This openness takes place in romantic relationships, in marriage, as well as in education (at any age), parent-child relationships, cooperations of various kinds in professional or religious life, in the places one lives, and in political arrangements. It is perhaps best explored, he argued, by the novelist: “mutual self-mediation provides the inexhaustible theme of dramatists and novelists.”⁸⁵ It escapes abstract formulation and “lies [instead] in the immediate interpersonal situation which

of community and love. This link is supported by the material earlier in his career (his early discussions of love often took place in the context of a discussion of the social order, and clearly he understood love’s upward dynamism and potency as part of the solution to the deformations of the good of order manifested in social surds). It should not surprise us, then, that these three are structured in metaphysical terms as successively higher integrations in the good of order in 1951, as tied to *Insight*’s three levels of consciousness in 1958, and as three fundamental communities forming the social-historical and existential context of subjectivity here in 1963. Before long, this tendency will develop still further, with Lonergan coming to understand these fundamental forms of love as providing new horizons for subjectivity.

⁸³ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 174.

⁸⁴ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 175.

⁸⁵ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 176. See also 175.

vanishes when communication becomes indirect through books, through television programs, through teaching by mail.”⁸⁶

The grace of God, Lonergan elaborated, is in part a self-mediation: it is “the mediation by our acts of what is immediate in us through the grace of God.”⁸⁷ But this self-mediation is through Christ, and so it is not only a self-mediation, but a mutual self-mediation. He cautioned that this “is not a matter of simultaneous mutual influence,” but he also affirmed that “it is nonetheless a very real mutual self-mediation because Christ himself, as man, developed; he acquired human perfection,” the character of which was determined by his intention to develop *for us*.⁸⁸ This mutual-self mediation is developed, on our end, “on the level of what is lived,” not on the level of reflection.⁸⁹

1.7.3. “THE ANALOGY OF MEANING”

The “Analogy of Meaning” contained another discussion of intersubjective meaning, very much like that of the previous year’s “Time and Meaning,” but now with more of a theological reference and implication.⁹⁰ Built onto intersubjectivity can be common meaning and community,⁹¹ a position that hearkens back to FLM, with its discussion of the embedding of reason and freedom in a “field of natural spontaneity and infused virtue,”⁹² as well as to *Insight*, with its situating of intersubjectivity as the basis of

⁸⁶ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 176.

⁸⁷ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 180.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 180–181.

⁸⁹ Lonergan, “Mediation,” 181.

⁹⁰ Lonergan, “Analogy,” 188.

⁹¹ Lonergan, “Analogy,” 201.

⁹² Lonergan, FLM, 30.

the productions of human intelligence.⁹³ But beyond the positions Lonergan achieved in those works, where intersubjectivity formed the basis, root, or rudimentary context for the achievements of intelligence, here as in “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” interpersonal connection can also reside at the apex of human intelligence as a result of the deliberate and meaningful ties of human beings, one to another: “Besides the potential community and the community of knowledge, there are communities of commitment. The commitment may be absolute or relative, conditioned, qualified. Absolute commitment is represented by the family, the state, the church.”⁹⁴

In 1962 and 1963, Lonergan elaborated greatly on the intersubjective and interpersonal and tied them to his developing understanding of individual subjectivity. Not only did he acknowledge a lower intersubjective manifold out of which individual subjectivity rose; now he was very close to affirming a higher context for interpersonal activity constituted by deliberate interpersonal commitments. This clarified elements that, at the time of *Insight*, had been present but not completely spelled out, and it developed positions that began as far back as FLM.

⁹³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 237

⁹⁴ Lonergan, “Analogy,” 202. In the notes from the Gonzaga institute paralleling this section of “The Analogy of Meaning,” Lonergan had written a marginal comment that read, “Conditional, limited commitment, in subordinate communities: partnership, corporation, legal firm, medical profession, teacher or professor” (Lonergan, “Analogy,” 202 n 44). This indicates that he was realizing not only the undergirding aspect or role of intersubjectivity, and not only the fact of an interpersonal element transcending human subjects' exercise of intelligence, reason, and deliberation, but also that that transcending interpersonal element had varying degrees.

1.8. 1964

Two articles and a significant treatise on the Trinity from 1964 indicate the fruit of Lonergan's continuing work on love at the end of what I am identifying as the first stage of his development. In them, he brought to the intentionality analysis of love the earlier distinction between particular acts and a habit, he elaborated yet further on his understanding of community, and he delved deeply into his understanding of the presence of and union between lovers.

1.8.1. "*EXISTENZ AND AGGIORNAMENTO*"

The discussion in "*Existenz and Aggiornamento*"⁹⁵ involved a major distinction that would become central in Lonergan's future thought about love: "It is one thing to be in love, and another to discover that what has happened to you is that you have fallen in love. Being oneself is prior to knowing oneself."⁹⁶ This affirmation of a new being-in brought into the context of intentionality analysis the distinction between acts and habits by distinguishing between the "deeds and words" of one in love on the one hand, and "the prior conscious reality" of being in love, on the other.⁹⁷

For Lonergan, when this being in love is being in love with God, it sets up not only an orientation to God, but also a participation in God. Our conscious desire already orients us to God, but "in Christ Jesus we are not only referred to God, as to some omega

⁹⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "*Existenz and Aggiornamento*," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 222–231.

⁹⁶ Lonergan, "*Existenz and Aggiornamento*," 229.

⁹⁷ Lonergan, "*Existenz and Aggiornamento*," 229.

point, but we are on our way to God. The fount of our living is not *eros* but *agape*, not desire of an end that uses means but love of an end that overflows. . . . Those in Christ participate in the charity of Christ. . . .”⁹⁸ Where in FLM Lonergan had affirmed that there is an upward tendency from *eros* to friendship and from friendship to a charity that is an openness to a participation in the divine solution to the social deterioration through the mystical body of Christ, he was now reaffirming and drawing on that point as a way of articulating our openness for a new being-in that is a participation in God.

At this point, Lonergan inserted a distinction that illuminated the struggle to shift from the metaphysical horizon to the horizon of intentionality analysis: the distinction between a being-in Christ Jesus as merely a substance or as (more fully) a subject. Being in Christ as merely a substance leaves one with only faith through propositions, correct affirmations and deductions, and liturgical reinforcement of our efforts to form imagination and affect so that we might live in accord with the propositions, deductions, and judgments. It lacks an awareness of being in love with God *per se*: “quietly, imperceptibly, there goes forward the transformation operated by the *Kurios*, but the delicacy, the gentleness, the deftness, of his continual operation in us hides the operation from us.”⁹⁹

To the extent that being in love with Christ “is the being of a subject,” however, this hiddenness turns to revelation:

In ways you all have experienced, in ways some have experienced more frequently or more intensely than others, in ways you still have to experience, and in ways none of us in this life will ever experience, the substance in Christ

⁹⁸ Lonergan, “*Existenz and Aggiornamento*,” 230.

⁹⁹ Lonergan, “*Existenz and Aggiornamento*,” 231.

Jesus becomes the subject in Christ Jesus. For the love of God, being in love with God, can be as full and as dominant, as overwhelming and as lasting an experience as human love.¹⁰⁰

The priority ceases to be the propositions, the affirmations, the deductions, even the formation of the self, and it becomes instead the love of God experienced in the subject's own subjectivity. Propositions, affirmations, deductions, and formation, which still have a role to play, are placed within the higher horizon of a changed being-in.

Not only had Lonergan, at this point, much more fully elaborated on the conscious-intentional ramifications of love, but he had also reached the point of placing the love of God in Christ and human love together in the conversation. Here it is as though, rather than establishing any validity of human love vis-à-vis the love of God, he is in fact doing the opposite by affirming that being in love with God is no less an experience than being in love with another human being. Love was, at this point, clearly conscious for Lonergan—a conscious change of being that is a participation in God at the summit of our subjectivity and as a solution to social ills.

1.8.2. "PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS WITH REGARD TO KNOWING"

In "Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing,"¹⁰¹ an important discussion of community paralleled much of the content in the previous year's "The Analogy of Meaning." Where in that lecture Lonergan had suggested that a community needs

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, "*Existenz and Aggiornamento*," 231.

¹⁰¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 214–243.

common meaning, here he broke it down with reference to his analysis of conscious intentionality, such that a community needs a common field of experience, common understanding, and common judgments.¹⁰² But again, as in the previous year's article, there is a supervening element to community beyond common experience, understanding, and judgment, and that element is commitment: "In the last place, finally, there are the communities of commitment in which will enters in. There is a common will, whether founded on love as in the family, or loyalty as in the state, or faith as in religion."¹⁰³

Lonergan clearly placed such commitment on the fourth level ("a common will"), and this position was reaffirmed in an ensuing question and answer session. After a discussion of the possibility of "drift" at the fourth level, the following conversation ensued:

Q: Can you still be intelligent and drift?

L: Oh, yes.

Q: But without exercising the will rationally you'll keep on drifting?

L: Yes, usually with God's grace, as the relation comes in on the fourth level too.

Q: Then rational self-consciousness . . .

L: . . . is a fourth level.

Q: Does it equate with rational consciousness?

L: It's beyond it.

Q: Cooperating with grace?

¹⁰² Lonergan, "Philosophical Positions," 234. For the discussion in "The Analogy of Meaning," see 201 of that article, where his language was less focused than in the present text.

¹⁰³ Lonergan, "Philosophical Positions," 235.

L: Well, grace can come in anywhere, but particularly on the level of decision and choice.

Q: Even in rational consciousness?

L: It can come in there.¹⁰⁴

There is a lack of clarity here regarding the distinction between grace and our own native operations at the fourth level. Since affirming the distinct fourth level in 1959, Lonergan had referred primarily to our own native subjective operations, not to grace, when discussing the fourth level as such. Here, he placed the primary operation of grace on that fourth level, although he also acknowledged that “grace can come in anywhere.” Yet he had already affirmed that grace elevated subjectivity and that it was a higher, disproportionate realm. If grace comes into play primarily at the fourth level, with possible entry at other levels as well, and if all these levels are proportionate, then what or where is the elevation? It seems that, at best, Lonergan at this point lacked a clear, explanatory meaning for ‘elevation’ in terms of conscious-intentional analysis.

A similar issue arises with the new component of community he named “commitment.” Communities are grounded on commitment, but the three types of community he had come to emphasize—familial, civil, and religious—each had a peculiar type of commitment as ground: love for family, loyalty for civil, and faith for religious.¹⁰⁵ Yet while domestic love and civil loyalty would seem to be natural possibilities, religious faith certainly is not. Once again, there is lacking a clear, explanatory, conscious-intentional distinction that would untangle these elements.

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, “Philosophical Positions,” 240–241.

¹⁰⁵ Lonergan, “Philosophical Positions,” 234–235.

Such problems illustrate the sorts of questions that arose with the development of a new level. Once again, this is 1964—a full five years after Lonergan’s first explicit confession of the realm of decision and choice as a distinct fourth level—yet his interlocutor in the question session is unclear on the fourth level’s status, meaning, and relationship to the first three levels, and there are many elements tangled together and lacking sufficient distinction in Lonergan’s own discussions of the fourth level. Such exchanges and problems would recur—much more often, and often much more forcefully¹⁰⁶—when Lonergan began to refer to a ‘fifth level’ of consciousness.

1.8.3. *DE DEO TRINO: PARS SYSTEMATICA*

In *De Deo Trino*,¹⁰⁷ Lonergan combined his earlier insights into the procession of love and the presence of beloveds to one another with the analysis of presence in several previous articles.

1.8.3.1. *The Presence of the Beloved in the Lover*

In Part Two, Lonergan addressed the issue of the presence of the beloved in the lover. Relying on Thomas Aquinas, he argued first that besides the procession in the intellect, there is the procession of love in the will, “whereby the beloved is in the one

¹⁰⁶ This may be a function, less of a genuine increase in these sorts of questions with regard to the fifth level, and more of an increase in the number of question and answer sessions that were recorded and retained in the Lonergan Archives.

¹⁰⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 12 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007); originally published as *De Deo trino: Pars systematica, editio altera et recognita* (Romae: Universitatis Gregoriana, 1964). [*The Triune God: Systematics* will hereafter be abbreviated TGS.]

who loves, just as the reality spoken or understood is in the one who understands through the conception of the word.”¹⁰⁸ This presence of the beloved in the lover was a vital element of Lonergan’s understanding of love, extending back to the *verbum* articles and continuing to play a role in his analysis of love even in a context of intentionality analysis.

The central question at this point was for Lonergan whether “that reality which is named ‘the beloved in the lover’ . . . is really distinct from love and proceeds from love.”¹⁰⁹ As in the *verbum* articles, Lonergan’s focus in *De Deo Trino* was not on the argument between various groups of theologians, but on discovering Thomas’ own position on the question. While certain Thomist thinkers tended to say that the beloved in the lover is produced by love, Lonergan interpreted Aquinas as maintaining that the beloved in the lover is constituted by love.¹¹⁰ He demonstrated that for St. Thomas, although in the intellect the act of understanding results in the production of an inner word, this is not strictly paralleled in the will. For Aquinas and for Lonergan, the act of loving is itself constitutive of the presence of the beloved; it does not *produce* it as any sort of “inner beloved.”¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan, TGS, 219, referring to ST I, q27, a3 c.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, TGS, 221. His answer to this question laid groundwork that will help to explain some of the confusion surrounding the third, fourth, and fifth levels, their respective contents, and the intelligible interrelation of both the operations and their contents.

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, TGS, 221–23.

¹¹¹ See Lonergan, TGS, 229 and 623, where he quoted Aquinas (*De veritate*, q4, a2, ad 7m): “There is this difference between intellect and will: the operation of the will terminates at things, in which there is good and evil; but the operation of the intellect terminates in the mind, in which there is the true and the false, as is said in *Metaphysics* VI [lect. 4, 1240]. Consequently, the will does not have anything going forth from itself, except what is in it after the manner of an operation; but the intellect has in itself something that goes forth from itself, not only after the manner of an operation, but also after the manner of a reality that is the term of the operation.”

Later in the work, Lonergan revisited this point by more directly engaging the principle representative of the contrary view, John of St. Thomas, who held that “just as in the intellect there is a *processio operati*, there is likewise one within the will.”¹¹² Lonergan objected to this position because it “would result in the Holy Spirit being, not proceeding Love, but a term proceeding *from* love,” and he engaged in an extensive argument to show why John’s position must be mistaken, not just in terms of Aquinas’s meaning, but also in terms of an adequate understanding of the operations of the human subject.¹¹³

Love is the most fundamental act of will, it is a principle of unity “both by reason of the object and by reason of the act itself,” and “love is unitive by reason of its act inasmuch as the love in the lover is in a way the beloved in the lover.”¹¹⁴ As before, this is both similar to and yet different from the way the known is in the knower, with the similarity in terms of the conditions for actually being known or being loved,¹¹⁵ while the difference is

according to the way in which *being known* is in the knower and *being loved* is in the lover. *A man being known* is in the knower according to an intellective, an intentional, mode of being. But *a man being loved* is in the lover, not by way of

¹¹² Lonergan, TGS, 623.

¹¹³ Lonergan, TGS, 625.

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, TGS, 675.

¹¹⁵ “It is similar with respect to the conditions for the correspondence of truth. The statement, ‘This man is known,’ is true as long as there exists in someone an act of knowing this person. It is similarly true that ‘This man is loved’ as long as there exists in someone an act of loving this man. And so ‘being known’ and ‘being loved’ are not in the one known or loved but in the one who knows or loves” (Lonergan, TGS, 676–77).

an intentional representation, but by way of a real inclination and a quasi-identification.¹¹⁶

Love, then, is not intentional in the way that knowing is. It does not intend but involves the whole disposition of one's life, and it does not have its own inner word, but rather relies on the inner word presented to it from the intellect.¹¹⁷

1.8.3.2. The Presence of the Divine Persons and the Just to One Another

This understanding of the presence of the beloved in the lover allowed Lonergan to understand the indwelling of the divine persons in the just as being “in accord with the fact that through the grace that renders us pleasing God is in the just as the known in the knower and the beloved in the lover.”¹¹⁸ This being-in is linked not only with “the uncreated gift of God” but also with “our acts, by which we habitually keep Christ's commandments through love.”¹¹⁹

Lonergan's elaboration of this point involved a return to the analysis of presence already seen in 1959's Cincinnati lectures on education, but developed further into four types, instead of three. The first is again spatial proximity; the second was a development on the second type of presence in 1959, now become a “psychic adaptation” resulting from spatial proximity; the third was grounded in a psychic adaptation resulting from the capacity of free human subjectivity to go beyond mere spatial proximity and to imagine

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, TGS, 677.

¹¹⁷ Further discussion of this issue can be found in Lonergan, TGS, 783–85, where an appendix reproduces portions of *De Deo Trino*'s predecessor text, *Divinarum Personarum conceptio analogica*, which were eliminated when Lonergan edited the work for the 1964 edition (*De Deo Trino*).

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, TGS, 503.

¹¹⁹ Lonergan, TGS, 503.

the distant, the past, the future, etc.; and the fourth type of presence was an intentional presence, which goes beyond the level of sensitivity to that of the intellectual and was identified by Lonergan as “personal presence.”¹²⁰ In this fourth type of presence, the operations of intellect and love are necessarily habitual, leading to the development of habits of knowing and loving that are the foundations of knowledge of and union with another person.¹²¹

Using this analysis, Lonergan related the Trinity to human subjects in terms of personal presence and indwelling, arguing that in uniting the members of his body to himself, Christ also unites them with the Father, and the divine persons, those in heaven, and the just on earth are in one another as the known are in knowers and the beloved are in lovers.¹²² Although such indwelling is substantial in the case of the Trinitarian Persons and only “by way of intentional existence and the quasi-identification of love” in the just, this became the ground of Lonergan’s affirmation that the state of grace is social.¹²³ In virtue of the mutual indwelling, the state of grace is “a divine-human interpersonal situation” in which “the divine persons and the just are in one another as those who are known are in those who know them and those who are loved are in those who love them.”¹²⁴ It is a union of love, founded on divine proceeding love itself.

¹²⁰ The first, second, and third types of presence are discussed on Lonergan, TGS, 504. The fourth type is found on 505, where it is made clear that the fourth type is personal because the (personal) operations of intellect and love “are performed in the intellectual part of our being.”

¹²¹ Lonergan, TGS, 505.

¹²² Lonergan, TGS, 511.

¹²³ Lonergan, TGS, 511–517. Such a state requires “(1) the Father who loves, (2) the Son because of whom the Father loves, (3) the Holy Spirit by whom the Father loves and gives, and (4) the just, whom, because of the Son, the Father loves by the Holy Spirit, and to whom the Father gives by the Holy Spirit, and who consequently are endowed with sanctifying grace, whence flow the virtues and gifts, and who are thereby just and upright and ready to receive and elicit acts ordered towards eternal life.”

¹²⁴ Lonergan, TGS, 517.

1.9. SUMMARY OF PHASE ONE: 1943–1964

The period from 1943 to 1964 showed major shifts in language, but a gradual and consistent development of four fundamental points in Lonergan's understanding of love was clear: subjectivity is in potency for something beyond its own proportion; the actuation of that potency involves some sort of identification between subjects; that actuation is historical in nature; and that actuation changes the constitution of the world of human meaning.

It was clear in FLM that individual subjects are in potency to individual act, and that pluralities of individuals in act are in potency to social act. Love plays a constitutive role in this progression, forming the base potency of desire, serving as the principle of individual fulfillment of the desire, uniting groups of subjects in their pursuit of a good, and serving as the principle of the union achieved between subjects in their mutual attainment of the good. The course notes on grace presumed such vertical finality in their account of the social union that fulfills the potencies of individual subjectivity. *Insight* shifted to intentionality analysis, but in it Lonergan maintained the openness of individual subjectivity to an end higher than its own proportion: faith, hope, and love were higher conjugate forms. This point was reaffirmed in the Halifax lectures, and then in 1964, *De Deo Trino* elaborated still further on the higher interpersonal synthesis that once again presumed a potency for such union in the individual subject.

As indicated in both the 1951–52 course notes and *De Deo Trino*, the actuation of the individual potency for something disproportionate involves an interpersonal identification. The first hints of this were in FLM, but the *Verbum* articles began the highly focused account of the presence of the beloved in the lover. Again, the course

notes presumed this, and in 1959 Lonergan supplied the roots of the transposition of this point into the context of an intentionality analysis by offering a detailed analysis of presence. This was developed further in *De Deo Trino*, where it became clear that our “being-in” love with God is the same as God’s “being-in” us. Finally, a few years before, “Time and Meaning,” “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” and “The Analogy of Meaning” had all clarified a point that had been in the background of FLM when they distinguished between a primordial, root intersubjectivity, and a deliberate interpersonal realm at the apex of subjectivity, which could be significantly developed in terms of mediation.

Stretching through the materials that were composed in the earlier scholastic style is the notion that the self-communication of God, which brings about this interpersonal actuation of individual potency, occurs in history in the world of human meaning. FLM, the *Verbum* articles, the 1951–52 notes, and *De Deo Trino* are all unified on this point. On the other hand, the works that are in or are at least heading for an intentionality analysis focused on the results of the divine self-communication in their affirmation that the higher synthesis changes individual subjectivity and the constitution of the human world. This and the previous emphasis on the entry of God into history work together as different points of view: one, from the top down, and the second, from the bottom up.

What is clear from all of this earlier material is the unity that obtains for Lonergan between individual subjectivity, a higher integration of individuals, the social/historical character of that integration, and the changes in the constitution of the world that result from that integration. Our subjectivity cries out for something more, and that something

more is provided to us in an interpersonal relationship with one another and with God that remakes history and reconstitutes our world.

2. DEVELOPING THE SHIFT TO INTERIORITY: 1965 TO NOVEMBER, 1972

The second phase of Lonergan's development on love began in May of 1965 with his use, in "Dimensions of Meaning," of a set of images that expressed the content of his shift to interiority analysis. These and similar recurring images depicted a successive movement from complete lack of awareness, through a gradual entrance into and progression through the world of meaning, to a culmination in an interpersonal, communal, historical, concrete situation of love with cosmic and divine connections.

Although such imagery differed from Lonergan's largely scholastic mode of expression in the earlier phase, the four themes from the first phase were still present in the second phase, albeit in transposed formulations. Instead of potency, the second phase emphasized that limitations in individual subjectivity and issues of authenticity and unauthenticity offered an opening for the work of love and grace. Instead of actuation of a potency, the second phase emphasized that individual subjective experience finds its fulfillment in an interpersonal situation of love and, often, grace. While such fulfillment remained concrete and historical, in the second phase Lonergan went further to affirm that it offers a cosmic connection and an interpersonal relationship with the divine persons of Father, Son, and Spirit.

Along with this development and transposition more fully into the realm of interiority and the third stage of meaning, and in part because of it, difficulties arose in understanding the relation that obtains between individual subjectivity and its historical, interpersonal fulfillment in the state of being in love. Inconsistencies entered into Lonergan's positions on the characteristics of the fulfillment, to which level it might correspond, and whether or not it—or various aspects of it—were to be understood as

higher than the level of deliberation or as residing at that level. It appears that a cause for these difficulties can be deduced, but that alone does not solve the problem presented by this phase of Lonergan's development on love.

2.1. 1965

“Dimensions of Meaning”¹ developed themes with roots in “*Existenz* and *Aggiornamento*” and “Time and Meaning.” The interiority analysis in those two articles was now expressed in images of human beings' successive entry into the world of meaning:

Insofar as one is lost in dreamless sleep, or lies helpless in a coma, then meaning is no part of one's being. As long as one is an infant, etymologically a nontalker, one is busy learning to develop, differentiate, combine, group in ever broader syntheses one's capacities for operation in the movements of head and mouth, neck and arms, eyes and hands, in mastering the intricacies of standing on one's feet, then of tottering from one spot to another. When first hearing and speech develop, they are directed to present objects, and so meaning initially is confined to a world of immediacy, to a world no bigger than the nursery, and seemingly no better known because it is not merely experienced but also meant. . . .

¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Dimensions of Meaning,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 232–246.

So we come to live, not as the infant in a world of immediate experience, but in a far vaster world that is brought to us through the memories of other men, through the common sense of the community. . . .²

Lonergan had already conceived of each lower level as open to the one above it, particularly in the case of individual subjectivity being open to the higher realm of community, but here in 1965, this was done in an intentionality analysis that focused on the experience of the subject through various forms of consciousness, up to and including the realm of community. Imagery of this progressive type became a repeated tool of Lonergan's for at least the next eight years, marking the difference between what I am distinguishing as the first and second stages of his development on love.

2.2. 1968

Four articles in 1968 differentiated and elaborated upon the basic meaning of this image. They introduced the notion that the various levels of consciousness could be understood as subsuming one another, suggested that individual intentional consciousness heads for a communal horizon with epistemological implications, affirmed a distinction between a state of being in love and individual acts of love, and put forward a distinction between unrestricted love and restricted instances of love. A further contribution at a Boston College seminar made clear that Lonergan had begun to differentiate clearly the

² Lonergan, "Dimensions of Meaning," 232–233. "Dimensions of Meaning" is the first published use of this sort of successive, serial imagery. However, it should be noted that a similar set of images can be found in Lonergan's notes for the 1963 Gonzaga University institute, "Knowledge and Learning," in which he listed "dreams, empirical, intellectual, rational consciousness; self-consciousness" (Lonergan Research Institute Library).

identification of the realm of the religious from the identification of other elements of intentional consciousness.

2.2.1. "THE SUBJECT"

"The Subject"³ contained the first 1968 appearance of the imagery of succession: We are subjects, as it were, by degrees. At a lowest level, when unconscious in dreamless sleep or in a coma, we are merely potentially subjects. Next, we have a minimal degree of consciousness and subjectivity when we are the helpless subjects of our dreams. Thirdly, we become experiential subjects when we awake, when we become the subjects of lucid perception, imaginative projects, emotional and conative impulses, and bodily action. Fourthly, the intelligent subject sublates the experiential, i.e., it retains, preserves, goes beyond, completes it, when we inquire about our experience, investigate, grow in understanding, express our inventions and discoveries. Fifthly, the rational subject sublates the intelligent and experiential subject, when we question our own understanding, check our formulations and expressions, ask whether we have got things right, marshal the evidence *pro* and *con*, judge this to be so and that not to be so. Sixthly, finally, rational consciousness is sublated by rational self-consciousness, when we deliberate, evaluate, decide, act. Then there

³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Subject," in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 69–86.

emerges human consciousness at its fullest. Then the existential subject exists and his character, his personal essence, is at stake.⁴

Here, the relation between levels is first characterized as one of sublation. For Lonergan, this meant that that which sublates “retains, preserves, goes beyond, completes” that which is sublated. It is Hegel’s notion of sublation, in which a lower is “retained, preserved, yet transcended and completed by a higher,” but without Hegel’s suggestion that the sublation reconciles a contradiction in the lower.⁵

2.2.2. “HORIZONS”

The article “Horizons”⁶ presented a second 1968 version of the imagery: One can live in a world, have a horizon, just in the measure that one is not locked up totally within oneself. The first step in this liberation is the sensitivity we share with the higher animals. But while they are confined to a habitat, we live within a universe, because beyond sensitivity we question, and our questioning is unrestricted.

First, there are questions for intelligence. We ask what and why and how and how often. . . .

On questions for intelligence follow questions for reflection. . . . [where] self-transcendence takes on a new meaning; it not merely goes beyond the subject but also seeks what is independent of the subject. . . .

⁴ Lonergan, “The Subject,” 80.

⁵ Lonergan, “The Subject,” 80.

⁶ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Horizons,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 10–29.

Still, such self-transcendence is only intentional, only cognitional; it is in the order not of doing but only of knowing. On the final level of questions, questions for deliberation, self-transcendence ceases to be intentional and becomes real. . . .⁷ That self-transcendence is the possibility of benevolence and beneficence, of willing what is truly good and doing it, of collaboration and true love, of swinging completely out of the habitat of an animal and of becoming a genuine person in a human society.⁸

The main textual difference between the account given in “The Subject” and that given in “Horizons” is found in their respective endings. While the earlier account ended with the focus still on the individual (“there emerges human consciousness at its fullest. . . the existential subject exists and his character, his personal essence, is at stake”), in the second version such “personal essence” and fullness of human consciousness were situated in a higher context, where real or moral self-transcendence is the possibility of entry into a new realm in which benevolence and beneficence become possible, as do the attainment of the truly good, collaboration, love, genuine personhood, and entry into human society.

Alongside these subtle shifts in the successive imagery, other elements of Lonergan’s understanding of love began to emerge in “Horizons.” This article introduced a reference to Blaise Pascal’s “reasons of the heart” as a way of articulating the difference between the knowledge of love and cognitive knowledge:

There is a knowledge born of love. Of it Pascal spoke when he remarked that the heart has reasons which reason does not know, *le coeur a ses raisons que la*

⁷ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 12 n 2.

⁸ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 11–12.

raison ne connaît pas. Here by reason I would understand the compound of the activities of the first three levels of intentional consciousness, namely, of experiencing, of understanding, and of factual judging. By the heart's reasons I would understand feelings that are intentional responses to values; and I would recall the two aspects of such responses, the absolute aspect, inasmuch as the feeling is a recognition of value, and the relative aspect, inasmuch as feelings express preference of some values over others. Finally, by the heart I understand the subject on the fourth, existential level of intentional consciousness and in the dynamic state of being in love.⁹

Lonergan's transposition of Pascal's comment suggested that the state of being in love affords a new window through which we can know in a way that is not reducible to the kind of knowing achieved through only experience, understanding, and judging. This becomes clear when one simply removes the terms 'heart,' 'reasons,' and 'reason' in the translation of Pascal's original statement and inserts Lonergan's transpositions of those terms: *The subject on the fourth, existential level of intentional consciousness and in the dynamic state of being in love has feelings that are intentional responses to values which the compound of the activities of the first three levels of intentional consciousness, namely of experiencing, of understanding, and of factual judging, doesn't know.*

The door to this new, higher, way of knowing is opened by the dynamic state of being in love. Lonergan noted that "such being in love may be total,"¹⁰ indicating negatively that total being-in-love isn't the only situation that qualifies as a being-in-love that would give a new knowledge. But total being-in-love is exceptional:

⁹ Lonergan, "Horizons," 19–20.

¹⁰ Lonergan, "Horizons," 20.

It is without conditions, reserves, qualifications; it is otherworldly, for only idolatry would bestow it on anyone or anything of this world; it is a state reached through the exercise of vertical liberty, the liberty that chooses, not among objects within a horizon but between different horizons, different mentalities, different outlooks. It is a state that, once reached, is distinct from, prior to, and principle of subsequent judgments of value and acts of loving. It is the fulfillment of man's capacity for self-transcendence, and as fulfillment it brings a deep-set joy and a profound peace. It radiates through the whole of one's living and acting, opening one's horizon to the full, purifying one's intentional responses to values, rectifying one's scale of preference, underpinning one's judgments of value, simplifying issues by moving them to a deeper level, and strengthening one to achieve the good in the face of evil.¹¹

At this point, Lonergan appeared to be indicating that this unrestricted state of being-in-love is the fulfillment of individual subjectivity's capacities for self-transcendence. It is not completely clear here whether the fulfilling capabilities are a property of *unrestricted* being-in-love or whether they are a property of being-in-love as such, but the arrangement of the material in "Horizons" suggests the former.

The characteristics of unrestricted being-in-love articulated here became recurring elements of Lonergan's account of love as the fulfillment of transcendental intending. The lack of conditions and otherworldliness, the connection to vertical liberty, the change in horizons, its role as principle of subsequent activities, its fulfilling capacities, the deep-set joy and profound peace it gives, and its healing and strengthening qualities all

¹¹ Lonergan, "Horizons," 20.

resurfaced as love was repeatedly presented as the culmination of individual subjectivity.¹²

This culmination or fulfillment was both religious and communal:

Such being-in-love is religious. . . . But however personal and intimate, it is not solitary. It can be given to many, and the many can recognize in one another a common orientation in their living and feeling, in their criteria and their goals.

From a common communion with God, there springs the religious community.¹³

The religious community is not abstract, but instead “invites expression” in diverse concrete forms that remain over time because “communities endure.”¹⁴ This alone makes them historical, but there was an even more important sense in which a community might be historical:

The total loving of ultimate concern has the character of a response; it is an answer to a divine initiative. And the divine initiative may be not only the act of creation and conservation but also a personal entrance into human history and a

¹² Such elements would be further clarified by the exchanges at question sessions, such as this one from his presentation of “Horizons”:

“Q: How do you distinguish different kinds of love, especially otherworldly love from this-worldly love?”

“L: There is loving God with your whole heart, your whole soul, with all your mind and all your strength. That is from the Old and New Testament. It is a love without conditions or qualifications or reserve. Insofar as it is without any qualification or condition or reserve, it is something absolute in its character, totally and in every respect. To love any creature in that fashion would be idolatry. It is God’s gift to us, St. Paul, Romans 5:5: ‘The love of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given to us.’ Now in that love it is common to distinguish two phases: operative and cooperative. Operative is represented by what you say: St. Peter saying at the Last Supper, ‘Lord, if everyone should deny you, at least I won’t deny you’; and cooperative, when St. Peter underwent martyrdom. He not only professed it but he did it.

“Q: What do you mean by otherworldly love?”

“L: When I say it is otherworldly I mean its object is not some creature, something of this world. I don’t say it doesn’t occur in this life; I say it does occur in this life. I say it is in anyone in the state of sanctifying grace, though I don’t say that anyone in the state of sanctifying grace is skillful enough at psychological introspection to detect it” (Lonergan, “Horizons,” 26–27).

¹³ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 20.

¹⁴ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 20–21.

communication of God to his people. Such was the religion of Israel. Such has been Christianity. . . .

[Then, faith] becomes harkening to the word of Emmanuel, of God-with-us. The history of its origins and developments becomes doctrine as well as narrative; faith is also belief. As a subject grasped by ultimate concern can discern others similarly grasped, so too it can discern God's expression of his total love.¹⁵

The historicity of the community grounded on being-in-love gives the subjects in that community a new window on truths, a new way of discerning—it has, in other words, epistemological implications that draw on Pascal's "heart's reasons":

I have been describing faith as the eye of otherworldly love, and doctrinal faith as the recognition of God's own love. Such recognition is on the level of personal encounter. Its formula is Newman's device: *Cor ad cor loquitur*, heart speaketh to heart. It is true that God's word comes to us not immediately but only through the religious community. But the community, as a fellowship of love at the service of mankind, is the sign raised up among the nations, and its members speaking from the heart will speak effectively to those whose hearts the Spirit fills.

Faith, then, subsists and is propagated on a level quite beyond philosophy, or history, or human science; they are the work of Pascal's reason, of experience, understanding, and judgment. But faith is the eye of otherworldly love, and the love itself is God's gift; it is on the level of feelings, values,

¹⁵ Lonergan, "Horizons," 21.

beliefs, actions, personal encounters, community existence, community action, and community tradition.¹⁶

Because it occurs through personal encounter, it involves

the intersubjective relation between two or more intending subjects. . . . ‘I’ and ‘thou’ constitute a ‘we’ to make our plans, do our work, develop ourselves. This relationship is not subject-to-object but subject-to-subject. Now, there is something similar in total, and so otherworldly, being-in-love, for it puts the existential subject in a personal relationship to God. It is not a relationship to God as object, for it is prior to all objectification, whether in judgments of value or beliefs or decisions or words or deeds. It is not similar to human intersubjectivity, for that is between persons with a common horizon; but this being-in-love determines the horizon of total self-transcendence by grounding the self and its self-transcendence in the divine lover whose love makes those he loves in love with him, and so with one another. Beyond human intersubjectivity, then, there is a subject-to-subject relationship that is unique and that differs from human intersubjectivity much more than resembles it.¹⁷

All of this material shows that, in “Horizons,” Lonergan suggested that the enlargements of horizon indicated by his sequential imagery could find their fulfillment in a community. Such communal fulfillment would carry with it epistemological

¹⁶ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 21. Note that Lonergan wanted to protect against the notion that such higher knowing is unreasonable: “to say that faith subsists and is propagated on a level beyond experience, understanding, and judgment in no way implies that faith is without experience, understanding, and judgment. The higher levels of man’s intentional consciousness do not suppress but presuppose and complement the lower” (Lonergan, “Horizons,” 21–22).

¹⁷ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 22–23.

implications, opening the horizon of knowing to include objects of knowledge not reducible to the contents of experiencing, understanding, and judging.

2.2.3. “NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD”

“Natural Knowledge of God,”¹⁸ a third article from 1968, provided a short summary of the levels (“there is a level of experiencing, a level of understanding and conception, a level of reflection and judgment, a level of deliberation and decision”¹⁹), but here Lonergan focused more on the unity underlying the levels than he did on the progression from one to the next,²⁰ noting that each level is but a stage in the one progression of self-transcendence:

What is the intellectual but an intentional self-transcendence? . . . With the moral a further step is taken, for by the moral we come to know and to do what is truly good. That is a real self-transcendence. . . . What, finally, is religion but complete self-transcendence? It is the love of God poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that is given to us (Rom. 5:5). . . . That love is not this or that act of loving but a radical being-in-love, a first principle of all one’s thoughts and words and deeds and omissions, a principle that keeps us out of sin, that moves

¹⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Natural Knowledge of God,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 117–134.

¹⁹ Lonergan, “Natural Knowledge of God,” 127.

²⁰ Touching on the latter point, Lonergan merely observed that “we are moved, promoted from one level to the next by questions; from experiencing to understanding by questions for intelligence; from understanding to judging by questions for reflection; from judging to deciding by questions for deliberation” (Lonergan, “Natural Knowledge of God,” 127).

us to prayer and to penance, that can become the ever so quiet yet passionate center of all our living. . . .²¹

The complete being-in-love, the gift of God's grace, is the reason of the heart that reason does not know. It is a religious experience by which we enter into a subject-to-subject relation with God. It is the eye of faith that discerns God's hand in nature and his message in revelation. It is the efficacious reality that brings men to God despite their lack of learning or their learned errors. It is in this life the crown of human development, grace perfecting nature, the entry of God into the life of man so that man comes to love his neighbor as himself.²²

In "Natural Knowledge of God," the unity of individual consciousness stretches out toward its fulfillment in a "subject-to-subject relation with God." Such a relation with God is the reason of the heart, the eye of faith, an efficacious reality effecting the relation itself, the culminating point toward which our desires strive, and God's entry into our world to make our world one of neighbor loving neighbor.

²¹ He continued here with elements already seen: "It is, whatever its degree, a being-in-love that is without conditions or qualifications or reserves, and so it is other-worldly, a being-in-love that occurs within this world but heads beyond it, for no finite object or person can be the object of unqualified, unconditional loving. Such unconditional being-in-love actuates to the full the dynamic potentiality of the human spirit with its unrestricted reach and, as a full actuation, it is fulfillment, deep-set peace, the peace the world cannot give, abiding joy, the joy that remains despite humiliation and failure and privation and pain."

²² Lonergan, "Natural Knowledge of God," 128–130, my emphases.

2.2.4. SEMINAR ON “TRANSCENDENTAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE STUDY OF RELIGION,”
BOSTON COLLEGE

This seminar highlighted the four themes seen in the four articles from this year. The distinction of a state of love from acts of love,²³ the epistemological reshaping of horizons in love,²⁴ the use of sublation,²⁵ and the distinction of unrestricted from restricted love²⁶ were all mentioned at one point or another during this seminar. Beyond these four themes, further contributions were made on the issues of the distinction of two sorts of intersubjectivity—one prior to intentional subjectivity and one resulting from intentional subjectivity—and the clear differentiation of the means of identifying the state of being in love from the means by which are identified other elements in conscious-intentional experience.

Lonergan distinguished between “a ‘we’ that results from friendship, associations, comrades, collaboration, being in love” and “a prior ‘we’ that is prior to the distinction

²³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Horizons and Categories,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 483 (lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 486 (48600A0E060)]); Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Analysis of Meaning and Introduction to Religion,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 550 (lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Thursday, 11 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 491 (49100A0E060) and 492 (49200A0E060)]); and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 559 (lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Friday, 12 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 493 (49300A0E060)]).

²⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Human Good and Values,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 506 (lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Tuesday, 9 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 487 (48700A0E060) and 488 (48800A0E060)]); and Lonergan, “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion,” 559–560.

²⁵ Lonergan, “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion,” 560.

²⁶ Lonergan, “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion,” 558; and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Discussion 2,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 582–583 (question session as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 485 (48500A0E060)]).

between ‘I’ and ‘thou.’”²⁷ Such a prior ‘we’ is “as though we were all members of one another before we started distinguishing each from the other.”²⁸ Although he used the term ‘intersubjectivity’ for both, Lonergan clearly affirmed a distinction between a ‘we’ prior to subjectivity and a ‘we’ following on subjective and deliberate collaboration.

Of more significance was his differentiation of the means of identifying religious experience and grace from the means by which other elements of conscious intentionality are identified. Generally, he suggested that “there are many ways in which people talk about religious experiencing, and I think that each one should reflect on his own life, and become aware of how the grace of God has been acting in it; in that way one will arrive at an account of religious experience that means something to him.”²⁹ Lonergan developed the same point further and more forcefully in a discussion session:

Aquinas . . . said that you can’t have scientific knowledge of the fact that you are in the state of grace, and I imagine that it is the same thing with regard to the supernaturality of your faith, because supernaturality means an intrinsic ordination of the act to the divine essence or the beatific vision. . . . However, as conjectural—“By their fruits you shall know them”—you can have good grounds for believing that you are in the state of grace in which your faith is supernatural, from its fruits.

Q: So you can experience the effects of grace?

²⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Beliefs and Carriers of Meaning,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 517 (lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Wednesday, 10 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 489 (48900A0E060) and 490 (49000A0E060)]).

²⁸ Lonergan, “Beliefs and Carriers of Meaning,” 517.

²⁹ Lonergan, “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion,” 559.

L: Yes. And it is manifested in your living, in your convictions. . . . The thing I'm taking is not belief and not even faith but charity. . . . It is something that develops with the development of the spiritual life. It becomes more conscious over time. . . . Reflecting on your own life, over time especially, seeing the things that moved you one way and another and why you acted as you did: in that way you discover grace acting in your life.

Q: But I'm never present to grace as I am to experience, understanding, judging, deciding?

L: No. It is not the same way. It is something much more fundamental in you—"You have not chosen me, I have chosen you."

Q: In other words, there is some deduction in there?

L: No—some analysis, some finding out that you are not alone. It is the sort of thing that has been neglected, first of all, because Scholasticism has been terrifically objectivist; and secondly, because this technique of heightening of consciousness of what is going on in oneself is extremely difficult.

Q: Can you think of it as the new *esse*?

L: Do not think of it that way. In other words, think of it as on the subjective side, think of it in terms of contrasts: the trivialization of human life, where the religious part of man is ignored; or the fanatical pursuit of finite ends, where religious is taking a wrong manifestation. . . .³⁰

³⁰ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Discussion 2," *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 580–582 (question session as part of a seminar on "Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion" [Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 485 (48500A0E060)]).

In his exchange with this interlocutor, Lonergan clearly differentiated the way in which one is present to grace in one's life, to the state of being in love unrestrictedly, from the way in which one is present to the operations of intentional consciousness as he typically discussed them.

2.2.5. "THEOLOGY AND MAN'S FUTURE"

A fourth article from 1968, "Theology and Man's Future,"³¹ lacked the successive imagery up through individual consciousness, but it did elaborate on the character of the love that resides at the summit of subjectivity, highlighting the "profound difference between particular acts of loving and the dynamic state to which we refer when we speak of falling in love and of being in love."³² This state, not the individual acts, is the principle of further acts of love, but the state is complex, not simple, as indicated by Lonergan's return to the three-fold distinction within love.³³ Yet again, this distinction was not simply between three equivalent forms of love, but between two forms that are limited and a third which is unlimited: "All authentic being-in-love is a total self-surrender. But the love of God is not restricted to particular areas of human living."³⁴ While Lonergan's affirmation that "all authentic being-in-love is a total self-surrender" leaves one wondering about the clarity with which he distinguished unrestricted love

³¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 135–148.

³² Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," 145.

³³ Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," 145: "There is being-in-love with the domestic community, with one's mate and one's children. There is being-in-love with the civil community, eagerly making one's contribution to its needs and promoting its betterment. There is being-in-love with God. Of this love St. Paul spoke when he wrote to the Romans: 'The love of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Spirit of God who has been given to us' (Rom. 5:5)."

³⁴ Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," 145–146.

from restricted instances of self-surrender, still this made it clear that earlier elements were continuing to develop.

The role of love as principle of further operation and as the fulfillment of the capacities of transcendental intending was expressed differently in this article, through Lonergan's use of the term holiness:

There exists, then, in man a capacity for holiness, a capacity for love that, in its immediacy, regards not the ever-passing shape of this world but the mysterious reality, immanent and transcendent, that we name God. Deeply hidden, intensely personal, this love is not so private as to be solitary. The Spirit is given to many, and the many form a community. The community endures over generations, spreads over different nations, adapts to cultural changes. It acquires a history of its origins, its development, its successes and failures, its happy strokes and its mistakes.³⁵

Clearly, such holiness was the fulfillment of which Lonergan had already spoken, and which he recognized here as classically expressed by Augustine: "God had made us for himself and . . . our hearts are restless till they rest in him."³⁶ In "Theology and Man's Future," then, Lonergan reaffirmed the distinction between a prior state of love and particular acts of love as well as the distinction between unrestricted and restricted loves.

³⁵ Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," 146.

³⁶ Lonergan, "Theology and Man's Future," 146–147. He elaborated: "What that restlessness is, we see all about us in the mountainous discontents, hatreds, and terrors of the twentieth century. But what it is to rest in God is not easily known or readily understood. Though God's grace is given to all, still the experience of resting in God ordinarily needs a religious tradition for it to be encouraged, fostered, interpreted, guided, developed. Though grace bestows both good will and good performance, still one shrinks and draws back from the performance of denying oneself daily and taking up one's cross and following Christ. For the fulfillment that is the love of God is not the fulfillment of any appetite or desire or wish or dream impulse, but the fulfillment of getting beyond one's appetites and desires and wishes and impulses, the fulfillment of self-transcendence, the fulfillment of human authenticity, the fulfillment that overflows into a love of one's neighbor as oneself."

He also indicated that the fulfillment of individual consciousness consists in holiness, and it becomes clear that not only is such holiness fulfilling, but it is also intimately related to community and to a knowledge of the heart.

2.3. 1969

At the 1969 Method in Theology Seminar at Regis College, Lonergan indicated the superiority of the religious horizon and its cosmic, universal, import, while also clouding the issue of this horizon's relation to the levels of consciousness. Both "Faith and Beliefs" and "The Future of Christianity" further contributed to this confusion.

2.3.1. METHOD IN THEOLOGY SEMINAR, REGIS COLLEGE

The question periods from the Method in Theology Seminar in July of 1969 clarified and deepened some of the positions Lonergan had developed to this point, while also making interpretation of his views on the levels of consciousness more difficult. On the evening of July 8,³⁷ he affirmed that "theological foundations or horizons [are] superior to or normative of other life horizons that a person might have." By way of clarification, he added that "fundamentally, the horizon is Romans 5:5, through the Holy Spirit given to us, God's love that has flooded our hearts." Such a horizon, as the fulfillment of transcendental intending, must stand at the summit of subjectivity and therefore cannot be subject to the restrictions of any other horizon.

³⁷ 51800DTE060.

As earlier material has already shown, this horizon is intrinsically communal and has to do with interpersonal relations. Lonergan attempted to further clarify the link between horizons and interpersonal relations when he was asked why the functional specialty Dialectic was positioned at the fourth level:

Because it's the level of decision, the level of encounter with other persons.

What you're encountering is the past, and that means the people down the ages that have been witnesses to Christ—whatever principle of selection you may have in your church. Fundamentally, that whole first phase is an encounter with persons, a learning from them, carrying on a religious tradition in a very serious way that the study of theology is. . . . But besides data and their meanings and movements, you're also meeting persons, and you're being confronted with the problem of decision and commitment, because they are opposed to one another. You're clarifying for yourself the nature and the alternatives of the commitment you're proposing to make, and that's what makes it the fourth level.³⁸

This answer highlighted the difficulties at this point in Lonergan's development. Whereas he had previously seemed to situate interpersonal community above the level of decision, he now situated it *at* the level of decision. This positioning was not unknown in his development, however, and he had placed 'encounter' as the mediated object of Dialectic just a few years before.³⁹ Thus, it appears that by July of 1969, Lonergan had not reached a consistent position on the situating of the interpersonal with respect to the levels.

³⁸ 51800DTE060.

³⁹ See 47200D0E060, Lonergan's notation of his breakthrough to functional specialization, dated February 5, 1965.

Related questions, clarifying the relationship of beauty and *complacentia boni* to our transcendental intending, arose on the evening of July 10.⁴⁰ Lonergan affirmed beauty's status as a transcendental, even in terms of his intentionality analysis, but he qualified that beauty was a transcendental

in terms of developing consciousness, and consciousness at a level in which the higher reaches, the higher concerns, such as truth, reality, value are apprehended through the sensible and are, as it were, a sort of plus to the harmony, the unity, the balance, and so on, that is found in the sensible or the denial of them. . . .

Beauty is self-transcendence expressed through the sensible. . . . [It is] something very human; it is the whole put together.⁴¹

Complacentia boni enters with reference to this "whole." While *complacentia* is the rest achieved in the dynamic state of being in love that is sought in the subject's striving for the good,⁴² it is linked to the order of the whole as well:

Q: If I make a statement such as 'That is a good tree,' without committing myself one way or the other, what sort of judgment is that? What level would it belong to?

L: A good tree? Because it gives you apples, and you like eating apples? Or it's a beautiful tree? Or it's a good thing that there are trees? What do you mean?

You approve the order of the universe?

⁴⁰ 52200DTE060.

⁴¹ 52200DTE060.

⁴² 52200DTE060: First, "The *complacentia* is what you want insofar as what you want is value; you are moving towards what is to be loved." Second, the rest of *complacentia* "is after you have achieved; that is after you are in love. The dynamic state of being in love. . . ."

Q: I'm trying to take the bland use of the word 'value' in contemporary terms about value judgments and to see whether the schema that you've given us can handle it, and if so how.

L: Well, it is by self-appropriation. The man who answers it is the man that has moved to self-appropriation on the level of the question for deliberation. Is it worthwhile? You don't mean, Is it good to eat? Will it favor us white, English-speaking North Americans, and so on? Those are all things that are beside that. It's what you don't mean. What is this 'Is it worthwhile?' It expresses a transcendental notion, something towards which one is tending and one does not get to it yet. Just as when you ask why and you don't know why; but you want to know why. . . .

Q: Essentially, then, everything that can legitimately be called a value judgment belongs on the fourth level.

L: Yes.

Q: So you weren't joking there: the value judgment would be that you approve the order of the universe in saying this is a good tree.

L: Yes.

Q: Would that imply that really my place in the order is good?

L: Well, if you get into the order of the universe, you take the whole thing.⁴³

In seeking after the good, in striving for *complacentia*, the subject is seeking after a link to the order of the whole universe. Beauty was identified as "self-transcendence expressed through the sensible" and *complacentia* as the state of self-transcendence that

⁴³ 52200DTE060.

is sought in the striving for the good and achieved in the dynamic state of being in love. The good, at its fullest, has to do with the proper situating of the good thing and the subject affirming the good thing into their respective roles within the order of the whole universe. Beauty is thus the sensible expression of the proper situation of things within the order of the whole universe, and because self-transcendence is fully achieved in love and such achievement is the proper situating of the subject within the order of the universe, then beauty is linked to love: it is the sensible expression of the proper divine order achieved in love.

In further discussion of love as the achievement of self-transcendence, Lonergan identified a distinction between “the self qua transcended and the self qua transcending.” The self that is transcended is “the self that isn’t yet in love; it is the self that seeks satisfactions and doesn’t worry too much about values; it’s qua seeking satisfaction and neglecting value; it is the self insofar as it is trapped by some image about what it is to know.”⁴⁴ Note the steps in Lonergan’s account: there is a self that is not yet in *love*, there is a self that is mistaken in its striving for *values*, and there is a self that is mistaken about what it is to *know*. While his reference was most likely to conversion—religious, moral, and intellectual—still here again, love was distinguished from the level of values. While this is certainly not clear evidence of Lonergan affirming a *level* of love above the level of value, it is suggestive that the levels of value and knowing were related vertically and he did not identify a difference between the relations between knowing and valuing, on the one hand, and valuing and loving, on the other.

⁴⁴ 52200DTE060.

Finally, although the love that fulfills transcendental intending is experienced, it is experienced in a special way:

I think an experience of (I would say) mystery lies in a fulfillment of the transcendental notions, of what you are in virtue of the transcendental notions. . . . The gift of that love is something conscious but we cannot say what it is; it is mystery. But it is loving, and it is loving in an unrestricted manner; it corresponds to the unrestricted character of the transcendental notions. . . . Have you read Rahner on St. Ignatius and consolation without a cause? Well, that's the sort of thing I would call an experience of God.⁴⁵

A questioner pressed this point the following evening (July 11),⁴⁶ asking about the content of the love with which our hearts are flooded, to which Lonergan responded:

It has a content, but it hasn't got an object; this is Rahner's way of putting it. This is how he puts it in *The Dynamic Element in the Church*.⁴⁷ Here he discusses this consolation without any cause that Ignatius talks about as the discernment of spirits; and he says that 'without a cause' means without an object. Insofar as it is unrestricted it is out of this world; it is otherworldly; there are no conditions or qualifications to that love, and it is with all one's heart and soul and mind and strength. Because it is conscious without being known, it is mystery; you can call its object mystery. Because it is love it is fascinating; because it is unrestricted it is *tremendum*; it is awe as well as love.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ 52200DTE060.

⁴⁶ 52400DTE060.

⁴⁷ Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, trans. William J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964) (originally published as *Das Dynamische in der Kirche* [Freiburg: Herder, 1958]).

⁴⁸ 52400DTE060.

When asked about the continuity or discontinuity between such fulfillment and subjects' transcendental intending, Lonergan replied that the fulfillment "is continuous with our capacity for self-transcendence; it is the fulfillment of our capacity for self-transcendence; it is something ultimate in self-transcendence, in the line of self-transcendence."⁴⁹

The question sessions from this seminar made clear that the religious, fulfilling horizon was superior to other horizons, including the horizon of values. Yet Lonergan's comments made problematic a full understanding of the relation between interpersonal encounter—an element of the fulfilling religious horizon—and the analysis of conscious operations in terms of levels. It is unclear how exactly Lonergan understood the interpersonal in relation to the fourth level of consciousness at this point, but it is clear that he affirmed a cosmic context for the fulfillment of intentional consciousness that had to do with the good of order of the whole created universe. While such fulfilling connection to the good of order could be experienced, it was at the same time a peculiar kind of experience—a content without an object—that still remained "continuous with our capacity for self-transcendence."

2.3.2. "FAITH AND BELIEFS"

The imagery of succession was once again used in "Faith and Beliefs,"⁵⁰ where it fit well with his previous development. At the same time, Lonergan introduced a new

⁴⁹ 52400DTE060.

⁵⁰ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 30–48. A very similar paper had been given as early as October 18 (see 30 n 1).

element in his statements that “on the topmost level of human consciousness the subject deliberates, evaluates, decides, controls, acts. . . .”⁵¹ and “the topmost level is the level of deliberate control and self-control; there consciousness becomes conscience; there operations are authentic in the measure that they are responses to value.”⁵² It appears that for the Lonergan of October 23, 1969, self-transcendence is achieved and one becomes a principle of benevolence and beneficence at this topmost, fourth, level. Previously, the achievement of self-transcendence and one’s becoming a principle of benevolence and beneficence were part of the fulfillment of intentional consciousness for which deliberation, evaluation, decision, etc., were open, but in the language used here, the subject becomes a principle of benevolence and beneficence at the fourth level, which then has a capacity for genuine collaboration and love.

His further statements only confused the matter more. After a descriptive series paralleling previous accounts of love, in which he highlighted the three types of being-in-love, its unrestrictedness, its joyousness, the fact that it is conscious but not known, and that it is an experience of mystery,⁵³ he went on to state that “the gift of God’s love is on the topmost level. . . . It is the consciousness that is also conscience, that deliberates, evaluates, decides, controls, acts.”⁵⁴ Here, the fulfillment is clearly on the fourth level, not above it, yet there is still a qualifying caveat:

It is this consciousness as brought to fulfillment, as having undergone a conversion, as possessing a basis that may be broadened and deepened and

⁵¹ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 35–36.

⁵² Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 38. While the fourth level had so far been the de facto top level for Lonergan, he had not previously stated so in such absolute terms.

⁵³ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 38–40.

⁵⁴ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 40.

heightened and enriched but not superseded, as ever more ready to deliberate and evaluate and decide and act with the easy freedom of those that do all good because they are in love. So the gift of God's love occupies the ground and root of the fourth and highest level of man's waking consciousness. It takes over the peak of the soul, the *apex animae*.⁵⁵

The fulfillment takes place on the fourth level, but it does so under certain conditions or under the influence of a certain change of state—a fulfillment, a conversion, a new basis, a shift in the ground or root. Moreover, although it is found at the fourth level, this fulfillment “is not the product of our knowing and choice.”⁵⁶ Instead, while

ordinarily this fourth level presupposes and complements the previous levels of experiencing, understanding, and judging[,] what ordinarily is so admits exceptions, and such an exception would be what Paul described to the Romans as God's flooding our hearts with his love. Then love would not flow from knowledge but, on the contrary, knowledge would flow from love.⁵⁷

Pascal's “heart's reasons” once again provided Lonergan guidance on this, but here he added an element that had not appeared before. The knowledge born of love “consists in one's response to the values and disvalues and, more specifically, in the development, strength, fullness, refinement of one's responding.”⁵⁸ He was dealing here with God's love, so the new eye of love that sharpens our evaluating and brings the operations of the

⁵⁵ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 40.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 39.

⁵⁷ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 42.

⁵⁸ Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 43.

fourth level to a clarity they would not otherwise have had is a sub-element of the larger shift that results from religious being-in-love:

Religious experience . . . gives rise to inquiries and investigations that otherwise would not be undertaken . . . opens one's eyes to values and disvalues that otherwise would not be recognized, and . . . gives the power to do the good that otherwise would not be attempted. There results a transvaluation of values and, consequently, a transformation of the dynamics of one's world. So religious people live in a world transfused by religious experience, informed by the investigations to which the experience gives rise, and motivated by the evaluations which it grounds.⁵⁹

Lonergan affirmed repeatedly in this text that the fulfillment of transcendental intending, which is the gift of God's love, resides at the fourth level of deliberation and choice, but his position on transcending, transforming, and broadening makes such an affirmation problematic. He had come to recognize the limitations of "the spatial metaphor of speaking of levels of consciousness."⁶⁰ Strikingly, and contrary to the continued language of most contemporary Lonergan scholarship, Lonergan wished to "remove this metaphor" and replace it with "the notion of sublation, not exactly in Hegel's sense, but rather in a sense used by Karl Rahner."⁶¹ To do this, he suggested that a distinction be drawn

between a sublating set of operations and a sublated set. The sublating set introduces operations that are quite new and distinct; it finds among them a new

⁵⁹ Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," 46.

⁶⁰ Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," 36.

⁶¹ Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," 36.

basis and ground; but so far from stunting or interfering with the sublated set, it preserves them integrally, it vastly extends their relevance, and it perfects their performance. . . . The transitions effected by questions for intelligence, questions for reflection, questions for deliberation, are sublations.⁶²

The fulfillment of consciousness by God's gift of love meets nearly all of these characteristics of a sublating operation: it introduces a new basis and ground, preserves the original set of operations, vastly extends their relevance, and perfects their performance. But while the different sets of questions are sublating operators pointing to distinct operations, the fulfillment of consciousness lacks such identifiable "operations that are quite new and distinct." If new operations sublating the operations of deliberative consciousness could be identified in that fulfillment, then presumably, because the notion of sublated and sublating operations was just a transposition of the image of higher and lower "levels of consciousness," the fulfillment would constitute a fifth level of consciousness. At this point in Lonergan's development, however, he did not identify such new operations, even though his comments made clear the criteria for the identification of a new level of consciousness.

2.3.3. "THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY"

In "The Future of Christianity,"⁶³ Lonergan situated the love of God as more fundamental than the love of family or community,⁶⁴ but more importantly, he developed

⁶² Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," 36–37.

⁶³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 149–164.

his statement earlier in the year that in the fulfillment of intentional consciousness by God's love, "love would not flow from knowledge but, on the contrary, knowledge would flow from love."⁶⁵ He wrote here at the end of 1969 that "resting in God is something, not that we achieve, but that we receive, accept, ratify. It comes quietly, secretly, unobtrusively. We know about it when we notice its fruits in our lives."⁶⁶ It has an influence on us not because we have had an insight into data, affirmed the insight, decided that it is worthwhile, and acted upon it, but because it has first acted upon us: our spirit is fulfilled, we experience a peace and a joy beyond anything that can arise from things in this world, and we can see the roots of sin in the absence of this fulfillment. All of these "fruits" emerge because love has set "the total context, the *Weltanschauung*, the horizon," with faith as "the eye of love, discerning God's hand in nature and his self-disclosure in revelation."⁶⁷

Again, this horizon is interpersonal. It does not leave us alone, but pushes us to transcend ourselves for the sake of others, so much so that we are taken into a universal context:

Just as God himself is love (1 John 4:8, 16), and it is the overflowing of that love that creates and sustains and promotes this seething universe of mass and energy, of chemical process, of endlessly varied plant and animal life, of human intelligence and of human love; so too the love that God gives us overflows into a love of all that God has made and especially of all persons whom God wishes

⁶⁴ "Underpinning both love of one's family and love of one's fellow men, there is love of God" (Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 153).

⁶⁵ Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," 42.

⁶⁶ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 154.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 154.

to love. It is a love that makes a husband love his wife with all the tenderness he has for his own body (Eph. 5:28). It is a love that stops the good Samaritan and has him care for the traveler assaulted by thieves. It is a love that has no frontiers, for it seeks the kingdom of God, God's rule on earth, and that rule is universal.⁶⁸

Once again, love has an intrinsic connection both to community and to the universe as a whole. God's love pours forth to create and to order "this seething universe" from the lowest levels of potentiality—mere mass and energy—to the highest levels of actuality and achievement—human intelligence and love. An isomorphism obtains when God's own love given to us pours forth from us as a love of the universe. This was manifested through the potentiality that is marriage, through progress and redemption in society and culture and community, up to a love the boundaries of which are set only by the Creator's own infinite love. The gift of God's love is a unifying element that constitutes a community and is imbedded in history, making our love for God a historical and interpersonal love in Christ.⁶⁹ Though the process of God's entry into human history is slow and requires work—we must both sustain and be sustained by the community⁷⁰—still God's entry changes the rules, sublates our own immanent and proportionate

⁶⁸ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 154.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 156.

⁷⁰ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 157: "Normally, the gift of God's love is not a sudden transformation of character or personality. It is like the seed planted in ground that needs to be tilled, like the sprout that needs sunlight and rain and protection from choking weeds, devouring insects, and roving animals. . . . The need of teaching and preaching, of rituals and common worship, is the need to be members of one another, to share with one another what is deepest in ourselves, to be recalled from our waywardness, to be encouraged in our good intentions."

processes, and re-horizons human meaning with a divine horizon that enables the ultimate conformation of human historical meaning-making to the divine horizon.⁷¹

1969 thus offered both clarifications and difficulties. It is clear that at this point for Lonergan, the religious was a new, superior horizon that situates the subject in a cosmic context, has a content but not an apprehended object, and is received as a gift. At the same time, Lonergan's comments about the relation between the interpersonal and the levels of consciousness, the fourth level being the "topmost" level, and the characteristics of sublation with respect to the fulfillment found in love, all seemed less than clear on the relation between the fulfilling, interpersonal, and religious horizon of love, on the one hand, and the levels of consciousness, on the other.

2.4. 1970

In 1970 Lonergan wrote or participated in three items that together introduced a new element while strengthening prior emphases. "The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World," along with Lonergan's remarks at the Institute on Method in Theology at Boston College, offered the struggle for authenticity and the limitations of liberty as two new ways of understanding subjects' openness for the entrance of the dynamic state of being in love. Both of those, together with Lonergan's comments in the interview that took place in Florida of that year, emphasized the concreteness of the historical and interpersonal fulfillment of intentional consciousness.

⁷¹ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 161–162.

2.4.1. “THE RESPONSE OF THE JESUIT AS PRIEST AND APOSTLE IN THE MODERN WORLD”

The sequential imagery appeared once again in “The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World.”⁷² After progressing through dreamless sleep, waking, experience, understanding, judgment, and decision, Lonergan introduced a shift away from a language of potency in our openness to being-in-love. Instead, Lonergan now situated the openness for higher integration as a problem within the context of authenticity and unauthenticity: do human beings transcend themselves? “I think they do so when they fall in love.”⁷³

This transcending-in-love was once again not individual. Although he stated “that the gift of God’s love is on the topmost level[,] . . . the type of consciousness that also is conscience, that deliberates, evaluates, decides, controls, acts,”⁷⁴ Lonergan reaffirmed the concrete, interpersonal, and historical character of the fulfillment of intentional consciousness at that level:

Being in love is not just a state of mind and heart. It is interpersonal, ongoing. . . . If a man and woman were to love each other yet never avow their love, then they would have the beginnings of love but hardly the real thing. There would

⁷² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 165–188.

⁷³ Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 170. In this article, little of Lonergan’s understanding of that love changed beyond his earlier positions, but there were shifts in emphasis. He stated that the fulfillment of the capacity of our individual subjectivity “bears fruit in acts of love for one’s neighbor, a love that strives mightily to bring about the kingdom of God on this earth” (Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 171), tying the love of neighbor to the kingdom of God as a whole. He had done this the year before, and here as there, this both drew on and emphasized the historical and universal dimensions of the fulfillment of our intentional consciousness. The kingdom is the good of order of the whole universe, which includes but is not limited to historical, interpersonal relations, while love, as the fulfillment of our intentional consciousness, works through our intentional consciousness to bring about that kingdom.

⁷⁴ Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 172.

be lacking an interpersonal component, a mutual presence of self-donation, the opportunity and, indeed, the necessity of sustained development and growth. There would not be the steady increase in knowledge of each other. There would not be the constant flow of favors given and received, of privations endured together, of evils banished by common good will, to make love fully aware of its reality, its strength, its durability, to make love aware that it could always be counted on.⁷⁵

Clearly, the interpersonal in its fullness is historical for Lonergan, and for the first time in this second phase, he furthered this point by tying this interpersonal life to the interpersonal life of the Trinitarian Persons.⁷⁶ Such a position had roots in the earlier material in FLM, the “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace,” and *De Deo Trino*, but the establishment of this link in the terms of the second-phase intentionality analysis was new.

2.4.2. “AN INTERVIEW WITH FR. BERNARD LONERGAN, S.J.”

In an interview conducted Easter weekend of 1970, Lonergan introduced the suggestion that “you get the synthesis of this feeling side and the cognitional side on the level of the question, ‘Is this worthwhile?’ the judgment of value, the decision, the action. So, when you bring in the fourth, you move into a philosophy of action. You’re up with

⁷⁵ Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 172.

⁷⁶ Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 172.

Blondel.”⁷⁷ The distinctness of the horizon of the fourth level could not be more clear, and this distinct fourth level brings together what previously were, at least in one sense, kept apart: the cognitional and the affective.

When the interviewers then asked whether the horizon given to us in the gift of God’s love transcended the horizon of being, Lonergan replied,

I wouldn’t say so. The good is beyond the intelligible, the true and the real. It’s more comprehensive. Moral conversion takes you beyond intellectual conversion; and religious conversion takes you beyond both. But it’s not beyond being, if this being in love, total commitment, if that is the full actuation, the ultimate actuation of the movement towards the intelligible, towards the true, towards the real, towards the good. This is the ultimate step in it. It’s what your a priori, what your authentic subjectivity, is open to. It occurs, insofar as it does, through God’s grace. . . .⁷⁸

These statements suggest a link back to the material from the *verbum* articles and *De Deo Trino* regarding the operational distinction between love in the will and knowing in the intellect, but here the issue was cast in terms of the respective *horizons* of the good, being, and love. Although the good and love place being into a higher horizon and the religious is a still higher horizon, being is neither left behind nor rendered meaningless.

⁷⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J.,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 209–232, at 223.

⁷⁸ Lonergan, “An Interview,” 228. Lonergan then clarified these statements with the following example: “A person was demanding that I critically ground this religion and he was talking to Professor So and So and I went up to him and said ‘Would you require Professor So and So to critically ground the love he has for his wife and children?’ Being in love is a fact, and it’s what you are, it’s existential. And your living flows from it. It’s the first principle, as long as it lasts. It has its causes and its occasions and its conditions and all the rest of it. But while it’s there it’s the first principle and it’s the source” (Lonergan, “An Interview,” 229).

Being is included insofar as being in love is the fulfillment of intentional consciousness, which intends the intelligible, the true, the real. Just as in the context of a faculty-psychological analysis love is with respect to the object presented by intellect, so in the context of an intentionality analysis, questions within the horizons of the good and of love or religion, respectively, ask further questions of being—Is *that being* worthwhile? Is *that being* lovable? Is *that being* an object of unrestricted commitment?—and by doing so, they cannot leave being behind.

2.4.3. INSTITUTE ON METHOD IN THEOLOGY, BOSTON

The Institute on Method in Theology at Boston College pulled together many of these developments. On the evening of June 15,⁷⁹ Lonergan stated that the limitations of human liberty are an opening for the working of what an older theology would identify as operative grace and what a methodical theology would identify as a dynamic state of being in love with God that effects a change in horizon.

Two nights later (the evening of June 17⁸⁰) a discussion ensued concerning this dynamic state and its relation to the divine initiative. After highlighting positions from earlier in his career,⁸¹ Lonergan pressed on to illumine the historical and interpersonal character of love:

The interpersonal element, what you mean by God, filling that out, you can fill that out to a certain extent with a philosophy. But philosophy doesn't reveal the God of love the way the Gospel does. And it is precisely that type of revelation

⁷⁹ 593BCDTE070/594BCDTE070.

⁸⁰ 597BCDTE070/598BCDTE070.

⁸¹ See Lonergan's responses to questions 15–18.

that is the mutual expression of love. Christ crucified is God's expression of his love. It is not an afterthought if you conceive love as something interpersonal, a manifested, expressed self-donation, self-surrender. A man and a woman if they are in love and never admit it, never avow it to one another, they are not really in love; there is a whole dimension missing.⁸²

He was immediately asked about the constitutiveness of love and replied that love is interpersonal. It is one thing to read and write books, and it is another to meet people. In meeting people there arise elements that are just not in the others. There is a book called *The Phenomenology of the Encounter*⁸³ by Buytendijk. There is a whole phenomenology of what goes on; like the phenomenology of the smile, that can be multiplied to infinity, all the relations between two persons, all the aspects to it have a concreteness. And if you are reading books and so on it is experience, understanding, judging, but the interpersonal thing is two consciences meeting, two incarnate subjects communicating. I think you just have to reflect on that aspect of things to get the point.⁸⁴

⁸² 597BCDTE070/598BCDTE070.

⁸³ Frederik J.J. Buytendijk, *Phenomenologie de la rencontre* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952).

⁸⁴ 597BCDTE070/598BCDTE070. Further questions pressed him on the epistemological relevance of interpersonal encounter. While not "an intuitionism," the knowledge born of love "is moving into a philosophy of action. It is not just experiencing, understanding, and judging, but also, and on the highest level, deliberating, evaluating, deciding, doing." Lonergan recognized here that knowing was situated into a whole context of value judgments, decisions, and actions. He was affirming that the world of human meaning was "thicker," if you will, than merely intellectual grasps and affirmations and that such grasps and affirmations themselves took place within a larger context constituted by values, actions, and interpersonal relations. Although this development itself was not substantively new (this same point was made as early as FLM and extended through many of the texts examined in this study), the link between this context and the operations of intentional consciousness at the fourth level was made in a different way here than it had been before, emphasizing the "field" of action and interpersonal relation as clearly distinct from and not reducible to experience, understanding, and judgment.

These three items from 1970 introduced the element of authenticity and the limitations of liberty as the openings for the entrance of the dynamic state of being in love. They further stressed the concrete historical and interpersonal character of the dynamic state, as well as the distinctions between the realm of love and the realm of being and between the field of values, actions, and interpersonal relations and the field of experience, understanding, and judgment.

2.5. 1971

A 1971 seminar on Method in Theology pressed further the differences between the interpersonal and love, on the one hand, and the content of experience, understanding, and judgment, on the other. On August 2, with regard to the development of personal virtue, Lonergan noted that “while you cannot handle this stuff logically, you can understand it as a process.”⁸⁵ Although this comment was directed toward moral development, it seems to fit as well his developing understanding of religious experience and the working of grace in subjectivity. An answer to a question on Thursday, August 5, showed that once again for Lonergan, such grace could not be reduced to the contents of experiencing, understanding, and judging.⁸⁶ It is unclear whether he therefore situated religious experience at the fourth level, but further responses on the same day suggest something more complicated.

When asked about “the new sort of meaning that results from [religious] conversion,” he replied,

⁸⁵ 640Q0DTE070.

⁸⁶ 643Q0DTE070.

Conversion is a matter of moving into a different horizon, living in a different world. To some extent we all live in different worlds, but conversion involves a change of level, outlook. The unbeliever will not understand, not until he is converted. However, he can be moving towards it; there can be a fundamental conversion, God's gift of his love.⁸⁷

This gift changes the parameters of the relevant questions. The following day, August 6, Lonergan noted that one of the major impacts he hoped his new book, *Method in Theology*,⁸⁸ would have would be that the (then) standard idea of proof in theology would be "liquidated and replaced."⁸⁹ Instead, the parameters of the theological process would change, at least, in part, as a result of an issue he clarified in another response when he stated, "The dynamic state of being in love precedes knowledge. Acts of loving follow knowledge."⁹⁰ The gift changes the parameters by placing the emphasis on the dynamic state as prior to and setting the stage for particular acts.

Such a state had to do with subjects as subjects rather than subjects as objects, as he indicated on August 9: "knowing someone else as a subject . . . arises insofar as one is intersubjective with that other person."⁹¹ The following question, "Is 'intersubjectivity,' the level of the 'we' prior to the 'I-Thou,' is this an occurrence on the level of the psyche and feeling rather than on the level of reflection and decision?" elicited a very direct response from Lonergan: "Yes."⁹² In the continuing discussion, he clearly affirmed that he "would place the love of God at the root of the fourth level of consciousness, the level

⁸⁷ 643Q0DTE070.

⁸⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999).

⁸⁹ 644Q0DTE070.

⁹⁰ 644Q0DTE070.

⁹¹ 645Q0DTE070.

⁹² 645Q0DTE070.

of deliberation, evaluation, and decision,” but he also suggested that “it is the fulfillment of the whole effort towards self- transcendence that comes through attention, questions for intelligence, questions for reflection, and questions for deliberation.”⁹³

Because, whatever its level, this state was a horizon shift that changed the parameters, Lonergan did not agree that “the idea of a critical justification can be transposed from the problem of knowledge to questions of morality and religion.”⁹⁴ In fact, “there is no critical justification of 1 Corinthians 13, Paul’s account of the supremacy of charity. You read it and accept it or reject it. Similarly, if a person has such charity, he does not have to critically justify it; it justifies itself.”⁹⁵ Likewise, when asked about his affirmation in *Insight* that “a man or woman knows that he or she is in love by making the discovery that all spontaneous and deliberate tendencies and actions regard the beloved,”⁹⁶ he replied in part by affirming that “as the Gospel says, ‘By their fruits you shall know them.’ You are in the state of grace when you do what is right. And you may look back over a lifetime that has been devoted to God and suddenly discover, ‘Yes, I guess there must have been God’s grace must have been working at me.’”⁹⁷ As before, the key is an understanding of a process at work in one’s life; it is not the specific identification of an operation in conscious experience as are the identifications of insights, judgments, or decisions.

Further discussion centered on this point. Lonergan noted that the focus must lie on one’s loving God, not on one’s experience of God, which is only “a plus value that

⁹³ 645Q0DTE070.

⁹⁴ 646Q0DTE070.

⁹⁵ 646Q0DTE070.

⁹⁶ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992), 720–721, quoted in the question.

⁹⁷ 648Q0DTE070.

may or may not arise.”⁹⁸ When asked about “the data to which one would need to attend in order to understand religious conversion and moral conversion,” Lonergan clarified that “for the relevant data on being in the state of grace, read Paul to the Galatians, 5.22: ‘The harvest of the spirit is charity, joy, peace, patience, gentleness, kindness, and self-control.’”⁹⁹ The love expressed in those data is all-encompassing: “It is comparable to the love of man and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, and the love of mankind, human welfare. But it is a love that orientates a person to the universe. It is not just relatives or mankind, but an orientation to the universe, to the all.”¹⁰⁰

2.6. 1972

Published in 1972, *Method in Theology* pulled together nearly all of the previous developments in Lonergan’s understanding of love, fulfillment of intentional consciousness, the historical and interpersonal realms, and the religious horizon. Even here, however, the problematic relation between levels of intentional consciousness and the interpersonal horizon of love continued to offer real difficulties, and three articles from that year, “The World Mediated by Meaning,” “Is It Real?” and “What Are Judgments of Value?” all added to these complications.

⁹⁸ 648Q0DTE070.

⁹⁹ 649Q0DTE070.

¹⁰⁰ 649Q0DTE070.

2.6.1. *METHOD IN THEOLOGY*

Method in Theology restated previous material on the fulfillment of intentional consciousness in love without developing it much further.¹⁰¹ There was, however, clear development in terms of the clarity and control with which previous materials were used, and *Method in Theology* was the first time that Lonergan put almost all of his developments on these topics together in one place, in extensive connection with one another.

In *Method*, Lonergan developed the meaning and role of love as a feeling. As with other components of the discussion, where before the focus had been more metaphysical or ontological, the shift to an analysis of conscious intentionality pushed toward the consideration of the subjective experience of love. It was to be distinguished from other intentional responses: “There are in full consciousness feelings so deep and strong, especially when deliberately reinforced, that they channel attention, shape one’s horizon, direct one’s life. Here the supreme illustration is loving. A man or woman that falls in love is engaged in loving not only when attending to the beloved but at all times.”¹⁰² This reveals the prior state of being in love Lonergan had already discussed a great deal, but here he went further, developing that state in terms of mutuality: “Mutual love is the intertwining of two lives. It transforms an ‘I’ and ‘thou’ into a ‘we’ so intimate, so secure, so permanent, that each attends, imagines, thinks, plans, feels, speaks, acts in concern for both.”¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ For example, very early in the text, there is a series of concise presentations of the sequential imagery (Lonergan, *Method*, 9–13), but there is not to be found a significant change of substance in their use.

¹⁰² Lonergan, *Method*, 32–33.

¹⁰³ Lonergan, *Method*, 33.

As his earlier work already showed, such a state is the fulfillment of the various capacities of subjectivity. Our intending of the good,¹⁰⁴ our “initial infantile bundle of needs and clamours and gratifications,”¹⁰⁵ our inquiring, judging, and deliberating,¹⁰⁶ and indeed the transcendental notions themselves¹⁰⁷ all have limitations or inbuilt drives that push ever further, ever higher, toward a fulfillment of which they in themselves are not capable. This fulfillment responds to the disenchantment brought to light by the transcendental notion of the good, in which we see “the limitation in every finite achievement, the stain in every flawed perfection, the irony of soaring ambition and faltering performance,” and although “it plunges us into the height and depth of love, . . . it also keeps us aware of how much our loving falls short of its aim.”¹⁰⁸ It is at “the summit of the ascent” where we find “the deep-set joy and solid peace, the power and the vigor, of being in love with God,” where “affectivity is of a single piece” and “lapses from grace are rarer and more quickly amended.”¹⁰⁹ It is that “basic fulfillment, peace, joy,” that is reached “only by moving beyond the realms of common sense, theory, and interiority, and into the realm in which God is known and loved.”¹¹⁰

This is the summit—“the final level”¹¹¹—of a series beginning with sensitive consciousness and proceeding through intelligence and reflectivity to the moral level. While the transcendental notions inherent in those various levels of consciousness are capacities for higher fulfillment, “that capacity becomes an actuality when one falls in

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, *Method*, 36.

¹⁰⁵ Lonergan, *Method*, 39.

¹⁰⁶ Lonergan, *Method*, 84.

¹⁰⁷ Lonergan, *Method*, 105.

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan, *Method*, 36.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *Method*, 39.

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, *Method*, 84.

¹¹¹ Lonergan, *Method*, 104.

love”¹¹²; one then has a new first principle giving rise to benevolence and beneficence, collaboration, true love, and society.¹¹³ While the manifestation of that principle takes different forms—again there is mention of the family, the polity, and religious love—the latter, being in love with God, stands out. While “all love is self-surrender, . . . being in love with God is being in love without limits or qualifications or conditions or reservations . . . [and] just as unrestricted questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so being in love in an unrestricted fashion is the proper fulfillment of that capacity.”¹¹⁴

Here, finally, it is clear that *unrestricted* love fulfills intentional consciousness. Moreover, this fulfillment is, again, beyond the capacities of our subjectivity: it “is not the product of our knowledge and choice. On the contrary, it dismantles and abolishes the horizon in which our knowing and choosing went on and it sets up a new horizon in which the love of God will transvalue our values and the eyes of that love will transform our knowing.”¹¹⁵ This state is conscious but not known, awe-inspiring, an experience of the holy, and a consolation without a cause.¹¹⁶

In terms of an older mode of theology, Lonergan identified this state as, of itself, operative grace, and as principle of further acts, cooperative grace, and in general the state only “notionally differs from” sanctifying grace.¹¹⁷ In terms of a theology grounded

¹¹² Lonergan, *Method*, 105.

¹¹³ See Lonergan, *Method*, 104, and above, at 63–64.

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, *Method*, 105–106.

¹¹⁵ Lonergan, *Method*, 106.

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, *Method*, 106.

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *Method*, 107. He would return to this point later in the book: “Operative grace is the replacement of the heart of stone by a heart of flesh, a replacement beyond the horizon of the heart of stone. Cooperative grace is the heart of flesh becoming effective in good works through human freedom. Operative grace is religious conversion. Cooperative grace is the effectiveness of conversion, the gradual

on an interiority analysis, however, one prioritizes the profound peace, deep joy, and other experienced characteristics of the state, and one recognizes the state as interpersonal: “To be in love is to be in love with someone. To be in love without qualifications or conditions or reservations or limits is to be in love with someone transcendent.”¹¹⁸

Such interpersonal love requires an outward expression in order to be mutual: One must not conclude that the outward word is something incidental. For it has a constitutive role. When a man and a woman love each other but do not avow their love, they are not yet in love. Their very silence means that their love has not reached the point of self-surrender and self-donation. It is the love that each freely and fully reveals to the other that brings about the radically new situation of being in love and that begins the unfolding of its life-long implications.

What holds for the love of a man and a woman, also holds in its own way for the love of God and man. Ordinarily the experience of the mystery of love and awe is not objectified. It remains within subjectivity as a vector, an undertow, a fateful call to a dreaded holiness. . . . But . . . one needs the word—the word of tradition that has accumulated religious wisdom, the word of fellowship that unites those that share the gift of God’s love, the word of the gospel that announces that God has loved us first and, in the fullness of time, has revealed that love in Christ crucified, dead, and risen.

movement towards a full and complete transformation of the whole of one’s living and feeling, one’s thoughts, words, deeds, and omissions” (Lonergan, *Method*, 241).

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, *Method*, 109.

The word, then, is personal.¹¹⁹

This interpersonal, dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly is constituted by mutual outward affirmations of love, without which the love would remain unfulfilling because it would be individualistic and ahistorical. Such outward affirmations highlight the historical dimension of “the experienced fulfillment of our unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence.”¹²⁰ With its objectification,

there recurs the question of God in a new form. For now it is primarily a question of decision. Will I love him in return, or will I refuse? Will I live out the gift of his love, or will I hold back, turn away, withdraw? Only secondarily do there arise the questions of God’s existence and nature, and they are the questions either of the lover seeking to know him or of the unbeliever seeking to escape him. Such is the basic option of the existential subject once called by God.¹²¹

Lonergan further proposed that without the knowledge of the heart, which again consists of the interpersonal, experienced fulfillment of the thrust to self-transcendence, “the originating value is man and the terminal value is the human good man brings about. . . . [but] in the light of faith, originating value is divine light and love, while terminal value is the whole universe. So the human good becomes absorbed in an all-encompassing good.”¹²² This is the key to the role of experienced interpersonal fulfillment in the overcoming of decline in history:

¹¹⁹ Lonergan, *Method*, 112–113.

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *Method*, 115.

¹²¹ Lonergan, *Method*, 116.

¹²² Lonergan, *Method*, 116.

Faith is linked with human progress and it has to meet the challenge of human decline. . . . Faith places human efforts in a friendly universe; it reveals an ultimate significance in human achievement; it strengthens new undertakings with confidence. . . . Most of all, faith has the power of undoing decline. . . . It is not propaganda and it is not argument but religious faith that will liberate human reasonableness from its ideological prisons. It is not the promises of men but religious hope that can enable men to resist the vast pressures of social decay. If passions are to quiet down, if wrongs are not to be exacerbated, not ignored, not merely palliated, but acknowledged and removed, then human possessiveness and human pride have to be replaced by religious charity, by the charity of the suffering servant, by self-sacrificing love.¹²³

This is the sense in which knowledge is preceded by love: love gives the epistemological horizon within which knowledge can reach its fullest term.¹²⁴ All three forms of love are exceptions to the priority of knowledge over love; all three are instances of falling in love, which is “something disproportionate to its causes, conditions, occasions, antecedents. For falling in love is a new beginning, an exercise of vertical liberty in which one’s world undergoes a new organization.”¹²⁵ Yet, although no instance of falling in love is a result of reason, religious conversion is unique insofar as it “is *other-worldly* falling in love. It is total and permanent self-surrender without

¹²³ Lonergan, *Method*, 117.

¹²⁴ See Lonergan, *Method*, 122 on Lonergan’s qualification of the maxim, *nihil amatum nisi praecognitum*. Lonergan maintained the distinction between the two lesser forms of love (familial and community) and the higher form of love (religious) when he gave the status of “minor exceptions” to “*nihil amatum . . .*” to the former two and the status of “major exception” to “*nihil amatum . . .*” to the latter.

¹²⁵ Lonergan, *Method*, 122.

conditions, qualifications, reservations. But it is such a surrender, not as an act, but as a dynamic state that is prior to and principle of subsequent acts.”¹²⁶

This dynamic state situates “all human pursuit of the true and the good . . . within . . . a cosmic context and purpose and, as well, there now accrues to man the power of love to enable him to accept the suffering involved in undoing the effects of decline.”¹²⁷

Yet here, as before, Lonergan’s construal of religious love introduces a difficulty. His description of the role of religious love fits the definition of sublation he gave here: it “goes beyond what is sublated, introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with the sublated or destroying it, on the contrary needs it, includes it, preserves all its proper features and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization within a richer context.”¹²⁸ In fact, he outright denied that the religious could be reduced to the prior levels:

It is not to be thought . . . that religious conversion means no more than a new and more efficacious ground for the pursuit of intellectual and moral ends.

Religious loving is without conditions, qualifications, reservations; it is with all one’s heart and all one’s soul and all one’s mind and all one’s strength. This lack of limitation, though it corresponds to the unrestricted character of human questioning, does not pertain to this world. Holiness abounds in truth and moral goodness, but it has a distinct dimension of its own. It is other-worldly fulfillment, joy, peace, bliss.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Lonergan, *Method*, 123, my emphases.

¹²⁷ Lonergan, *Method*, 241–242.

¹²⁸ Lonergan, *Method*, 241.

¹²⁹ Lonergan, *Method*, 242.

This issue was strained further two pages later, when Lonergan affirmed that “convictions and commitments rest on judgments of fact and judgments of value,” raising the question of whether such “resting” means that convictions and commitments were situated at least in some sense higher than judgments of fact and/or value.¹³⁰ How does this material reside alongside his earlier affirmation that the state of being in love “is conscious on the fourth level of intentional consciousness”?¹³¹

A further difficulty arises in Lonergan’s affirmation that religiously differentiated consciousness is in love and that being in love orients such consciousness “positively to what is transcendent in lovableness.”¹³² ‘Lovableness’ rings like a further transcendental notion, derived from the orientation of religiously differentiated consciousness, but whereas the transcendental notions of the intelligible and the real correspond to the identifiable operations of insight into data and judgment of fact and the transcendental notion of the good corresponds to the identifiable operations of judgment of value and decision, “the data . . . on the dynamic state of other-worldly love are the data on a process of conversion and development.”¹³³ In other words, the data on the dynamic state of being in love are not data on an identifiable single operation.

Given all of this, why did Lonergan not identify love as a subsuming level of consciousness in *Method*? The key component missing from religious love that would qualify it for full status as a subsuming level of consciousness can be identified from Lonergan’s own explicit account of the shift from a faculty psychology to a methodical theology:

¹³⁰ Lonergan, *Method*, 244.

¹³¹ Lonergan, *Method*, 106–107.

¹³² Lonergan, *Method*, 278.

¹³³ Lonergan, *Method*, 289.

From the very first chapter we have moved out of a faculty psychology with its options between intellectualism and voluntarism, and into an intentionality analysis that distinguishes four levels of conscious and intentional operations, where each successive level sublates previous levels by going beyond them, by setting up a higher principle, by introducing new operations, and by preserving the integrity of previous levels, while extending enormously their range and their significance.¹³⁴

Love, and particularly religious love, goes beyond previous levels, sets up a higher principle, and preserves lower levels' integrity while extending their range and significance. Yet it would appear that Lonergan, at this point, had identified neither a distinct conscious operation corresponding to love nor anything that would occupy the 'place' of an operation in the structure of the conscious experience of being in love. This prevented him from identifying love distinctly and fully as a level of consciousness.

2.6.2. LECTURES LATER IN THE YEAR

A trio of lectures later in the year only complicated the matter further. In "The World Mediated by Meaning,"¹³⁵ Lonergan's discussion of the constitutive function of meaning touched on constitutive meaning and community, returning to the elements of common experience, common understanding, common judgment, and common consent. He understood community here as "the source of common meaning," and common

¹³⁴ Lonergan, *Method*, 340.

¹³⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The World Mediated by Meaning," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 107–118.

meaning as “the act and form that finds expression in polity and family, in the legal and economic system, in customary morals and educational arrangements, in language and literature, art and religion, philosophy, science, and history.”¹³⁶ It is, I think, an open question whether or not Lonergan understood community as reducible to common experiences, understandings, judgments, and consents in this lecture. While community is the source of common meaning, that source could be understood as residing in the common judgments and/or consents, or it could be understood as underlying all the common elements, including consents, in which case it would be distinct from them.

Difficulties concerning the “operation” of community (or lack thereof) continued in “Is It Real?” where clearly there were “three operators and four sets of operations.”¹³⁷ The operators are questions, and “the four levels of operations are (1) sense experience, (2) insights and formulations, (3) reflective understanding and judgment, and (4) evaluation and decision.”¹³⁸ Again, Lonergan did not identify the role or function of community as a level of conscious operation, most likely because at this point he still could not identify an operation in or of community in individual conscious experience.

These complications were brought to a clear formulaic head in “What Are Judgments of Value?” where the successive imagery reached its summit in love, which was distinguished from the top level of decision. The summit was once again a felt experience responsible for shaping horizon, but Lonergan positioned it at the highest reaches of consciousness:

¹³⁶ Lonergan, “The World Mediated by Meaning,” 110.

¹³⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Is It Real?” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 122.

¹³⁸ Lonergan, “Is It Real?,” 122.

Judgments of value occur in different contexts. There can be the context of growth: one's knowledge of one's operating increases, and one's responses advance up the scale of values; openness to further achievement prevails. At the summit there is the power and vigor of being in love: the love of intimacy, the love of mankind, and the love of God.¹³⁹

A clue to the resolution of these difficulties can be found in Lonergan's treatment of the phenomenology of the smile "The World Mediated by Meaning." After offering a brief version of that phenomenology,¹⁴⁰ Lonergan observed that

the meaning of the smile resides in the manner in which it modifies the intersubjective situation. It supposes the interpersonal situation with its antecedents in previous encounters. It is a determinant in the present situation both at its opening and as it unfolds. Moreover, that meaning is not about some object. Rather, it reveals or even betrays the one that smiles, and the revelation is immediate. I do not see the smile and infer its meaning. Rather, the revelation occurs inasmuch as the smile affects my feelings, attitudes, response.¹⁴¹

Here, Lonergan suggested that there is something immediate and non-object-oriented about an intersubjective relation. There is a revelation between two persons, two subjects, in which the revealing subject as such, rather than the subject as object or an object as object, plays the role normally occupied by an object with respect to an operation. The revealing subject immediately affects the subject to whom the revelation

¹³⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "What Are Judgments of Value?" in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 145.

¹⁴⁰ See above, at 38 n 73.

¹⁴¹ Lonergan, "The World Mediated by Meaning," 111.

is made. This throws into disarray the normal standards of how an operation might be conceived with respect to its object, precisely because there is no standard object here at all.

2.7. SUMMARY OF PHASE TWO: 1965–NOVEMBER, 1972

In this second phase, the four points from phase one—individual subjectivity’s potency for higher fulfillment, the intersubjectivity of such fulfillment, the historical nature of such fulfillment, and the changes in the world of human meaning resulting from such fulfillment—were transposed into a language appropriate for the new mode of understanding and reflection Lonergan had entered upon. Now, experience of the limitations of individual subjectivity offer openings for grace and love; grace and love operate in an interpersonal way; grace and love operate in a concrete, historical, realm; and not only do grace and love change human meaning, but they bring it into coincidence with the universal order through interpersonal connection to the divine persons.

These were developments arising largely out of the context afforded by a more concentrated and fleshed out shift to an intentionality analysis. 1965’s “Dimensions of Meaning” initiated the new form of expression through which these developments were carried, but it was not until 1968 that the real ramifications of this new mode became clear. In that year, sublation entered the discussion as a way to understand the relation between levels of consciousness, while a higher context of community offered an epistemological shift through a new state not reducible to particular acts. Such a state Lonergan identified as holiness, linking it with Augustine’s dictum that we love God and do what we wish. Such developmental trends continued in 1969, with the clear

affirmation of the superiority of the religious horizon tied to a cosmic context in terms of the good of order. Mystery, a content without an apprehended object, became the formulation for the experience of the state of being in love without restriction, a state received as gift.

Alongside these developments, however, difficulties entered. The situating of the realm of the interpersonal in relation to individual subjectivity became increasingly problematic and unclear, especially with the similarities between Lonergan's extended accounts of the functioning of sublation and the functioning of love with respect to individual subjectivity. The introduction, in 1970, of authenticity and liberty as factors and of further emphases on the historical, interpersonal, and Trinitarian elements of the fulfillment of individual consciousness, although they were important developments in their own rights, did little if anything to alleviate these difficulties. Though in that year the field of values, actions, and interpersonal relations was clearly not reducible to the contents of experiencing, understanding, and judging, its precise relation to evaluation and deliberation remained explanatorily unspecified.

These developments and problems came together in 1972 with the publication of *Method in Theology*. The developments were controlled in their expression and carefully connected to one another, some of them being brought together for the first time. Yet such clarity and control only serve to highlight the lack of clarity when it comes to the relation that obtains between the fulfillment of consciousness and the fourth, deliberative, level of consciousness. The difficulties were highlighted further by three additional texts from that year, all serving to show that while the shift to an intentionality analysis had opened up numerous avenues for development, retaining in their substance the four

streams of emphasis present in the first phase of Lonergan's development on love, that same shift had also clarified a problem that had not arisen in that first phase: precisely how does the fulfillment of conscious subjectivity relate to the structure of that subjectivity?

The interpersonal, historical fulfillment of intentional consciousness in the dynamic state of unrestricted being in love fit nearly all the characteristics of a higher, subsuming level of consciousness. Such an understanding of love would answer the question about the relation between the fulfillment of consciousness and the structure of consciousness, but Lonergan did not identify the unrestricted state of being in love as such a level of consciousness and so was left without a full answer to that question. My suggestion is that, up through November of 1972 at least, Lonergan refrained from such an identification because he could locate neither an operation of love in conscious experience nor anything that would fulfill the function of an operation in the structure.

3. THE EMERGENCE AND CLARIFICATION OF THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS: DECEMBER, 1972, TO NOVEMBER, 1984

The explicit identification of the fulfillment of intentional consciousness in love as a sublating level would not occur until the final month of 1972. At that time, Lonergan gave three talks under the title, “The Relationship of the Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty, Systematics.” More commonly known as “Philosophy of God, and Theology,” these presentations provided the first documented breakthrough to the phrase “fifth level” with reference to love and the levels of consciousness. Lonergan affirmed then that such a level was conscious but unknown, that coming to know it was similar to the process of coming to know in any other transcendental analysis, that it was irreducible to other levels, that it was intersubjective—at least for the Christian—and that it posited a distinct question: “With whom are we in love?” This breakthrough marked the beginning of the third and final stage of Lonergan’s development on love and its relation to intentional consciousness.

The breakthrough, initially only an impromptu response at a question session, was reaffirmed and fleshed out in 1973 when Lonergan identified the interpersonal as a sublating level manifested in the subject’s experience of love. Throughout the following years, he continued to develop this point and further clarify its explanatory power, relating it to emergent probability, a “topmost quasi-operator,” community, and the “healing vector.” As late as 1982, he was still affirming that there was a fifth level that sublated the other levels just as they sublated the levels below them.

On the other hand, also as late as 1982, Lonergan was offering confusing responses that seemed to renege on his fifth level position, making it difficult to develop

a consistent account of his final thoughts on the matter. Some of his answers were helpful and revealed a consistency: he twice answered a question about the ontological difference made by religious conversion by suggesting that it changed the community to which one belonged (in 1974 and 1981), revealing a continuing link between the effect of grace in individual subjectivity and interpersonal, communal relations. Other answers were not so helpful: he was asked three times about the effect a fifth level would have on the functional specialties he had articulated in *Method in Theology*, and each of the three times, he gave a different answer (in 1974, 1981, and 1982).¹

With these difficulties in mind, this chapter will progress as follows. The initial breakthrough in December, 1972, will be established, as will its reaffirmation and more solid and systematic explication in the following year. The rest of the chapter will then note significant emphases and efforts to flesh out the breakthrough, some of which were in Lonergan's own writings and others of which were in response to questions asked of him at various workshops and seminars. The conclusion will leave to the following chapter the major effort to synthesize Lonergan's position and will instead offer only a brief summary of his development in this third stage.

3.1. DECEMBER, 1972

In December, 1972, Lonergan presented three talks under the title, "The Relationship of the Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty, Systematics." In the first of the three lectures, mounting sequential imagery appeared once again, reaching its

¹ On the functional specialties, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999), Chapter Five.

structural term in religious differentiation, which is “placed” in God’s gift of his grace.² As before, this was identified with Romans 5:5 and Romans 8, among other biblical texts,³ and it was described as a dynamic state that is conscious but not known.⁴ New here was the specification that the dynamic state of being in love was not only both conscious and unknown, but also “consciously unrestricted.”⁵ This meant that we can become aware of its unrestricted character and by that awareness we can identify it as a love of God, while the love itself remains a gift and does not depend on any prior apprehension of God.⁶ Instead, because Lonergan had qualified the notion that nothing is loved that is not first known,⁷ the argument could now be made that one could not apprehend God at all were there not the prior gift of God’s love to us.

Discussion of the first lecture further illuminated these points.⁸ Lonergan explained that a nonconceptual religious conversion could serve as a basis for a philosophy of God and a systematic theology because “it gives you a new horizon. It gives you the horizon in which questions about God are significant.”⁹ The “key point” in such religious conversion is “God plucking out the heart of stone . . . and inserting the heart of flesh,”¹⁰ and its identification runs parallel to the procedure for transcendental

² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 162–168.

³ Mark 12 and Deuteronomy 6.

⁴ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 169.

⁵ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 169.

⁶ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 170.

⁷ On Lonergan’s reworking of the *nihil amatum* . . . principle, see above, at 103 n 124, and Lonergan, *Method*, 122.

⁸ The majority of the questions pertaining to the first lecture (Dec 8) were discussed on that evening; a few questions having to do with the first lecture were discussed after the following night’s lecture. See Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 192 n 30.

⁹ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 175.

¹⁰ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 175. For Lonergan, this is what is common to all the accounts of religious conversion, no matter their formulation, from Ezekiel to the 800,000 gods of Shintoism to the God of Jacob or Laban, to the God of the Hebrews. (One could go beyond Lonergan’s own examples here and

analysis of intentional operations: “Just as transcendental method is intentionality analysis at its root—you’re starting from the subject and his operations—so you can get a theological method if you have something further in the subject that will make that transcendental method into a theological method. And that is again religious experience, religious experience at its finest, God’s gift of his love.”¹¹

The second lecture, and especially the dialogue from the related question session, highlight that the gift itself does not include the knowledge that is obtained in reflection on the gift. The gift is an occurrence that constitutes “the ultimate state in a person’s self-transcendence.”¹² It is “a transvaluation of values in your living . . . not produced by knowing,” and it “is going beyond your present horizon; it is taking you beyond your present horizon.”¹³ When a questioner sought to clarify that “there would be no insight, no concept, no judgment,” Lonergan replied, “Not of itself, no. You can say it is on the fifth level. It is self-transcendence reaching its summit, and that summit can be developed and enriched, and so on. But of itself it is permanent.”¹⁴

This is Lonergan’s first recorded use of the phrase, “the fifth level.” He used that phrase here to highlight the distinctiveness of the gift, its non-reducibility to the levels of

include the Muslim identification and understanding of Allah, the various Hindu gods, or many of the other religions around the world.) Each of these formulations has at its heart what transcendental analysis would term religious conversion and what Christian religion has identified as both the replacement of the heart of stone with the heart of flesh and the gift of God’s love (Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 175).

¹¹ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 176. Such a method, however, does not reduce all religions to equivalent responses to God’s gift of love. The gift of God’s love “is not complete revelation. It is not Christian revelation, which is something that goes beyond it and brings in a specific difference. There is an intersubjective element to love that is present in Christianity, where God is expressing his love in Christ as well as giving you the grace in your heart; and this element is missing when you haven’t got a Christian revelation” (Lonergan, “Philosophy of God,” 178).

¹² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 193.

¹³ Lonergan, “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 193.

¹⁴ Lonergan, “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 193.

moral deliberation, judgment, understanding, or experience. The gift is a new horizon within which deliberating, judging, understanding, and experiencing are done; it is not simply a new set of deliberations, judgments, understandings, or experiences; it is the summit of self-transcendence, going beyond those four levels.

This breakthrough allowed for the introduction, in the third lecture, of a further question beyond the epistemological and existential ones upon which Lonergan had already elaborated. He claimed that in addition to questions for intelligence, reflection, and deliberation, “there is the religious question: we are suffering from an unconditioned, unrestricted love; with whom, then, are we in love?”¹⁵ This religious question is manifested in four forms, derived from each of the four types of questions: in attempting to understand our questions for intelligence, reflect on our questions for reflection, deliberate about our questions for deliberation, or reflect on our religious experience, we confront the question of God.¹⁶ Though distinct, these forms of the question of God are not separate but are, instead, cumulative. Thus,

the question of God is epistemological when we ask how the universe can be intelligible. It is philosophic when we ask why we should bow to the principle of sufficient reason when there is no sufficient reason for the existence of

¹⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 205–206.

¹⁶ Lonergan’s formulation of this last form of the question of God was, “A fourth form of the question of God arises when one reflects on religious experience” (Lonergan, “Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 206). ‘Reflection’ was used technically when he stated that the question of God arises when we reflect on our reflecting, but it was used in a perhaps less technical sense in his articulation of the fourth version of the question of God. In each of the other cases, the question of God arises when we turn the operation of that level onto the questions of that level (*understanding* questions for intelligence, *reflecting* on our questions for reflection, *deliberating* about our questions for deliberation), but it may be that the newness of his language about religious experience presented him with a conundrum: it would not be clear if he had said that we “religiously experience our religious experience.”

contingent things. It is moral when we ask whether the universe has a moral ground and so a moral goal. It finally is religious when we ask whether there is anyone for us to love with all our heart and all our soul and all our mind and all our strength.¹⁷

In these lectures, Lonergan reached a new milestone. He reaffirmed that religious experience offered a new horizon of which we are conscious but which we do not know without turning our conscious operations on it. He noted that such coming-to-know is parallel to other transcendental analyses, suggesting that religious experience is similar to other elements of consciousness. He understood religious experience to be irreducible to the other levels. He understood Christian religious experience to be intersubjective, setting it apart from other religious experience. But here he began a new phase of development in which he now felt justified identifying religious experience as a “fifth level,” distinguishing it from the other levels of consciousness and suggesting a distinct question for that level: “With whom are we in love?”¹⁸

3.2. 1973

In 1973, Lonergan reinforced his identification of this distinct element as a fifth level. He appeared on a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio show where his comments about love clearly grew out of his affirmations the previous December, and he also presented the Larkin-Stuart Lectures at the University of Toronto, in which he offered the first full-fledged account of a sublating level of interpersonal love.

¹⁷ Lonergan, “Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 207.

¹⁸ See Lonergan, “Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 217–218.

3.2.1. INTERVIEW FOR *CONCERN* RADIO SHOW

On May 7, 1973, Lonergan sat down for an interview with the CBC radio show, *Concern*.¹⁹ After a discussion of “the primary precepts that don’t change” (Be Attentive, Be Intelligent, Be Reasonable, and Be Responsible), the host asked about Lonergan’s understanding of self-sacrificing love. Lonergan replied bluntly by saying,

Romans. Chapter five, verse five. God’s love has flooded our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us. If you take it as literally true, he’s speaking of a gift, the gift that floods our hearts, the gift of love, of God’s love. It seems to be a possessive genitive there: God does the loving. It’s God’s type of loving or God’s loving, that takes over our hearts. And, as illustrated by Christ, the life of Christ, it is a self-sacrificing love.²⁰

The theme of self-sacrificing love returned later in the conversation when Lonergan once again offered a series of mounting images beginning with the infant and moving through the world mediated by meaning, then empiricism, then idealism.²¹ He then noted that “consciousness moves on different levels” before elaborating on those levels—a level of experience, a level of inquiry, a level of reflection, and a level of responsibility and freedom—and then he added that “being in love seems to be another

¹⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Interview for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Radio Program, ‘Concern,’” recorded May 7, 1973, Regis College, Toronto, aired October 24, 1973, Toronto, 3 Windows Media Audio files, PCD 753.wav (41:20), PCD 754.wav (39:53), and PCD 755.wav (16:23).

²⁰ Lonergan went on to highlight Augustine’s distinction between a good will and good performance as two stages in the influence of grace. Further elaboration highlighted the distinction between being in love and acts of loving, as well as the point that it is God’s gift but we can let it grow cold and “renege on it.” See PCD 753, at 31:01.

²¹ For Lonergan, empiricism and idealism are stepping-stones on the way to critical realism (see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992], 22). Though the inclusion of empiricism and idealism are new, the notion of such stepping stones fits well with his previous uses of successive imagery.

level.”²² Among these levels of consciousness, Lonergan argued that “the most universal one of all is of course the top one,” which is “a matter of being in love with God,” and he emphasized that the unrestrictedness of the experienced love indicates that it is a being-in-love with God and not some finite entity.²³

After a change of the tape reel in the recording, Lonergan’s voice enters in the midst of a story that he would use several times in the coming years to relate his understanding of love:

L: My ministry was in a town about two miles away, Bonnyrigg, in the mining district about 20 miles out of Edinburgh [Scotland]. And one of the people that I went to, the mother was terribly upset, her daughter was going to marry a non-Catholic, and that was something the mother couldn’t envisage, and I was to speak to the daughter. And all the daughter’d ever say [was], “Well, I’ll ask him.” She was in love.

Q: What were the restrictions, the limitations, of that situation?

L: Oh, well, it was the restrictions on any human love. She couldn’t have asked him if he’d died.

Lonergan thus briefly displayed the effect he understood love—a fifth-level state of being in love with God—to have on individual subjectivity. Further, with the help of the host’s question about the limitations on that love, he offered an example of the distinction between unrestricted and finite loves.

²² For this and the following discussion, see PCD 754, at 32:49.

²³ Likewise in the scale of values, he noted that religious values are “on the top, because they regard the universe . . . [and] man stands in the universe”; in other words, religious values go beyond human beings because they regard the entire universe, of which human beings and their own values are only a part.

3.2.2. THE LARKIN-STUART LECTURES, TRINITY COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

In “A New Pastoral Theology,” given on November 12, Lonergan noted that as one can exist as a human being, so too a human being can exist as a Christian. That is the existence of one whose heart is flooded by God’s love through the Holy Spirit given him or her (Romans 5.5). . . . [Moreover,] authentic Christian experience . . . is alive. It is that experience as shared by two or more that is intersubjective; that, as shared by many, is community; that, as transmitted down the ages, is historic; that, as intended for all Christians, is ecumenical and, as intended for all men, is universalist; it is the same experience, as headed for an ultimate goal, that is eschatological. So a single human reality, in its many aspects, and through its many realizations, at once is alive and intersubjective, communal and historic, ecumenical and universalist and eschatological.²⁴

The following evening, Lonergan gave the lecture, “Variations in Fundamental Theology,” in which he made a series of bold statements highlighting his ongoing emphasis on and distinction of a fifth level beyond the cognitional and the moral. He stated that

it turns out . . . that the priority of cognitional theory is only relative, and the priority of cognitional operations qualified. The cognitional yields to the moral, and the moral to the interpersonal. To make a sound moral judgment one has to know the relevant facts, possibilities, probabilities; but with those conditions

²⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “A New Pastoral Theology,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 232 (see CWL 17, 221 n 1, for more background information on these lectures).

fulfilled, the moral judgment proceeds on its own criteria and towards its own ends. Again, moral judgments and commitments underpin personal relations; but with the underpinning presupposed or even merely hoped for, interpersonal commitment takes its own initiative and runs its own course.²⁵

The distinct “initiative” and “course” of interpersonal commitment had here the character of a distinct, sublating level:

A distinction may be drawn between sublating and sublated operations, where the sublating operations go beyond the sublated, add a quite new principle, give the sublated a higher organization, enormously extend their range and bestow upon them a new and higher relevance. So inquiry and understanding stand to the data of sense; so reflection, checking, verifying stand to the formulations of understanding; so deliberating on what is truly good, really worth while, stands to experience, understanding, and factual judgment; so, finally, interpersonal commitments stand to cognitional and moral operations.²⁶

Although he had already identified love as a distinct “level,” this lecture was the first time Lonergan specifically identified the interpersonal as sublating, and here we also find the suggestion that the sublating level of interpersonal relations could be understood as not just a level, but a level *of consciousness*:

The successive sublations of which I speak are, not at all the mysterious surmounting of contradictions in a Hegelian dialectic, but the inner dynamic structure of our conscious living. . . . Problems let us find ourselves inquiring;

²⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Variations in Fundamental Theology,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 247.

²⁶ Lonergan, “Variations,” 248.

solutions let us find the insights of the solver; judgments bring us to the subject critically surveying the evidence and rationally yielding to it; decisions point not only outwardly to our practical concerns but also inwardly to the existential subject aware of good and evil and concerned whether his own decisions are making him a good or evil man. But beyond all these, beyond the subject as experiencing, as intelligent, as reasonable in his judgments, as free and responsible in his decisions, there is the subject in love. On that ultimate level we can learn to say with Augustine, *amor meus pondus meum*, my being in love is the gravitational field in which I am carried along.²⁷

With this, Lonergan had now clearly identified the interpersonal as sublating, on par with understanding, judgment, and deliberation, and he had identified such interpersonal, sublation as consciously manifested in the subjective experience of love, which he had already identified as a fifth level. Here, then, is the fullest initial account of the experience of interpersonal love as a distinct level of consciousness. The emphasis on community resulting from this breakthrough was further elaborated upon in the third

²⁷ Lonergan, "Variations," 248. He followed this with a further account of the three types of love: "Our loves are many and many-sided and manifold. They are the ever fascinating theme of novelists, the pulse of poetry, the throb of music, the strength, the grace, the passion, the tumult of dance. They are the fever of youth, the steadfastness of maturity, the serenity of age. But on an endless topic, let us be brief and indicate three dimensions in which we may be in love. There is domestic love, the loves that makes a home, in which parents and children, each in his or her own ever-nuanced and adaptive way, sustains and is sustained by each of the others. There is the love that is loyalty to one's fellows: it reaches out through kinsmen, friends, acquaintances, through all the bonds—cultural, social, civil, economic, technological—of human cooperation, to unite ever more members of the human race in the acceptance of a common lot, in sharing a burden to be borne by all, in building a common future for themselves and future generations. But above all, at once most secret and most comprehensive, there is the love of God. It is twofold. On the one hand, it is God's love for us: 'God loved the world so much that he gave his only Son, that everyone who has faith in him may not die but have eternal life' (John 3:16). On the other hand, it is the love that God bestows upon us ' . . . God's love has flooded our inmost heart through the Holy Spirit he has given us' (Romans 5:5)" (Lonergan, "Variations," 248–249).

lecture, “Sacralization and Secularization” (given November 14),²⁸ but the fundamental breakthrough attributing sublation to the fifth level of interpersonal love had occurred in the second lecture.

3.3. 1974

The breakthrough to the identification of interpersonal love as a sublating level of consciousness had now occurred, but it remained to be shown just what that would mean for Lonergan’s other analyses, especially as they had come to be accepted among scholars influenced by his work. This was first seen in the question sessions during the inaugural Lonergan Workshop, held June 17–21, 1974.²⁹

3.3.1. LONERGAN WORKSHOP, BOSTON COLLEGE

On June 17, Lonergan addressed three questions together, remarking that they were connected with one another: “What becomes of isomorphism on the fourth level?”; “It seems that Fr. Lonergan has not worked out in *Method* where human love is really an exception to the ordinary development from level to level. Has he anything further to say

²⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Sacralization and Secularization,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 267–269 and 280–281.

²⁹ Discussions of religious conversion, Romans 5:5, and the fulfillment of consciousness again showed up in “Moral Theology and the Human Sciences” (given February 28), and Lonergan linked changes in horizon to changes in the subject—suggesting that one does not occur without the other—in “Method: Trend and Variations” (given on March 15). Although continuing his line of thought, these accounts presented nothing new and will not be dealt with in detail. (See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Moral Theology and the Human Sciences,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004], 308, and “Method: Trend and Variations” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe [New York: Paulist, 1985], 18.)

on this question since writing *Method?*"; and "Will Fr. Lonergan specify the difference in the ontological constitution of the person as morally authentic and as religiously authentic?"³⁰

Noting that his answer bore most directly on the second of these questions, Lonergan began by highlighting the relation between levels within emergent probability: "In general the emergent probability is from the system, the coincidental manifold, on the lower level to something that becomes organic, systematic, normative on a higher, on a further level."³¹ The authentic subject is a similar series of successive levels of self-transcendence, in which sensitivity is succeeded by intelligence, intelligence by judgment, and judgment by "the moral subject." Yet moral self-transcendence in a plurality of subjects "constitutes a coincidental manifold, ready to snap into something further. That something further is being in love: on the domestic level—the family; on the human group level—the tribe, the city, the state, humanity; and with regard to the universe."³² The references to emergent probability and higher system³³ make it clear that interpersonal love is explicitly performing a sublating function like that of the other levels, but there is a shift here from the individual to a plurality.

Lonergan's emphasis on higher system continued in his answer to the third question. He suggested that the difference in the ontological constitution of the person as morally versus religiously authentic was to be found in the community of which that person is a citizen: "Moral authenticity is being a citizen of the *civitas terrena*, and

³⁰ 809A0DTE070. These were questions 6, 8, and 10, respectively.

³¹ 809A0DTE070.

³² 809A0DTE070.

³³ On emergent probability, see Lonergan, *Insight*, 138–151; on higher system, see Lonergan, *Insight*, 98–99, 229–230.

religious of the *civitas caelestis*.³⁴ Likewise, the isomorphism that obtains between subject and object at the fourth level “is moving beyond the individual to something distinct, to a new creation, to a vertical finality, to the next level of emergent probability.”³⁵ Together, Lonergan’s answers to the third and first of these questions suggest that, just as the ontological difference between moral and religious authenticity has to do with the community of which one is a part, so the moral level in consciousness is an openness to a higher, interpersonal, level of emergent probability.

Lonergan was then asked whether or not the addition of further levels and/or further distinctions within levels would result in further functional specialties.³⁶ While not prepared to admit further functional specialties, Lonergan did affirm that “with regard to levels, I have moved from three operators to three operators and two quasi-operators, and there is a quasi-operator before the other three, the symbolic operator. . . . And the [other] quasi-operator that moves to the next stage of emergent probability, when you get a new synthesis, a new order.”³⁷

This notion of ‘quasi-operator’ was the focus of further investigation during the question session the next day, June 18.³⁸ When asked why he spoke of quasi-operators rather than operators at points both lower and higher than the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding, Lonergan replied that

³⁴ 809A0DTE070.

³⁵ 809A0DTE070.

³⁶ In response to the possibility, raised in the question, of a distinction at the level of moral deliberation between “What ought to be done?” and “Am I to do it?” Lonergan remarked that while those were distinct questions, he was not sure that there were distinct criteria for the two. Without those criteria, it seems that one would have no grounds to affirm that they would constitute or even indicate separate, previously-unrecognized, levels of consciousness. This question deals with the issue of the structural isomorphism (or lack thereof) between the levels of judgment and decision.

³⁷ 809A0DTE070.

³⁸ 810A0DTE070.

the operators and quasi-operators are concerned with vertical finality. . . . [and] vertical finality can be thematized and not only thematized globally, but different parts of it, different levels of it, can be distinguished and named, and those distinctions can be based on procedures like asking questions and answering them. . . .

You can classify questions and distinguish different types of questions with differences that are not merely specific or generic but transcendental, and when you make these distinctions, you get the operators. . . .

Now, vertical finality is not limited to what is sufficiently in consciousness to be thematized. . . . [There is] the vertical finality of what in man is the vital, the neural. . . . [and] besides this vertical finality of what we begin from, there's the vertical finality that still goes on, simply because we are self-transcending subjects, and that's the second quasi-operator. It's the self-transcending subject finding a realization in the family, in the social group, and in the new creation, in an orientation to the universe: three ways of being in love. A clarification of that operator is all that I have said about self-transcendence in *Method*, and all that I was prepared to say about self-transcendence in *Insight*, prior to *Method*; and more particularly what I have said about probability and emergent probability and explanatory genera and species. The new genus is a matter of a new system, integrating, systematizing, making organic what is merely a coincidental manifold on a lower level. We talked about that yesterday.³⁹

³⁹ 810A0DTE070.

Love is clearly not unconscious, here, but it is a peculiar kind of consciousness not sufficient for full thematization of its contents. The vertical operator (note the lack of the prefix ‘quasi-’ the last time he referred to it) opens up on a new system organizing a plurality of conscious subjects as a way of being in love. Such a new system was what he had positioned as higher than the moral level on the previous day.

This was not a one-off comment. He reaffirmed the same point when pressed further on his use of the term ‘*quasi-operator*’ specifically:

There is a difference between what is already in consciousness and is not thematized and what is going beyond consciousness. Discovering a new world, falling in love: people don’t decide about that; it happens. You may decide for it or against it after it does happen, but it happens, I mean fundamentally it happens. Similarly, there were a lot of people all along the ages who paid a lot of attention to dreams, and so on, but they didn’t make a science of it the way it has been done in this twentieth century. But if anyone doesn’t want to use the word ‘quasi’ there for that reason, OK. You can all follow Humpty Dumpty’s rule, paying the words double and making them mean what you want.

He appeared here to affirm a kind of difference between falling in love and other operations (the former *happens to you*), but he clarified how one accesses the data on such a happening when, later in the same session, he was asked whether religious conversion—the replacing of the heart of stone with a heart of flesh—was “a first step that is to be distinguished from falling in love.” Noting Aquinas’ understanding of the prior events leading to justification and elaborating on the relation between conversion and falling in love in the context of a scholastic metaphysical theology, Lonergan

addressed the process surrounding religious falling in love and illustrated the peculiarity of the data on the upper quasi-operator. Although the discussion was complex, his meaning was clear enough: even older analyses of the event of falling in love with God emphasized a process of prior and subsequent events surrounding whatever one might try to identify as the moment of falling in love. As he would suggest more and more in the coming years, the relevant data are data on a *process*, not data on a single moment.⁴⁰

He had already suggested that this process and its horizon were set in a context of community, and on June 21, Lonergan elaborated further on that point. He clarified the role played by a community's common fields of experiencing, understanding, judging, and valuing in reply to a question about the relation between the interpersonal, the "transpersonal," and the upper quasi-operator⁴¹:

The interpersonal is community, and there is a self-transcendence to community, and I have conceived community as people who are self-transcending with a common field of experience—otherwise they are out of touch—and common or complementary understanding—otherwise there is misunderstanding, and everything that follows from misunderstanding—and common judgments of fact, common values, common goals. In other words, by a community I do not

⁴⁰ The following day (June 19), Lonergan remarked that "faith . . . is identical with God's gift of his love. . . . It is love that founds positive apprehensions of value, and especially of potential value." Because such love has a content but no object, so likewise does faith have a content but no object: "God's gift of his love as such is a gift of love, and having an object that interprets that gift is something further, something distinct. It may be prior; it may be simultaneous; it may be subsequent; but it is distinct. . . . God's gift of his love, insofar as it is relevant to faith, is a gift awaiting its interpretation." Similarly, in answer to another question he stated that "religious conversion is God's gift of his love, faith is the eye of love. . . . The person in love sees all sorts of things that the people who aren't in love don't. Whether they're illusory or not is another question." Thus, the gift of God's love provides a new horizon, but it must be reflected upon to be known, and it needs to be adjudicated to determine the authenticity of the new values, realities, and experiences made recognizable in it. As his comments the previous day suggested, such reflection and adjudication are reflection and adjudication on a process (812A0DTE070).

⁴¹ 815A0DTE070. The questioner had used the word "transpersonal."

mean people in the same locus with nothing in common apart from that, or with some one thing in common and everything else to be thwarted or impeded or eliminated if possible. That's not a community.⁴²

A real community is situated within an entire universe including meanings and values, and he had maintained earlier in the week that 'universe' was the object of the third way of loving. This prompted a questioner to ask about his use of 'universe' rather than 'God' in the description of this third kind of love. While the cosmic formulation of the third way of loving had precedent in Lonergan's development on the question, the link between the cosmic context of love and the religious nature of being in love with God (the other formulation of the third way of being in love) had not been addressed directly and was clearly confusing, at least to some. That lacuna was rectified when Lonergan suggested that the universal, cosmic context was also a God-context: "The thing is there is such a thing as accepting the universe. And when it does occur as acceptance, it is accepting someone responsible for the universe in some way. It leads right on to God; in other words, the question of the universe turns into a question about God."⁴³

At this Workshop, Lonergan linked emergent probability to the higher horizon of love, clarifying that a plurality of morally self-transcending subjects forms a coincidental manifold that is systematized by being in love. Love performs a sublating function on this plurality and in so doing it establishes a new community for which there is a

⁴² That such interpersonal relations had a vertical finality was clear, once again, from his further comment that "if by the transpersonal you mean self-transcendence that is not only to other persons, human persons, but to God, excellent. If by 'transpersonal,' you mean to some superior being that is to be conceived anthropomorphically, well, I have not been able to follow. . . ." (815A0DTE070).

⁴³ 815A0DTE070.

corresponding element in individual subjectivity. That element is the topmost quasi-operator, which, while not a single datum of consciousness or even sufficiently conscious to be thematized initially, can become known in reflection on the process of its unfolding in one's life and history. The love realized in that reflection, finally, reaches up to a cosmic context, linking one's love of God with one's love of God's creation, the universe.

3.3.2. AFTER THE WORKSHOP

The lecture, "Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious," given on October 10, once again made use of successive imagery culminating in love and situated love as the ground of stable authenticity insofar as it is the fulfillment for which intentional consciousness strives.⁴⁴ Lonergan's further comments on finding one's own love of God hearkened back to and sharpened his June comments about the process of falling in love. He suggested here that "if anyone wishes to ascertain whether he loves God, he is not to attempt psychological introspection, but he is to consider his own palpable behavior[; a] person can be profoundly in love with God yet fail to find it in his inner experience."⁴⁵ While this could be taken to indicate that he did not consider love to be conscious, Lonergan attempted to prevent this by reaffirming that love was indeed

⁴⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 316–325.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, "Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious," 326.

conscious but not known, and that “being in love with God, if not a peak experience, at least is a peak state, indeed a peak dynamic state.”⁴⁶

Any lack of clarity in these comments was somewhat alleviated in “Mission and the Spirit,” written no later than October 31. There, Lonergan addressed a central question: “What in terms of human consciousness is the transition from the natural to the supernatural?”⁴⁷ In order to answer the question, Lonergan first distinguished the three kinds of finality—absolute, horizontal, and vertical. He then detailed both how vertical finality includes a participative element insofar as lower entities actually enter into higher entities and how “it is only as an instrument operating beyond its own proportion that the lower, as long as it is lower, can bring about and participate in the constitution of the higher.”⁴⁸ When submitted to intentionality analysis, the human subject is understood to be a similar hierarchically-structured set of related operations, with “three types of operator yield[ing] four levels of operation,” and each lower level an instance of vertical finality toward the higher levels.⁴⁹ In addition to these three operators, the passionateness of being “*underpins* and *accompanies* and *reaches beyond* the subject as experientially, intelligently, rationally, morally conscious”: it *underpins* in “the quasi-operator that presides over the transition from the neural to the psychic,” it *accompanies* in the felt “mass and momentum of our lives,” and it *reaches beyond* in “the topmost quasi-operator that by intersubjectivity prepares, by solidarity entices, by falling in love establishes us as

⁴⁶ Lonergan, “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” 326–327.

⁴⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 23.

⁴⁸ Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 24.

⁴⁹ Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 29.

members of community.”⁵⁰ Vertical finality is the striving for self-transcendence in the underpinning, accompanying, and reaching passionateness of being, and an aggregate of self-transcending individual subjects provides a “significant coincidental manifold in which can emerge a new creation,” one in which the passionateness of being manifests in the three kinds of love—familial, civil, and religious.⁵¹

While all three of these loves are natural for human subjects, as a matter of concrete fact we live under the reign of sin and our “redemption lies not in what is possible to nature but in what is effected by the grace of Christ.”⁵² The concrete situation of human lives in history points to the inability of reason as such to remove the surds that have become objectively instantiated in our history, but the mission of the Son makes visible, and the mission of the Spirit makes effective, the new order that would replace this absurd order. These missions are sustained through history by the sending of the disciples, which extends through tradition and community down to the present day. Once this happens, the

experience of grace . . . is as large as the Christian experience of life. It is
 experience of man’s capacity for self-transcendence. . . . It is experience of a . . .
 frustration of that capacity. . . . It is experience of a transformation one did not
 bring about but rather underwent. . . . It is the experience of a new community. .
 . .⁵³

As Lonergan had already indicated, the data on this state are data on a (quite large and diverse) process. That process, moreover, can not only be experienced in the

⁵⁰ Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 29–30, my emphases.

⁵¹ Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 30.

⁵² Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 30.

⁵³ Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” 32–33.

conscious “reaching beyond” of one’s own topmost (quasi-)operator, but also witnessed to in the ongoing history of a community. A capacity for self-transcendence, frustration of that capacity, transformations of human beings, and an experience of a new community can all be both individually experienced and seen in the history of a group.

3.4. 1975

The emphasis on community and process continued to develop as Lonergan worked out the link between community, interpersonal relations, and authenticity throughout 1975.

3.4.1. BEFORE THE WORKSHOP

“Prolegomena to the Study of the Emerging Religious Consciousness of our Time,” presented January 8, offered a window on some of the work influencing Lonergan’s growing understanding of community.⁵⁴ He quoted at length Robley Edward Whitson’s *The Coming Convergence of World Religions* “because he brings out so well the mating of external and internal factors in emerging consciousness [including] . . . the attraction of an idea only in the bud, of community.”⁵⁵ He likewise offered Raimudo

⁵⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Prolegomena to the Study of the Emerging Religious Consciousness of Our Time,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 55–73.

⁵⁵ Lonergan, “Prolegomena,” 66–67. The long quote from Whitson is worth reproducing here: “Without parallel in the past, contemporary civilization is coming to be centered upon consciousness of man as community: the significance of man in personal relationship—not the isolated individual nor the subordinating society. . . . Perhaps this is the most impressive element in the development of the first half of the century: materialist individualism, exalting the pragmatic good in the isolated value of possession, pleasure, security—the individual as opposed to others, morally unrelated; and subordinating

Panikkar, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, and William Johnston as examples of a movement toward community in which the commonality of an underlying religious experience was fundamental.⁵⁶

These same sorts of communal and personalist trends were again highlighted a few months later in “Christology Today.”⁵⁷ There, Lonergan suggested that one’s Christology must go beyond Aristotelian metaphysics and deal with the challenging assumptions that, first, “a person is the psychological subject of interpersonal relations”; second, “human development is entry into a symbolic world, a world mediated by meaning”; and third, “one cannot be truly a human being without being a human person.”⁵⁸ Although he would qualify this last challenge in light of Christian affirmations about the personhood of Christ, Lonergan was clearly sympathetic to the idea that human

totalitarianism, identifying all reality in the will of one as leader, as consensus, as collective dictatorship—the individual absorbed in anti-relational conformism.

“In the latter half of the century we find that our choice does not rest between these two. It seems, rather, that opposition to both is stimulating an awareness of a positive corespondence between man as individual and as social: community. And an immediate consequent of even the most rudimentary recognition of human community is the further recognition of human unity, not simply in terms of external pressures and circumstances pragmatically forcing man to come together, but as emerging consciousness of what man really is, and hence the consciousness that these ‘external’ factors are not determinative causes, but dynamic reflections of the human condition.

“Yet human unity . . . is still clearly at its beginnings, still mostly dream. But perhaps now we can see it as dream in the psychological sense—a sign from within the hidden inward side of our process of consciousness revealing our fuller life history—rather than a dream in the sense of theoretical ideal. The thrust toward unity in contemporary civilization is unique precisely because it has emerged in our consciousness from our real, experiential history, not from an abstract social theory. We can see this best in terms of problems. The sense of reality we have about human unity does not rest upon what has been achieved, but upon the appalling problems experienced (and only partly resolved) in the first half of the century and upon the problems now arising as we seek unity” (Robley Edward Whitson, *The Coming Convergence of World Religions* [New York: Newman, 1971], 17–18).

⁵⁶ Lonergan cited Raimundo Panikkar, “Have ‘Religions’ the Monopoly on Religion?” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* XI (1974): 515–517; Panikkar, “Metatheology or Diacritical Theology as Fundamental Theology,” *Concilium* CLVI (1969): 43–55; William Johnston, *Silent Music: The Science of Meditation* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); Johnston, *The Mysticism of the Cloud of Unknowing: A Modern Interpretation*, with a Foreword by Thomas Merton (New York: Desclée, 1967); Johnston, *The Still Point: Reflections on Zen and Christian Mysticism* (New York: Fordham University, 1970); Johnston, *Christian Zen* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

⁵⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Christology Today: Methodological Reflections,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 74–99.

⁵⁸ Lonergan, “Christology Today,” 76.

being and personhood are intrinsically *interpersonal*: one is not an authentic human being without being interpersonally situated.

This was confirmed in his ongoing notion that community constitutes the invitation for falling in love, and falling in love—in its domestic, neighborly, and universal or religious dimensions—is the means by which we not only develop toward our goal of self-transcendence in a below-upwards fashion, but are also taken hold of in an above-downwards fashion.⁵⁹ Insofar as it is the presence of Christ properly speaking, the latter is not something in the world of immediacy; it is present to us as mediated by meaning that has been transmitted through community in tradition.⁶⁰ Again as before, while one can have the experience of being in love, its proper identification is in the analysis of a process—this time a process in history manifested in tradition, rather than a process in an individual life, but a process nonetheless. Within the Christian horizon, analysis of this process confronts us with a further question beyond the level of existential deed: “Who is this Jesus?”⁶¹

Before the Workshop in 1975, then, Lonergan had emphasized community and the necessity of an interpersonal element for the full realization of the personhood and authenticity of human beings. The healing vector operated through the interpersonal dimension of tradition to foster authenticity in human subjects. This healing vector was the explanatory identification of the conscious manifestation of the process emphasized the prior year as the locus of data on the fifth level; Lonergan had now articulated the entrance of that process into individual consciousness.

⁵⁹ Lonergan, “Christology Today,” 76–77.

⁶⁰ Lonergan, “Christology Today,” 79.

⁶¹ Lonergan, “Christology Today,” 84.

3.4.2. LONERGAN WORKSHOP

On this same issue⁶²—the identification of the conscious experience of being in love in its relation to tradition—Loneragan was clear in the Workshop discussion session of June 19, when he was asked a direct question about the fifth level of consciousness: “Recently you have spoken of a fifth level of human intentional consciousness, whereby a plurality of self-transcending individuals achieve a higher integration in a community of love. Please expand on this.”⁶³ Loneragan’s initial reply indicated that at this point he thought his remarks so far should be clear: “There is very little to expand on this. Everyone knows what it means. Getting there is another thing.”⁶⁴ He went on to characterize the shifts from an unconscious state up through the emergence of consciousness, experience, understanding, judgment, and responsibility as “all a matter of [the] immanent development of the subject.”⁶⁵ On the other hand, one’s whole life, from before one’s birth and throughout one’s existence, is surrounded by others: “Robinson Crusoe is a real abstraction. And if he really is all alone, his history does not go beyond himself.”⁶⁶ We are therefore enmeshed in a field of common meaning, common

⁶² A questioner asked about a different, but related, issue on June 17. Was there necessarily, in the words of the questioner, “an awareness of being loved unrestrictedly” included as part of “the basic religious experience of unrestricted loving”? The reply indicates that the derivation of the knowledge of *being loved* unrestrictedly is typically a result, not of the experience of unrestricted being in love itself, but of *reflection* on the “objective revelation of God’s love” that “complement[s] the interior experience of God’s grace.” Given this, not only did Loneragan consider the knowledge of one’s own *being in love* to be a result of a reflection on a process in one’s life, but also the knowledge of one’s *being loved* is a result of a reflection on a process in the historical transmission of revelation in tradition: the outer word in tradition is key for the identification of one’s experience as an experience of being loved (85000DTE070).

⁶³ 85200DTE070.

⁶⁴ 85200DTE070.

⁶⁵ 85200DTE070.

⁶⁶ 85200DTE070.

judgments, and common values, and “the highest form of this is love as opposed to hate.”⁶⁷

This point was reaffirmed in a paper Lonergan gave that night, “Healing and Creating in History.” The healing movement (from above downwards) begins with falling in love, which reveals values, undoes bias, and works through faith and hope to thwart the determinisms of psychology and society.⁶⁸ Such a movement works together with an authentic creative movement (from below upwards), and neither the healing movement without the creative, nor the creative movement without the healing, is healthy or authentic.

The same issue was dealt with again the following night (June 20) in the context of a question about the effect that Lonergan’s reorientation of the phrase “*nil amatum nisi prius cognitum*” would have on his work in *Insight*.⁶⁹ He replied that although *Insight* focused on and in fact progressed from below upwards, fundamentally development from above downwards comes first: “The child develops out of a symbiosis, an affective symbiosis with the mother, and as I say, what do babies and children need? Well, love, principally. So it is the affective that provides the global, the big synthesis.”⁷⁰ Just as in his previous writings and replies, love provides the sublating horizon within which authentic deliberative, judgmental, intellectual, and experiential development takes place.

⁶⁷ 85200DTE070.

⁶⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 100–112, at 106. In addition, Lonergan introduced a brief discussion of the authenticity of love and healing, in which he noted that “healing [and love likewise] is not to be confused with the dominating and manipulating to which the reforming materialist is confined by his own principles” (Lonergan, “Healing and Creating,” 107). Although the editorial notes in *A Third Collection* identify this talk as having been given on May 13 (at 108), the version published therein was in fact given at the Lonergan Workshop of that year on June 19 (see the archival notes for 85300DTE070).

⁶⁹ 85400DTE070. On that reorientation, see Lonergan, *Method*, 122.

⁷⁰ 85400DTE070.

At the 1975 Workshop, Lonergan continued his emphasis on process as the locus of data on the fifth level. That process is in the ever-present interpersonal field surrounding individual subjectivity, offering new principles and new ends, and constituting a new horizon that would not be achieved under the operation of individual subjectivity as individual. These new principles and ends, this new horizon, result from the sublation⁷¹ of individual subjectivity by the interpersonal context, thereby initiating the work of the healing vector.

3.5. 1976

In 1976, prior to the Workshop, Lonergan was able to elaborate on the effects of this new horizon and its grounding in love and to suggest a defining characteristic of the difference such a loving community would make in terms of humans' treatment of one another. At the Workshop itself, he focused on sublation and the potentially inconsistent presence of the love of God in explicit consciousness.

⁷¹ He again explained what he meant by this term: "What is sublation? When you distinguish operations of different kinds and certain operations with respect to others. You introduce a new principle, and because there is a new principle there is a new end. And they complete the previous set of operations that are sublated, and sublating operations complete the sublated operations and perfect them and go beyond them and give them a new, fuller finality and preserve them as opposed to destroying, cramping them, or interfering with them. . . . Understanding, so far from interfering with sense, perfects it. And judgment, so far from interfering with understanding, prunes off the overgrowth of myth and magic and astrology and alchemy, and God knows what. Deliberation and evaluation and decision take you out of the ivory tower, have you doing something, and so on. Each successive level sublates previous levels. And when you say, What do you mean by level, and higher and lower levels? I mean what is defined by sublation, the set of words I use in sublation" (85400DTE070).

3.5.1. BEFORE THE WORKSHOP

On March 2–4, Lonergan presented three “Lectures on Religious Studies and Theology.”⁷² In the first lecture, “Religious Experience,” Lonergan reaffirmed much of his previous development. Commitment makes one to be, not a drifter, but a self-actualized person, and such commitment makes its effective entrance most commonly in love.⁷³ Further elaborations of domestic, civil, and religious love followed, until Lonergan addressed “in what manner God’s love flooding our hearts is a human experience and just how it fits into human consciousness.”⁷⁴ The experience, he said, is not a compound of many conscious elements but is instead a single element; it may not be the leading voice in consciousness or always be audible, and in different people it will manifest differently; the same person at different times in his or her life will find the experience different; and experienced development from above downwards⁷⁵ sets the stage for development from below upwards.⁷⁶ The horizon provided by development from above downward is ultimately found in “a type of love, distinct from the love of intimacy, distinct from loyalty to one’s fellows, for it grounds both domestic and civil devotion by reconciling us, by committing us, to the obscure purposes of our universe, to what Christians name the love of God in Christ Jesus.”⁷⁷

⁷² These were the Donald Mathers Memorial Lectures at Queen’s University, Ontario. See the editorial note to Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 127.

⁷³ Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” 123.

⁷⁴ Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” 125.

⁷⁵ Or “if not from above downwards, at least from within an encompassing, enveloping worldview or horizon or blik” (Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” 126).

⁷⁶ Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” 125–126.

⁷⁷ Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” 127.

The new horizon, which is the concrete realization of self-transcendence as the meaning of the whole universe, can be an object of our experience: it is something within which and with respect to which we are conscious. As self-transcendent and self-sacrificing, love is the key to the notion of redemption in Lonergan's theological theory of history, especially as it implies a changed notion of interpersonal relations: "Besides the dialectic that is concerned with human subjects as objects, there is the dialectic in which human subjects are concerned with themselves and with one another. In that case dialectic becomes dialogue."⁷⁸ On this point, Lonergan again made reference to Whitson, Panikkar, and Johnston as illustrations and illustrators of the notion of dialogue he had in mind—intersubjective, interpersonal community in which meeting as subjects, not as objects, takes priority.

3.5.2. LONERGAN WORKSHOP

On June 15, at the Workshop for that year, Lonergan again affirmed that religion sublates morality by introducing a new principle and directing it "to a higher and fuller end."⁷⁹ He drew on Max Scheler's suggestion that love is the root of the apprehension and adherence to values, and he connected love and its opposite, hatred, to the cosmic level. Both can extend to the ground of the universe, and in fact, "the love of God is solidary with an appreciation of God's world, of life, of human community and human

⁷⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Religious Knowledge," in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 159. For the entire argument of which I have offered only a very condensed summation, see 130–134 and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods," in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe, (New York: Paulist, 1985), 151–152.

⁷⁹ 88600DTE070.

history, with faith in its meaningfulness, with hope in its redemption and salvation”; thus, in Catholic moral theology “the fundamental option is between cosmic love and cosmic hatred.”⁸⁰

Such a fundamental option is not always explicit. There is an “implicitness, incompleteness, wavering adherence” to it that “fits in with the nature of moral and religious conversion” insofar as conversion “is the good resolution without as yet the uniform and complete achievement of good performance.”⁸¹ But whether explicitly experienced or not, Lonergan made it clear that love sublates the other conscious operations, as on the following evening, June 18, when he discussed “the successive sublations of sense and consciousness by intelligence, of intelligence by reasonableness, of reasonableness by responsible freedom, and of all by being in love.”⁸²

3.5.3. AFTER THE WORKSHOP

In his presentations later in the year Lonergan once again emphasized the role of community in this sublation. In “The Human Good,” given on September 10, he set group membership as a condition on the transmission of the vector from above downwards, because there was an innately interpersonal element to that vector.⁸³

Likewise, in his answers to the “Questionnaire on Philosophy” (written no later than

⁸⁰ 88600DTE070.

⁸¹ 88600DTE070. When pressed about an explicit Christian conversion in relation to this more general fundamental option, Lonergan returned to the distinction between the inner, prethematic gift of God’s love flooding our hearts and the outer expression of that love: while the gift of God’s love is universal, Christian revelation had to do with the avowal of love, the explicitation of the gift.

⁸² 89000DTE070. Also see 88600DTE070.

⁸³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Human Good,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 340.

September 30), the work of the healing vector was explicitly communal.⁸⁴ Though he had already noted that a question beyond the typical questions of intentional consciousness could be derived from the role of love with respect to intentional consciousness, in the “Questionnaire” the recurrent theme of the social situation of individual subjectivity and the consequent role that interpersonal community plays in authenticity came to a pinnacle in the formulation of a fifth transcendental precept:

The structure of our knowing and doing expresses the conditions of being an authentic person; but this structure is a matter of being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable, being responsible; accordingly, there are four basic precepts that are independent of cultural differences. Moreover, since the actuation of the structure arises under social conditions and within cultural traditions, to the four there may be added a fifth, Acknowledge your historicity.⁸⁵

3.6. 1977

By 1977, Lonergan had made the breakthrough to interpersonal love as a distinct fifth level of consciousness subsuming the levels of deliberation, judgment, understanding, and experience, and he had attempted to clarify the relation of that breakthrough to his analysis of intentional consciousness and community. Now, his work before the Workshop summarized—and appeared to take as settled—his previous developments on

⁸⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Questionnaire on Philosophy,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 361.

⁸⁵ Lonergan, “Questionnaire,” 378.

the issue, while his efforts at the Workshop itself appeared to be further restatements of the same position in the face of direct questions.

3.6.1. BEFORE THE WORKSHOP

The social and historical situating of individual subjectivity formed a central element in “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness” (presented on April 16), as did the notion of a “tidal movement” beginning before consciousness and reaching beyond it to a fulfillment in being-in-love.⁸⁶ That fulfillment, in all three of Lonergan’s typical forms—familial, civil, and religious—was again explicitly identified as sublating intentional consciousness. In addition, Lonergan presented the levels as a five-fold structure several times. He suggested that “besides intelligence, there is obtuseness; besides truth there is falsity; besides what is worthwhile, there is what is worthless; besides love there is hatred” and that “the source of natural right lies in the norms immanent in human intelligence, human judgment, human evaluation, human affectivity.”⁸⁷ He also noted that the dialectic of history as he conceived it would enlighten collective consciousness “with the intelligence, the reasonableness, the responsibility, the love demanded by natural right.”⁸⁸ In “Theology and Praxis” (June 16), he reaffirmed the social, above-downward

⁸⁶ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 174–175.

⁸⁷ Lonergan, “Natural Right,” 176.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, “Natural Right,” 178. He skipped the first level in all three of these cases, but assuming experience as the first, we have a second, a third, a fourth, and a fifth in each list. Although in the second quotation the fifth was the affective or psychic element, rather than a specifically religious or loving element, Lonergan linked these just a few pages later when he stated that emancipatory enlightenment gives “knowledge of affectivity in its threefold manifestation of love in the family, loyalty in the community, and faith in God” and that conversion, “as affective, . . . is commitment to love in the home, loyalty in the community, faith in the destiny of man” (179).

context of human development in general and he emphasized that this principle held also for the revelation in Jesus Christ.⁸⁹

3.6.2. LONERGAN WORKSHOP

On June 20, Lonergan first distinguished the “event” of falling in love from the apprehension of values.⁹⁰ He restated again the image of the heart of stone being replaced with the heart of flesh, and he articulated the relation between love and the level of deliberation as parallel to the relations obtaining between the other levels: “As sensitivity takes us beyond the unconscious, as intelligence takes us beyond sense, as reflective rationality takes us beyond intelligence, as deliberation takes us beyond reflective rationality, so God’s gift of his love brings us to a consummation of our affectivity, our energy-laden bodies and the dynamism of the spirit. It is the spirit of man sparked by the Spirit of God.”⁹¹

That same day, he was asked whether his “post-*Insight* reflection on the objective reference of fourth-level religious experience [would] be the same as the theistic argument of chapter 19 of *Insight*.”⁹² His answer covered several of the significant markers of fifth-level, religious, loving consciousness that he had articulated to this point:

⁸⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Theology and Praxis,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 196–197.

⁹⁰ 91600DTE070.

⁹¹ 91600DTE070.

⁹² 91600DTE070.

“The objective referent of *fourth*-level religious experience”—I conceive it more and more explicitly since about 1972 as a *fifth* level.⁹³ This gift of God’s love . . . is as much a sublation of all that goes before as any of the others are sublations of what went before them. . . .

Now, the experience of falling in love . . . [is] a different experience, as being in love with God is something different from any of these other things because we haven’t had being in love on those levels—we have it on a separate level. . . .

Being in love is the consummation of unconscious desire. . . .

God’s gift of his love is the *agape* that sublates *eros*, the loving that sublates desiring.⁹⁴

Such sublation he illustrated, as he had done in the interview with the *Concern* radio show in 1972, with an experience from his work in Scotland. This time, however, he elaborated on the situation of the girl who intended to marry the Protestant boy:

She was in love. She wasn’t going to figure anything out for herself. She would ask him first. What did he think about it? Together they would make a decision.

But she wasn’t born that way. She fell in love. And it is that gift of love, that falling in love, that makes people different, and it is what makes the decision.

The decision is the acceptance of the gift of love in itself and in all its implications.

⁹³ His tone indicated that he was quoting the questioner, and he stressed ‘*fourth*’ when he did so, before stressing ‘*fifth*’ in his reply.

⁹⁴ 91600DTE070.

This account, however, was more descriptive than explanatory. When he was asked about the distinction between the fourth and fifth levels of consciousness, Lonergan was able to push this in a more explanatory direction by noting that morality is on the fourth level, and one becomes moral when one's deliberations are, not what's in it for me, or what's in it for us, but what's worthwhile. I put that on the fourth level because it sublates the previous levels. And it seems that falling in love, being in love, sublates previous levels too, all four of them. The distinction of levels is between operations that are sublating and operations that are sublated.⁹⁵

In the summer of 1977, then, Lonergan distinctly and directly clarified that religious experience fell on a fifth level rather than the fourth, and he affirmed that such a fifth level sublated the lower levels just as they sublated what was below them.

3.7. 1978

By 1978, Lonergan had reached a position on the question, formulated that position, faced questions about it, and elaborated on it both by answering questions and by using it as an opening for further developments. Now, he further solidified previous positions before turning his attention to the affective dimension of love in its relation to intentional consciousness.

⁹⁵ 91600DTE070.

3.7.1. BEFORE THE WORKSHOP

In “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” composed no later than early 1978,⁹⁶ Lonergan summarized quite clearly the level of development he had reached by this point:

Our intentionality analysis distinguished the four levels of experience, understanding, factual judgment, and existential decision. We must now advert to the fact that this structure may prove open at both ends. The intellectual operator that promotes our operations from the level of experience to the level of understanding may well be preceded by a symbolic operator that coordinates neural potentialities and needs with higher goals through its control over the emergence of images and affects. Again, beyond the moral operator that promotes us from judgments of fact to judgments of value with their retinue of decisions and actions, there is a further realm of interpersonal relations and total commitment in which human beings tend to find the immanent goal of their being and, with it, their fullest joy and deepest peace.

So from an intentionality analysis distinguishing four levels one moves to an analysis that distinguishes six levels. Moreover, the two added levels are particularly relevant to religious studies. The symbolic operator that shapes the development of sensibility and, in its ultimate achievement, guides the Jungian process of individuation, would seem highly relevant to an investigation of

⁹⁶ On the dating of this document, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 391.

religious symbols. And the soul of religion has been seen to lie in a total commitment that embraces the universe and frequently does so in adoration of a personal God. . . .

We adverted to a topmost level of interpersonal relations and total commitments, a level that can be specifically religious, a level that in one of its actuations is easily verified in New Testament doctrine, that conforms to the view of all Scholastic schools that without charity even the infused virtues are unformed, that provides a basis for explicating the universalism of Christianity and relating it positively to other religions. As a final note to this section one may add that what in a philosophic context I have named being in love in an unrestricted manner, in a theological context could be paralleled with Karl Rahner's supernatural existential.⁹⁷

This clear summary at the turn of the 1977–78 year offers valuable data on the state of his development to this point. He clarified something that before had been obscure: when he stated that the “topmost level of interpersonal relations and total commitments . . . *can* be specifically religious . . . in *one* of its actuations,”⁹⁸ this indicated that it is not always religious. Even non-religious interpersonal relations and commitments, indeed even non-religious love, function in a sublating way that qualifies them as a level above that of deliberation. Still, he distinguished the “levels of experience, understanding, factual judgment, and existential decision” from the two

⁹⁷ Lonergan, “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” 400–402. As a qualification on his point concerning the relation between Rahner's supernatural existential and Lonergan's being in love in an unrestricted manner, see Jeremy W. Blackwood, “Lonergan and Rahner on the Natural Desire to See God,” *MJLS*, n.s. 1, no. 2 (2010): 85–103.

⁹⁸ Lonergan, “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” 401, emphasis added.

further operators, while at the same time dropping the prefix “quasi-” from those two further operators, leaving it unclear whether or not those two further operators constituted levels of consciousness on equal footing with the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding.

3.7.2. LONERGAN WORKSHOP

On June 13, Lonergan made it clear that affectivity was a primary way by which love sublated the other levels:

Experience, understanding, judging, deciding, are just paper-thin without the affectivity which is the mass and momentum of our lives, and that is why falling in love involves the transformation of the person. My example of a person in love is a girl in Scotland whose mother didn't want her to marry a Protestant and asked me to speak with her. But anything I would say, she would answer, well, I'll ask him: she was in love. There was someone else in her life besides herself.⁹⁹

The change in affectivity is key for the sublating function of love. It alters the “mass and momentum” accompanying experience, understanding, judgment, and decision, and this alteration is a major means by which these operations are drawn up into a higher horizon and enlarged and enhanced in their applicability. We *feel* differently, so we decide, judge, understand, and experience differently.

⁹⁹ 94000DTE070.

Speaking about this difference in feeling, however, is not always easy. On the following day, June 14, Lonergan noted the difficulty of determining a definition *omni et soli* for love.¹⁰⁰ Ordinary language knows the meanings of words but it does not define, whereas technical language (definition *omni et soli*) defines in a manner grounded on “an intelligently devised system that corresponds with matters of fact.”¹⁰¹ Any definition of love, then, presupposes familiarity with the matters of fact concerning love, and “one comes to know what it is to love by falling in love. . . . Falling in love is something extremely existential, it takes one out of one’s self, enables one to transcend oneself.”¹⁰² His point seems to have been that a definition of love is meaningless without a basic familiarity with the change in feeling signified by the term ‘love’ or the phrase “falling in love.” Otherwise, one’s use of the word will be merely formal and it will not have an objective existential referent. Clearly for Lonergan, then, one can have an experience recognizable and identifiable as ‘love.’¹⁰³

On the following day, June 15, an exchange took place in which Lonergan strongly reaffirmed the distinction between this experienced being-in-love and the levels of decision, judgment, understanding, and experience:

Q: Is being in love as the first moment in the procession of the human spirit, it is a fourth-level act . . .

L: It is on the fifth level. It is you getting beyond yourself.

Q: Is it a feeling?

¹⁰⁰ 94400DTE070.

¹⁰¹ 94400DTE070.

¹⁰² 94400DTE070.

¹⁰³ Notice how this parallels the process by which insights, judgments, and decisions are identified in one’s own conscious experience.

L: It's a dynamic state, and it seeps down through the whole. But it is transforming. A person in love is a different person to what he or she was before.

Q: Does it give the possibility, then, of a moral and religious conversion quicker than any other?

L: Yes. Especially moral, if it is religious conversion, God's love has flooded our inmost hearts through the Holy Spirit he has given us (Romans 5:5). . . . Insofar as that gift of love is sanctifying grace, insofar as these acts are said to be supernatural, they are in a different category and are on a different level, but there is always interaction between above and below. There is ascent: experiencing, understanding, judging, deciding, and sometimes falling in love.¹⁰⁴

With these interactions, Lonergan established in 1978 that the sublating function of the fifth level, which he had already affirmed, was accomplished in part by the affective change that accompanies falling in love. Even so, the identification of love requires the subjective experience of it and its irreducibility to the prior levels; it is a dynamic state experienceable and identifiable in and of itself in consciousness. It is likely, given his previous statements on the issue, that Lonergan would have understood the identification of this dynamic state as taking place principally in the analysis of a process, but on the other hand, the affective change of which he spoke this year seemingly would be more immediately identifiable in conscious experience.

¹⁰⁴ 94500DTE070.

3.8. 1979

Questions continued to arise in 1979, revealed especially in his notes from the question sessions at the Method in Theology Seminar at Boston College. These suggest that he answered a question on October 4 about the relation between our free acts and the love of God in terms of sublation: it appears that he understood acts of love as related to unrestricted being-in-love just as form is related to potency or act is related to form.¹⁰⁵ In addition, he reaffirmed that while being-in-love is conscious, still that is not enough to constitute knowledge and so, subsequent to the presence of unrestricted love in one's consciousness, one must advert to it and its unrestricted character, understand it for what it is, and reach the correct conclusion that what one has experienced is unrestricted being-in-love.

At the next meeting, he answered a direct question about the sublative function of the fifth level and the corresponding formulation of a transcendental precept, suggesting that the transcendental precept for a fifth level would not be "Be Authentic" because, to quote his notes, "that would merely repeat the first four."¹⁰⁶ This indicates that he did not understand the operation of the fifth level to be reducible either to the authenticity or the operations of the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding; he reaffirmed that the fifth level "sublates the preceding levels: [it provides] a new basis, a broader finality, a transformation of previous values and insights."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ 29620DTE070.

¹⁰⁶ 29660DTE070.

¹⁰⁷ 29660DTE070.

Finally, his notes indicate that at another meeting of the Seminar, a question was asked concerning the “‘we’ beyond an I and Thou” discussed in *Method in Theology*.¹⁰⁸ His answer appears to have dealt with the distinction between a metaphysical union and a moral union: the union of spouses is moral, “a decision made in common with lifelong obligation,” rather than a natural, metaphysical, union.¹⁰⁹ Although he denied it this sort of ontological status, Lonergan clearly affirmed a “we” beyond the two marriage partners.

In 1979, Lonergan reaffirmed that being in love was a conscious but not necessarily known fifth level that is not reducible to the other four levels. He further recognized a union, though not an ontological union, between persons in love. Union, then, was “decision” manifesting over “lifelong obligation,” which again would be revealed in an analysis of a process in one’s life.

3.9. 1980

In the June 18 discussion session at the 1980 Lonergan Workshop, Lonergan took yet another opportunity to specifically state his position on the fourth and fifth levels.¹¹⁰

. . . I do think that experience, understanding, judgments of fact, probability, and possibility are three levels. Moral judgments are a fourth. And the complete self-transcendence of falling in love on the domestic level, the civil level, and the

¹⁰⁸ 19110DTE070. The questioner quoted Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 113.

¹⁰⁹ His counter-example was the two-in-one-ness of two fingers, which are two in one flesh metaphysically “in the sense that each is real, each is distinct from the other, both are parts in a whole greater than either.”

¹¹⁰ The questioner had said, “There seems to be a case for recognizing the fourth level of consciousness as, in fact, two levels, corresponding to the ‘what to do?’ and ‘is it to be done?’ questions. Could you please explain why you do not, in fact, separate such levels as a fourth and a fifth?” (97700DTE080). See above, at 126, for his answer to a similar, previous question.

religious level are a fifth level, the achievement of self-transcendence. You're no longer thinking only of yourself.

My illustration of people who begin to forget about themselves is when I was doing ministry at Bonnyrigg, which is about 20 miles outside Edinburgh. . . . At one house I visited I was to see the daughter of the lady of the house and explain to her daughter that she was out of that house and she would never see her again if she married the Protestant that she intended to marry. And I was to put this point across clearly. So I saw the daughter and said what I could, and everything I would say to her she would reply, "Well, I'll ask him." She only thought of what he thinks. It was the only answer she could give. It was complete self-transcendence. They were already two in one flesh, at least potentially, and she wasn't thinking of herself at all. . . . It's an example of what is meant by self-transcendence. It's self-forgetting.¹¹¹

Loneragan again made use of the Scotland example to illustrate a process at work, a process identifiable upon reflection as the girl's dynamic state of being-in-love affecting her decisions, judgments, understandings, and even experiences. In giving the example, he was communicating about a process in the girl's life to his listeners, displaying the very point he was attempting to make about the identification of the experience of love in consciousness.

Such a process can be one of growing authenticity in virtue of community, as he had mentioned before and as he once again illustrated in "A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of

¹¹¹ 97700DTE080.

Religion,” given on August 18. The “degrees of self transcendence”¹¹² began with the emergence of a fragmentary consciousness in the dream and continued through waking, inquiry, the grasp of truth, and the realization that “it is up to ourselves to decide for ourselves what we are to make of ourselves.”¹¹³ However, “this fifth stage in self-transcendence becomes a successful way of life only when we really are pulled out of ourselves” in, for example, the three ways of being in love.¹¹⁴ Once again, the community into which we are pulled is more than just geographical proximity but is instead a function of common experience, understanding, judgment, and decision, and such a community of common meaning forms the field of possibility for the authenticity of individual subjects.¹¹⁵

3.10. 1981

Lonergan continued to field questions about love and the fifth level and to develop his understanding of the interpersonal in the next year. At the Lonergan Workshop discussion session on June 16, he was yet again asked about the possibility of more than eight functional specialties as a result of the existence of more than four levels of consciousness.¹¹⁶ This time, he was less hesitant than he had been before:

¹¹² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of Religion,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 208. Lonergan here explicitly preferred the phrase “degrees of self-transcendence” over “stages of self-transcendence.”

¹¹³ Lonergan, “A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of Religion,” 208.

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, “A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of Religion,” 208. Here, what before had been the moral (fourth) was termed the “fifth stage,” but note that Lonergan began with “dreaming,” not experience (here, “waking”).

¹¹⁵ Lonergan, “A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of Religion,” 212–213.

¹¹⁶ 98700DTE080. For Lonergan’s previous discussion of this possibility and a related issue, see above, at 126 and 154 n 110, and below, at 159–160.

Well, [the fifth level] adds another specialty onto the theological specialties—namely, spirituality. . . . The fifth level puts religion into the other four, into what we attend to, imagine, feel, into what we understand, learn, or . . . into our reasonableness, into our responsibility—it’s the supernaturalizing of the other four. . . . And why the other four? Because theology is religion as related to a culture. Change the culture and you get a different . . . theology.

The fifth level of interpersonal religious love adds religion to the operations at the four lower levels, thus making spirituality—presumably something along the lines of the practice of religion—into another specialty besides the theological. This fits well with his distinction between religion and theology, with one the lived practice and the other the reflection on that lived practice.¹¹⁷

Such a fifth level, manifesting in lived religious practice, finds its root in sanctifying grace. On that topic Lonergan was questioned later in the session: “Does sanctifying grace transform the central potency, central form, central act of a person, and if so, how?” He offered the following in reply:

St. Thomas put sanctifying grace radicated in the essence of the soul to modify man’s nature, and he wanted a modification of man’s nature . . . in the essence, in the form, because he wanted the supernatural virtues to be virtues. Unless you have a shift in the nature, you can’t have a shift in what the virtues are. The central form makes a lion a lion and not a tiger. It makes a man a man and not a lion. And sanctifying grace radicated in the form of a man makes that man a Christian, a good citizen in the City of God. Augustine’s *On the City of God*, *De*

¹¹⁷ See, for example, his definition of theology: “A theology mediates between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of a religion in that matrix” (Lonergan, *Method*, xi).

Civitate Dei, is the distinction between the *Civita Terrina*, the earthly city, and the *Civita Coelestis*, the heavenly city. Both are on this earth. But the Christians belong to one, and the others to the rest.¹¹⁸

As it had before, an account of the ontological change that is sanctifying grace in the human being found its expression in terms of the community to which one belonged.¹¹⁹

In fact, Lonergan explicitly agreed that this change in “citizenship” was (in the questioner’s words) “the condition of the fifth level of consciousness.”¹²⁰

Such a community offered to individual subjects a new horizon, a process Lonergan clarified in the paper “Pope John’s Intention,” which he gave on June 19 at the Workshop. He argued that a person’s horizon was comprised of two main parts: “the main stem [made up of] what we know and what we value” and the “extensions through the persons we know and care for, since knowing and caring for them involve us in what they know and care for.”¹²¹ These two parts can intertwine, making the extensions mutual and “the horizon of each . . . an extension of the horizon of the other.” When enlarged yet further, these extensions of horizon may draw in an entire group.¹²²

¹¹⁸ 98700DTE080.

¹¹⁹ Such a connection, seen at least twice in very similar terms, fits well with his overall emphasis on the fifth level as *both* interpersonal or communitarian *and* the site or locus of religious experience in the form of the dynamic state of unrestricted being in love, which for Lonergan was “only notionally different from sanctifying grace” (Lonergan, *Method*, 107).

¹²⁰ 98700DTE080.

¹²¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Pope John’s Intention,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 224–238, at 234.

¹²² Lonergan, “Pope John’s Intention,” 234. The development of such horizons takes place in both the main stem and the extensions “through involvement in the knowing and caring of others. Development in the main stem increases the depth and range of the consequent horizon; and this increase leads to a development in the extensions, since our knowing others and our concern for them involve some sharing in the objects they know and care for. Moreover, inasmuch as among such objects there will be persons that know and care for their own circle, there will result a mediation of involvement at a second remove. Finally, developing horizons open the way to reciprocity on the part of those with whom one has become involved” (Lonergan, “Pope John’s Intention,” 235).

Horizons, then, are inherently interpersonal. A change in horizon cannot but be connected to a change in the extension(s) of one's horizon. In the case of the change in horizon known as the dynamic state of being in love, and especially the dynamic state of being in love with God, we can therefore say that it does not take place monadically but instead extends to one's concern with and for others. This, then, is the change in one's citizenship, and because Lonergan affirmed that horizon can be experienced, the changed horizon or citizenship that is the dynamic state of being in love can be experienced.

3.11. 1982

In 1982, near the end of his career, Lonergan significantly complicated the issue. In the June 16 Workshop discussion session, he was asked, "From time to time, in recent years, you have spoken of (unrestricted) love as a 'fifth level' of intentional consciousness. Since the levels of functional specialization are correlated with the levels of intentional consciousness, would this not imply the addition of two further, 'fifth-level' functional specialties? If so, what might they be or do?"¹²³ He had been asked this twice before, but here he gave yet another, third, answer to the question.¹²⁴ This time, he maintained that

there are sensitive consciousness, intellectual consciousness, rational consciousness, moral consciousness, and religious consciousness. But if you have religious consciousness as well as moral, it takes over the moral; it's a perfection added to the moral, with a broader horizon. So we're back to four.

¹²³ 9993ADTE080.

¹²⁴ See above, at 126, 154 n 110, and 159–160, for previous discussion of this and a related question.

However, it's a different four for different people. Religious consciousness has a fuller horizon than a purely moral consciousness, and the two are conjoined inasmuch as grace perfects nature, the supernatural perfects the natural.¹²⁵

It seems that Lonergan was denying the distinctness of the fifth level here. Religious consciousness, if not reducible to the moral, still appears to be replacing the moral and leaving intentional consciousness with a fourfold structure. He reinforced this reading when answering a later question by noting that

the triadic metaphysical structure of *Insight* corresponds to the triadic cognitional structure of *Insight*. Metaphysics is dealing with reality, and that by which you know proportionate reality is this threefold structure. The fourfold structure in *Method* corresponds to the fourfold structure of religious consciousness. And you could have a fourfold structure without a religious consciousness if you had a moral consciousness, which is included in the religious.¹²⁶

I will leave it to the next chapter to offer a full interpretation of these moves by Lonergan, but for now let me note the following. In the first question, Lonergan was addressing the theological functional specialties. His reply was therefore in terms of the relation between the fifth level and the functional specialties. If one affirms a fifth level and situates it as the epistemological root of spirituality—as he had done before—and if such spirituality is understood to be the horizon of religious practice within which theology is done, then it is true to say that because grace perfects nature rather than replacing it, religion perfects one's deliberations and thereby enters into the functional

¹²⁵ 9993ADTE080.

¹²⁶ 9993ADTE080.

specialties. When this happens, *in terms of the performing of theology*, one still has four levels (a level of data, a level of intelligibility, a level of truth, and a level of value) but one of the levels (that of value) is now religious value. That does not mean that there are only four levels *in consciousness*. A similar point involving the perfection of nature by grace can be made with respect to the second question.

The discussion session from June 17 brought up a related question about “the ontological correlatives of the distinct kinds of cognitional acts on the third, fourth, and fifth levels, respectively, of consciousness.”¹²⁷ Here, Lonergan replied,

Well, the third, fourth, and fifth levels are judgments of fact, . . . moral judgments, and religious judgments. Judgments of fact, of possibility and probability, whatever exists or could exist. . . . Moral judgments: the reality of good men, and the reality of bad men, extending to all the different manners in which people can be good or bad morally. . . . And religious judgments. The existence of God and theological issues. Moral judgments with a religious basis. Factual judgments with a religious basis.¹²⁸

This reply prompted an exchange with the questioner that highlights the distinctness of the fifth level, despite Lonergan’s statements the previous day.

Q: Would you say in terms of the traditional distinction of potency, form, and act, that the achievement of judgments of fact, . . . moral judgments, and religious judgments, in each case is a kind of *actus*, a kind of act, and if so, how would they differ?

L: Well, they differ in their objects. They’re all acts. Any judgment is an act.

¹²⁷ 9993BDTE080.

¹²⁸ 9993BDTE080.

Q: I'm speaking of the content that the judgment achieves. The correlation—the isomorphism. If experience is correlative with potency—

L: Oh, I see—

Q: understanding correlative with form—

L: Oh, I see. Well, I take 'ontological' as 'real.' . . . The judgment is an act. It's insofar as . . . they're knowing acts. The cognitional correspondence, the ontological correlative, to an act is an act. And . . . you can have an act . . . of central form, an act of accidental form. And in that case, what you know that's corresponding to the judgment as distinct from understanding and experience, gives you [the distinction between] potency, form, and act.

Q: So, on the third, and the fourth, and the fifth level, those respective judgments, all achieve or are correlative with act, as distinct from potency and form?

L: Right. If they're confined to an actuality.

Q: Now is there any further distinction that can be drawn within the act which those judgments respectively achieve by virtue of the fact that, as judgments, they differ as levels three, four, and five?

L: Well, yes. They regard a mere fact, or a moral fact, or a religious fact.¹²⁹

This exchange is illuminative and helps to qualify Lonergan's remarks on the previous day. He clearly was not going back on his affirmation (first made nearly ten years before) that the fifth level was distinct and irreducible to the fourth, third, second, or first level. Where the questioner sought an ontological difference between the objects

¹²⁹ 9993BDTE080.

of operations at levels three, four, and five, and thereby pursued the extension—or the clarification of the extension—of the isomorphism between knower, evaluator, and lover, on the one hand, and known, valued, or beloved, on the other, Lonergan suggested that the difference between the objects of operations at levels three, four, and five, and hence the isomorphic elements themselves, is not ontological. The difference lies in some other element besides their ontology: if the reader will forgive the crude English, third level objects *be*; fourth level objects *be good*; fifth level objects *be religiously good* or perhaps *be holy*. This point will receive more elaboration in the next chapter, but for the moment let it be noted that this position once again corresponds to the faculty-psychological view of the structural difference between the intellect and the will: the will, the faculty of love, does not have an immanently generated object; instead, it pronounces on the object presented to it because of the immanent generation of the object in the intellect. Likewise, a being is known at the third level, but it is a value at the fourth level and is beloved at the fifth level.

3.12. CONCLUSION

In December, 1972, Lonergan first used the phrase “fifth level.” It referred then to a realm of love not reducible to experiencing, understanding, judging, or deliberating, a realm that provided a new horizon for those operations at the summit of self-transcendence. He then spent the next ten years attempting to articulate an understanding of this fifth level, sometimes in print but, most significantly for this study, often in response to direct questions. His answers and publications reveal a developmental process at work as he attempted to explain his affirmation of a fifth level to others who, it

seems clear, never fully grasped what that fifth level was about. Perhaps the clearest contribution of this Chapter Three to the overall understanding and appreciation of the fifth level in Lonergan is its revelation that Lonergan's statements about the fifth level were neither intermittent, nor occasional, nor attempts to try out a new phrase that was then dropped. He moved in this direction, and he stuck with it until the end of his career.

4. “WHAT WAS GOING FORWARD” IN LONERGAN’S DEVELOPMENT ON LOVE: A HISTORY OF LONERGAN’S DEVELOPMENT

So far, the focus primarily has been in Lonergan’s functional specialty Interpretation, in which one seeks the meanings of texts, and only as much of the functional specialty History has been incorporated as was needed to understand the texts themselves. With this fourth chapter, I am shifting explicitly to the functional specialty History by proposing an understanding of “what was going forward”¹ in Lonergan’s development that would both account for and rely on the meanings we have so far discerned in his work on love from 1943 to 1982. As I have shown, his work on the topic progressed in three stages through four vectors of development. It began with disparate elements that were connected mainly through their common topic—love—yet as Lonergan’s understanding developed, these threads moved closer together and began to connect with one another, coalescing toward a single, though complex, position on love and the fifth level of consciousness. In its historical outlines, this movement from four to five levels resembled Lonergan’s shift movement from three to four levels, suggesting that his explicit affirmations of a fifth level of consciousness were not aberrant comments but instead fit the pattern of the development of a new level in his thought. The end result of this movement depended on a single key insight, which I will suggest grasped a link between a changed state, changed interpersonal relations, and operative change in the subject. The understanding of what was going forward in Lonergan’s development that is suggested in this chapter will allow for an evaluation of the focal issue in this

¹ See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999), 178.

dissertation: did or did not Lonergan affirm love to be a fifth level of consciousness? It will also allow us to go beyond that issue to determine, at least in part, how he conceived the position about which that question inquires.

To begin with, let me be clear about the meaning of the phrase ‘level of consciousness’ as it is operative in this chapter: a level of consciousness is constituted by any conscious² operator, operation, or set of operations that sublates and fulfills the vertical finality of other conscious operators, operations, or sets of operations and/or has a vertical finality that is fulfilled by other conscious operators, operations, or sets of operations. If this definition is accepted, then the criteria for determining whether or not Lonergan understood love to be a fifth level of consciousness are clear: (1) Did Bernard Lonergan understand love to be a sublating operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations? (2) Did Bernard Lonergan understand that sublating operator, operation, or set of operations to be conscious? Both of these must be answered in the affirmative if we are to affirm definitively that Lonergan held love to be a fifth level of consciousness, and if we do so, the criteria are also clear for determining whether or not scholars within the horizon of Lonergan’s work should consider love to be a fifth level of consciousness: (3) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to sublation? (4) Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness? Both of

² For key points in Lonergan’s understanding of the term ‘conscious’ with respect to conscious-intentional operations, see Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 7 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2002), 165, 167, and 185; Lonergan, “Christ as Subject: A Reply,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 166 n 14; and Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992), 344–345 and 350.

these also must be answered in the affirmative if we are to affirm definitively that Lonergan scholars should hold love to be a fifth level of consciousness.

In this chapter, I am concerned with the first of these pairs of questions—the questions about Lonergan himself. The next chapter will evaluate the conversation in the secondary literature in light of the answers to the first pair of questions, and I will leave it to the final chapter to argue fully for my evaluation of his position and for a way fully to systematize his position and adopt it for contemporary use in a Lonerganian theological horizon.

4.1. FOUR THREADS IN THE DEVELOPMENT

As the organization of the preceding chapters highlighted, the development of Lonergan's final position on the fifth level of consciousness progressed through three stages. Across all three stages, four main threads or vectors can be discerned in the development. While, initially, the various elements that would become his position on the fifth level of consciousness were scattered, they slowly came together to offer the possibility of a statement on his final position.

4.1.1. THE POTENCY OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTIVITY FOR DISPROPORTIONATE ACTUATION

It was clear almost immediately that Lonergan's theoretic context for discussions of love included a potency in individual subjectivity for a disproportionate object. In FLM, the very section entitled "The Concept of Love" relies on Lonergan's understanding of vertical finality, which is precisely a finality oriented from a lower

ontological level toward a higher, disproportionate level.³ Mirroring this, in *Insight* Lonergan understood the lower levels (the biological, the psychic, and the intellectual) as open to the higher, supernatural solution to the problem of evil (the conjugate forms of faith, hope, and love).⁴

As he emphasized in the Halifax lectures, Lonergan understood the human situation as leading onward and upward toward a supernatural, loving relationship with God.⁵ Our pure desire to know reaches for and demands a fulfillment beyond its own proportion.⁶ By the time he wrote “*Existenz and Aggiornamento*” (1964), Lonergan could shift from FLM’s movement from *eros*, to friendship, to a charity open to the divine solution to the problem of evil, and move toward stressing a new way of “being-in” that participated in God.⁷ At the same time, he could presume a disproportionately fulfilled potency in *De Deo Trino* as the background of the participative interpersonal situation in which subjectivity finds its fulfillment.⁸

As he shifted from scholastic language to intentionality analysis, this individual potency for disproportionate fulfillment was expressed in terms of the limitations and authenticity of individual subjectivity. The self-transcendence for which subjectivity strives provides the possibility of “benevolence and beneficence, of willing what is truly good and doing it, of collaboration and true love, of swinging completely out of the

³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 18–22.

⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 762–763.

⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being: The Halifax Lectures on Insight*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), 377.

⁶ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380.

⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “*Existenz and Aggiornamento*,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 231.

⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, tr. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 12 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007), 511–517.

habitat of an animal and of becoming a genuine person in a human society.”⁹ The ultimate in reaching beyond the boundaries of individual subjectivity’s limitations is found in religion, for “what, finally, is religion but complete self-transcendence?”¹⁰ Lonergan identified this ultimate fulfillment of subjectivity as *complacentia*, the finding of which fulfills subjectivity in the dynamic state of being in love.¹¹ When and if one reaches this state, one leaves behind a self that is hindered by failures in authenticity that leave the subject bound by the limitations of individual subjectivity.¹² This became clearest in “The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World,” where Lonergan situated love as a fulfillment in which human subjectivity transcends itself and finds authenticity.¹³ The same point was highlighted in the 1970 Institute on Method in Theology at Boston College, and the issue was cast in terms of the limitations of individual subjectivity later on.¹⁴ Fundamentally, falling in love actuates the capacities inherent in consciousness¹⁵ by providing a disproportionate “new beginning”¹⁶ that overcomes unauthenticity.

The state of being in love that constitutes this new beginning, he insisted, is given to us and is not achieved by individual subjectivity working under its own power.¹⁷ The

⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Horizons,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 11–12.

¹⁰ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Natural Knowledge of God,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 128–130.

¹¹ 52200DTE060.

¹² 52200DTE060.

¹³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 170.

¹⁴ 593BCDTE070/594BCDTE070 and Lonergan, *Method*, 36, 39, 84, and 105.

¹⁵ Lonergan, *Method*, 104–105.

¹⁶ Lonergan, *Method*, 122.

¹⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Future of Christianity,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 154.

fulfilling resolution of the limitations of subjectivity is found in God's gift of God's love to us, and the limitations of subjectivity are symbolized by the "heart of stone" that God removes and replaces with a "heart of flesh."¹⁸ This gift brings subjectivity to fulfillment by resituating it within a disproportionate larger horizon characterized, in part, by new interpersonal relations.¹⁹ God's gift of love is linked to interpersonal relations through Lonergan's understanding of emergent probability: a plurality of instances of a lower level becomes systematized at a higher level, and a plurality of instances of individual subjects who, through the gift of God's love to them, have become authentic subjects transcending their own limitations provides the lower manifold out of which the higher, graced, interpersonal situation is constituted.²⁰ This is precisely why the ontological change effected by grace can be identified in terms of the community to which the graced individual belongs: one does not receive the gift of God's love without the corresponding elevation to a higher system constituted by a change in interpersonal relations.²¹ Love is the systematization of graced, self-transcending individuals by their incorporation into new, higher, interpersonal relations, a systematization that fulfills the innermost cries of individual subjectivity, which, though originally identified in terms of potency, came to be understood as an openness of limited individual subjectivity to a healing movement working through interpersonal relations.

¹⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophy of God," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 175.

¹⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Variations in Fundamental Theology," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 247.

²⁰ 809A0DTE070.

²¹ 809A0DTE070.

4.1.2. THE INTERPERSONAL ACTUATION OF THE POTENCY

The interpersonal aspect of love did not arise only in the late period of Lonergan's development. As early as FLM, two of the four simultaneous aspects of love involved a plurality of individuals.²² Marriage was situated as the means by which Christ conformed married subjects to the image of Christ, thereby beginning the constitution of the mystical body of Christ as an interpersonal situation providing the solution to the otherwise inevitable downward spiral resulting from sin.²³ Lonergan's scholastic works elaborated on the union between subjects that constituted this new interpersonal situation: in the *verbum* articles, a beloved is present to a lover to the extent that it is loved, or in other words, the beloved's presence to a lover is as the term of the movement of the will.²⁴ In the slightly later notes on grace, our being the beloved of God is understood as making us friends of God who have been resituated into a new interpersonal arrangement in which the four preeminent graces, which came to be identified as parts of the four-point hypothesis in *De Deo Trino*, ground the mystical body made up of those who have received the graces.²⁵

These technical scholastic metaphysics shifted toward more existential and concrete language after the publication of *Insight*. Lonergan affirmed that "love involves a [spontaneous] quasi identification"²⁶ between people in the married state, and he drew

²² Lonergan, FLM, 23–24. My (2a) and (2b) above, at 14.

²³ Lonergan, FLM, 27.

²⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, ed. by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1997), 209–210.

²⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace," in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011), 649.

²⁶ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377.

an analogy between this situation and the love between subjects and God.²⁷ Such an interpersonal situation of commitment resides at the summit of human subjectivity and, in the case of the married state and civic loyalty, results from deliberate and meaningful ties between persons.²⁸ When Lonergan returned to the scholastic context in *De Deo Trino*, he offered extensive elaborations on the presence of the beloved in the lover,²⁹ but the shift was on to a new way of expressing love as a union between subjects.

In 1968, Lonergan placed the integrity of the individual into the higher context of community, which grounded individual authenticity.³⁰ The fulfillment of subjectivity became the joy and peace³¹ to be found in communal, interpersonal, being-in-love.³² Such an interpersonal relationship was subject-to-subject rather than subject-to-object,³³ and it was found not so much in individual acts as it was in a changed state of the whole being of the subject.³⁴ This distinction between acts and states was quickly and repeatedly highlighted,³⁵ while at the same time, Lonergan affirmed that the changed state resulted in a horizon that is higher than any other human horizon.³⁶ Moreover, the fulfilling

²⁷ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 380. See above, at 35–37.

²⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Analogy of Meaning,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 202. There are nuanced differences on this issue between the marriage and the society, on the one hand, and the interpersonal God-human relation, on the other. The former two result, at least in part, from human decisions and judgments; the latter results from the gift of God’s love to us. At this point in his development, these nuances, while present, had not been worked out fully.

²⁹ Lonergan, TGS, 219–229, 623–625, and 675–677.

³⁰ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 11–12.

³¹ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 20.

³² Lonergan, “Horizons,” 20–21.

³³ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 22–23.

³⁴ Lonergan, “Natural Knowledge of God,” 128–130.

³⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Theology and Man’s Future,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 145.

³⁶ 51800DTE060 and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 193.

change in the subject's horizon is not unconscious, but is, instead, conscious in such a way that its contents are mysterious.

The imprecise language of fulfillment shifted later to a more precise language distinguished by sublation and affective change: Lonergan explicitly wanted to leave behind the spatial metaphor of 'levels' and turn instead to the more explanatory term, 'sublation.'³⁷ When it sublates our subjectivity, love moves us into a universal context in which our self-transcendence is for the sake of other subjects.³⁸ Love was clearly becoming a sublation of individual subjectivity³⁹ that occurred through changed affectivity⁴⁰ and was distinct from the operations of the other levels.⁴¹ The loving self-transcendence that occurs through such sublation constitutes a community, and when the sublating love is the love of God (Romans 5:5), it constitutes a graced community.⁴²

It was in the context of a discussion on the fulfillment of individual subjectivity, which is found in the sublation of subjectivity by the gift of love, that Lonergan first used the phrase "fifth level" with respect to the levels of consciousness.⁴³ Interpersonal being in love then became a clearly distinguishable level for him, a "something further" into which morally self-transcending individual subjects are "ready to snap," as a lower coincidental manifold "snaps" into a higher ordering system.⁴⁴ This shift changed the interpersonal community to which the individual subject belonged and was experienceable as a change in consciousness identifiable through discerning reflection on

³⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Faith and Beliefs," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 36–37.

³⁸ Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 154.

³⁹ Lonergan, *Method*, 241.

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *Method*, 39 and 84.

⁴¹ 597BCDTE070/598BCDTE070.

⁴² Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 156.

⁴³ Lonergan, "The Functional Specialty 'Systematics,'" 193.

⁴⁴ 809A0DTE070. Note the use of emergent probability, once again.

the process of one's life.⁴⁵ Under the influence of sublating interpersonal relations, such a process was the manifestation of the passionateness of being in the three kinds of love—familial, civil, and religious.⁴⁶ By matching the creative vector operating from below-upwards to a healing vector operating from above-downwards, loving interpersonal relations' sublating of individual consciousness provided individual consciousness with something beyond its own capacities as individual and opened the door to true authenticity.⁴⁷

4.1.3. THE CONCRETELY HISTORICAL ACTUATION OF THE POTENCY

The interpersonal element could not be truly interpersonal without also being both concrete and historical. The social manifestation of individual subjects' loving and failing to love is certainly concrete and historical in FLM, where marriage becomes “a focal point in the stream of history” for the healing provided through grace and love.⁴⁸ Human development is in and through “an objective movement in the space-time solidarity of man,”⁴⁹ and it is therefore here that the work of grace and love make their fullest impact.

⁴⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 326.

⁴⁶ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 29–30.

⁴⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Christology Today: Methodological Reflections,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 76–77; 85200DTE070; Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 106; 85400DTE070; and Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 123 and 125–126.

⁴⁸ Lonergan, FLM, 37.

⁴⁹ Lonergan, FLM, 27.

A similar emphasis obtained in the *verbum* articles, where the concrete, existential loving of the lover constituted the presence of the beloved to that lover,⁵⁰ and in the course on grace, in which the economy into which God's love draws us is the economy, not only of those who are interpersonally related to the Trinitarian Persons, but of the entire creation in all its concreteness and historicity.⁵¹ In *Insight*, Lonergan insisted that the realm of parents' love sets the stage for individual subjective development⁵² and that the love of God in human subjects has a concrete impact on history because it loves all with a self-sacrificing love in virtue of its embrace of the whole, concrete universe.⁵³ Ultimately, this rests on God's having become human in the incarnation: the entry of God into history marks God's love as concrete.⁵⁴ As a human community self-mediate in history, it manifests the interpersonal connection between the members of the community, and as a graced human community self-mediate in history, it manifests the love of God as the ground of the interpersonal connection between the members of the community.⁵⁵ Such love is not strictly intentional in the manner of knowing. Instead, it encompasses one's whole being in its historical, existential concreteness.⁵⁶

This emphasis on community as a concrete, historical manifestation became more and more the focus of Lonergan's attention as he moved into the context of intentionality analysis. More clearly than before, Lonergan distinguished two kinds of historicity in religious communities: a first arising from the various concrete expressions of

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 209–210.

⁵¹ "Supplementary Notes," 611–637.

⁵² Lonergan, *Insight*, 237.

⁵³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721–722.

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377 and 380–381.

⁵⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 169–172.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, TGS, 676–677 and 783–785.

community that endured over time through the community, and a second arising from “a personal [divine] entrance into human history and a communication of God to his people.”⁵⁷ In communities as well as individual subjects, the work of grace as God’s gift of love can be identified less by a synchronic reflection than by a diachronic reflection, “seeing the things that moved you one way and another and why you acted as you did.”⁵⁸ It is concrete; its fruits in our lives reveal it.⁵⁹ It is in history, tying together concrete history and interpersonal relation.⁶⁰

One of the clearest examples of this emphasis on concrete historical manifestation was Lonergan’s illustration of the man and woman who loved one another but did not avow that love. Without an entry into concrete historical meaning, that love would not be full, real love.⁶¹ The outward, historical word of love is not incidental; it is constitutive of the very reality of that love.⁶² Thus, what we might call ‘love’ is not really love unless and until it enters the historical and concrete realm. In part, this is because the existential loving of the lover constitutes the presence of the beloved to that lover, but it is also because love is not simply an idea, but is instead about a changed state of being, a changed way of life. In the case of the love of God, God’s avowal of love for us is historically manifested in “Christ crucified.”⁶³

⁵⁷ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 21.

⁵⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Discussion 2,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 580–582 (question session as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 485 (48500A0E060)]).

⁵⁹ Lonergan, “The Future of Christianity,” 154.

⁶⁰ Lonergan, “The Future of Christianity,” 156.

⁶¹ Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 172.

⁶² Lonergan, *Method*, 112–113.

⁶³ 597BCDTE070/598BCDTE070.

The example he repeated from his ministries at Bonnyrigg, Scotland,⁶⁴ showed the necessity of an examination of historical process for the discernment of a concrete manifestation of love in history. He had to tell the story in order for the manifestation of love to be seen in the young girl's life. This was not simply a case of description supplanting explanation. Instead, narrative was explanatory (though, by definition, not theoretic) precisely because the object of the explanation was a change in the world of human meaning displayed historically in the existential commitments and decisions of a human subject.⁶⁵ This is why he could (and, in fact, must) have met what was intended as a technical theoretic question with a narrative response: the ontological change effected by sanctifying grace, religious conversion, is to be found in the concrete, historical, existential community to which the graced or converted person belongs, and the intelligibility of a particular concrete, historical, existential community is revealed more by narrative than by theoretic expression.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Interview for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program, 'Concern,'" recorded May 7, 1973, Regis College, Toronto, aired October 24, 1973, Toronto, 3 Windows Media Audio files, PCD 753.wav (41:20), PCD 754.wav (39:53), and PCD 755.wav (16:23); 91600DTE070; 94000DTE070; 97700DTE080.

⁶⁵ An account in the so-called 'hard sciences' like physics, chemistry, or biology would often be able to rely on formulae as the most elegant forms of explanatory expression. At least some writers influenced by Lonergan would suppose that any narrative account, in its departure from the elegance of this form of expression, departs also from the explanatory mode at least partially, if not altogether, and enters into a merely descriptive mode. While it must be admitted that narrative accounts certainly can be and often are instances of departures from an explanatory context for the sake of a merely descriptive account, Lonergan's insistence on implicit definition (see *Insight*, 36–37) has interesting consequences when it comes to studies of concrete interpersonal community: if (1) the point is the definition of terms by relations and relations by terms, (2) the black-marks-on-white-paper expression of those terms and relations is secondary to the insight into the terms and relations themselves, and (3) the expressions we use must be adequate to the terms and relations into which a given communicator wishes to foster an insight, then when we are dealing with changes in concrete, historical, and dynamic human meaning in interpersonal community, we must recognize that the key is the grasp of the terms and relations and we must use expressions capable of conveying concrete, historical, and dynamic changes in human meaning. At our current level of human development, and perhaps permanently, those expressions are found best in narrative accounts. (See also Lonergan, "Mediation," 175–176.)

⁶⁶ 809A0DTE070.

4.1.4. THE ACTUATION OF THE POTENCY AS CHANGING THE WORLD OF HUMAN MEANING

By the time he reached the end of his development on love, it was clear that Lonergan linked this change in community to a change in subjects' relation to the cosmos and to God. The change was epistemological insofar as it shifted the horizon of one's evaluating and deciding, reasoning and judging, understanding and conceiving, and even of one's experiencing and feeling. This position was in elementary form as early as FLM,⁶⁷ where the fourth aspect of love (my 2b) involved a union between subjects when they achieved a new intelligible reality in the universe of meaning—a commonly willed common good.⁶⁸ As he noted then, “there is a divine solidarity in grace which is the mystical body of Christ,” which is “not a merely private affair but rather a personal function of an objective common movement in that body of Christ *which takes over, transforms, and elevates every aspect of human life.*”⁶⁹

Love was similarly positioned in the *verbum* articles, where it is the union that is the solution to an otherwise deteriorating human meaning resulting in a deteriorating social situation.⁷⁰ Likewise, as already mentioned, the new interpersonal human-divine relation that was highlighted in Lonergan's grace notes also included a changed participation in the economy of the entire divinely-created universe of meaning,⁷¹ but both of these were complimented in *Insight* by Lonergan's attention to proportionately

⁶⁷ And even prior to that. See “PANTON ANAKEPHALAIOSIS,” *MJLS* 9, no. 2 [1991]: 139–172.

⁶⁸ Lonergan, FLM, 24.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, FLM, 27, emphases mine.

⁷⁰ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 209–210, but see also Lonergan, FLM, 27. Note that this reads neither “where love *produces* a union that *is* the solution” nor “where love *produces* a union that *provides* the solution.” This is an important point: love *is* the union, and it *is* the solution. Neither the union nor the solution is other than love. While already quite important in a scholastic metaphysical context, this becomes even more vital in the context of an intentionality analysis.

⁷¹ “Supplementary Notes,” 617.

human interpersonal relations. There, when civilization rises out of spontaneous intersubjectivity, the notion of the good changes, such that individual desires are resituated in relation to “an intelligible pattern of relationships that condition the fulfilment of each man’s desires by his contributions to the fulfilment of the desires of others.”⁷² Then, under grace, the love of God shifts our meanings to a cosmic level at which our good will aligns with God’s good will in the universe through faith, hope, and love.⁷³ The Halifax lectures further showed that Lonergan understood God’s gift of love as establishing the mystical body of Christ as a new good of order that stood to proportionate goods of order as the *civitas Dei* stood to the *civitas terrena*.⁷⁴ This is clearly a profound shift in the world of human meaning.

Beginning in 1965, Lonergan’s use of progressive imagery was clearly focused on successive changes in subjects’ worlds of meaning.⁷⁵ One of the end results of those changes was illustrated repeatedly by reference to Blaise Pascal’s “reasons of the heart,” in which the horizon of knowing is changed by love.⁷⁶ The dynamic state of being in love, on which these “reasons” are grounded, has to do with a vertical liberty that chooses between different horizons,⁷⁷ and that horizon shift was linked to changes in interpersonal

⁷² Lonergan, *Insight*, 238.

⁷³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721–722.

⁷⁴ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 381.

⁷⁵ See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Dimensions of Meaning,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 232–2233; Lonergan, “The Subject,” in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 80; Lonergan, “Horizons,” 11–12; Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 35–36; Lonergan, “The Response of the Jesuit,” 170; Lonergan, *Method*, 9–13 and 104–105; Lonergan, “What Are Judgments of Value?” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 145.

⁷⁶ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 19–21 and Lonergan, “Faith and Beliefs,” 42–43.

⁷⁷ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 20.

community through the dynamic state's link to interpersonal relations.⁷⁸ Likewise, in an intentionality analysis, the change in the human being that results from grace was discussed, not in terms of a "new *esse*," but in terms of the worlds of meanings of subjects.⁷⁹ Among those worlds of meanings and the horizons in or by which they are understood and actually meant, Lonergan then situated the religious or theological horizon as superior to proportionate horizons⁸⁰ and he tied any such theological horizon to the unity of the entire cosmos.⁸¹ This was most clearly affirmed when he insisted that love sets "the total context, the *Weltanschauung*, the horizon" and faith is "the eye of love"⁸² within which knowledge achieves its fullest realization.⁸³

It is clear that he held the "top" level of consciousness to be the most universal, when it is characterized as a being in love with God, although it is not always clear which level Lonergan had in mind when he made these statements.⁸⁴ While proportionate human love did effect limited horizontal changes, as displayed in his accounts of the Scottish girl and especially of his qualification of that love as finite,⁸⁵ the horizontal change effected by the love of God reached toward and embraced the entire universe.⁸⁶ This, then, is the highpoint of his understanding of the epistemological, horizontal change effected by love and manifested in changes in the universe of human meanings.

⁷⁸ Lonergan, "Horizons," 21. In other words, the horizon shift was linked to interpersonal community because the dynamic state was linked to both.

⁷⁹ Lonergan, "Discussion 2," 580–582.

⁸⁰ 51800DTE060.

⁸¹ 52200DTE060.

⁸² Lonergan, "The Future of Christianity," 154.

⁸³ Lonergan, *Method*, 117 and 122.

⁸⁴ Lonergan, "Interview for 'Concern.'"

⁸⁵ "Q: What were the restrictions, the limitations, of that situation? L: Oh, well, it was the restrictions on any human love. She couldn't have asked him if he'd died" (Lonergan, "Interview for 'Concern'").

⁸⁶ On the dating of this document, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 400–402. See above, at 150.

Horizontal change extends to a concern for other persons and is, therefore, interpersonal, constituting the change in one's citizenship, the shift from the *civitas terrena* to the *civitas Dei*, precisely insofar as the latter includes both a horizon and contents of meaning not present in the former.

4.1.5. SUMMARY

By the end of his career, and thus by the end of his development on the question of love and a fifth level of consciousness, Lonergan had clearly affirmed that the limitations of individual subjectivity were overcome through a self-transcendence that brought the individual subject to authenticity. That self-transcendence and its concomitant authenticity were grounded on a change in the subject's interpersonal situation that served as the carrier of the healing vector, which met and repaired the individual subject's creative efforts by sublating individual subjectivity into that new interpersonal situation. This change was historical, shifting the concrete interpersonal community to which one belonged and only in that change effecting the ontological newness formerly identified as sanctifying grace. That change in community, finally, was also a change in the world of human meaning, restructuring the subjective horizon of the subject such that her experiences, understandings, judgments, and decisions were all changed. Lonergan, finally, affirmed that this new, healing, sublating, historical, horizontal, interpersonal situation was conscious, and he identified it as a conscious fifth level.

4.2. A HISTORICAL NOTE ON DEVELOPMENT IN LONERGAN

The characteristics of Lonergan's development to this position are similar to the characteristics of his development of a distinct fourth level. *Insight* had been confined to the first three levels because in that text Lonergan's interest was largely confined to knowing and its ramifications, but also, it was clear that he was pushing toward a distinct fourth level of moral evaluation. In addition to specifically identifying "the entry of a volitional component" as "a fourth variable,"⁸⁷ he suggested that the realm of the good consisted in the "extension of intellectual activity that we name deliberation and decision, choice and will."⁸⁸ Even in *Insight*, existential action goes beyond knowing⁸⁹ and adding choice and action to knowing would provide a "fuller invariant structure."⁹⁰ At the same time, he explicitly identified the higher conjugate forms of faith, hope, and love as residing at a fourth level above that of judgment.⁹¹

Not surprisingly, the same was true in Lonergan's Halifax lectures, where the realm of doing goes beyond the realm of knowing,⁹² but it was not until 1959's lectures on education at Xavier University that Lonergan explicitly identified the move to doing as a move to a distinct fourth level.⁹³ He clearly had been struggling to fit existential doing and moral decision-making into the framework of the first three levels of experiencing, understanding, and judging, but it took time for him to realize that the

⁸⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 594.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 619.

⁸⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 622.

⁹⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 754.

⁹¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 762–763.

⁹² Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 374.

⁹³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe, CWL 10 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1993), 82.

solution to these difficulties was the affirmation of a distinct fourth level of consciousness. Even when he did make that affirmation, as much as five years later (in 1964), he faced questions that betrayed a lack of clarity on the issue on the part of his readers and listeners.⁹⁴

A similar set of circumstances obtained in the emergence of the fifth level of consciousness in his development, although in this case the issues are much more extensively documented, owing to the wealth of later recorded discussion materials that we currently have available. By the time of *Method in Theology*'s publication, Lonergan was consistently claiming a role for love which very nearly fit the definition of sublation that he had given: love “goes beyond [knowing and deciding], introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with [knowing and deciding] or destroying [them], on the contrary needs [them], includes [them], preserves all [their] proper features and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization within a richer context.”⁹⁵ Along with this, he denied the possibility of reducing love merely to new operations, or new qualities of the operations, at the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding.⁹⁶ Together, these two facts point toward a distinct affirmation of a new level,⁹⁷ yet Lonergan did not make such an affirmation in *Method in Theology*.

⁹⁴ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 240–241.

⁹⁵ Lonergan, *Method*, 241.

⁹⁶ Lonergan, *Method*, 242.

⁹⁷ He also suggested that religiously differentiated consciousness, consciousness that is unrestrictedly in love, is oriented “positively to what is transcendent in lovableness” (Lonergan, *Method*, 278). As I noted above (107), this sounds suspiciously close to an additional transcendental notion.

When the clear affirmation of a distinct fifth level of consciousness was made in December of 1972, it was not to be found in a published work, but in a question and answer session after the second talk in the series, “The Relationship of the Philosophy of God to the Functional Specialty, Systematics.”⁹⁸ The next recorded statement of the position was likewise not published, but was instead made nearly six months later in the interview for the radio show, *Concern*.⁹⁹ It was not until November of 1973, nearly one year after his initial affirmation of a distinct fifth level, that Lonergan gave anything resembling a full account of that level.¹⁰⁰

None of those initial statements, however, afforded Lonergan scholars a real opportunity to press him on the issue.¹⁰¹ While he answered several related questions during the inaugural Lonergan Workshop at Boston College in 1974, none of them made explicit reference to his affirmation of the fifth level of consciousness,¹⁰² and although his answers made it clear that he understood love to be a higher level of emergent probability, he likewise did not make explicit reference to the fifth level of consciousness. It was not until the Workshop in 1975 (thirty months after his initial public affirmation of a distinct fifth level of consciousness) that he was first asked a

⁹⁸ Lonergan, “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 96.

⁹⁹ Lonergan, “Interview for ‘Concern.’”

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, “Variations,” 247–248.

¹⁰¹ I am of course bound by the limitations of the archival materials we have available. It is possible that earlier public question and answer engagements occurred, but research revealed neither any record of them nor any reference to them in the archival material that is available.

¹⁰² 809A0DTE070. The three main questions were “What becomes of isomorphism on the fourth level?”; “It seems that Fr. Lonergan has not worked out in *Method* where human love is really an exception to the ordinary development from level to level. Has he anything further to say on this question since writing *Method*?”; and “Will Fr. Lonergan specify the difference in the ontological constitution of the person as morally authentic and as religiously authentic?” Any or all of these (especially the second) could easily have made reference to the fifth level of consciousness, but none of them did so. That fact may be indicative of a lack of awareness on the part of the participants as to Lonergan’s (now eighteen-month-old) affirmation of a fifth level of consciousness, a lack of understanding and/or unwillingness to grapple with Lonergan’s affirmation of a distinct fifth level, or some combination of both.

direct question about the fifth level of consciousness, and although that question asked him merely to “expand on” his affirmation of a fifth level of consciousness, Lonergan’s reply establishes that he thought he already had been clear on the issue.¹⁰³

His attention in subsequent years focused on components of the fifth level—community, horizon, the healing vector, self-transcendence—which were summarized neatly in his statements at the 1977 Workshop.¹⁰⁴ Those statements were, in part, in reply to another direct question seeking clarification on the distinction between the fourth and fifth levels of consciousness, and this indicated a continuing confusion about the issue among his listeners. A similar situation obtained the following year at the Workshop, when Lonergan was forced to correct a questioner who stated that “being in love . . . is a fourth-level act.”¹⁰⁵ To the contrary, Lonergan replied, “It is on the fifth level. It is you getting beyond yourself.”¹⁰⁶ Likewise, at the 1979 Method in Theology seminar, he confronted a question that sought to clarify a transcendental precept for the fifth level of consciousness. In doing so, he clarified that that precept needed to be distinguishable both from the individual precepts of the levels and from the sum of their precepts.¹⁰⁷ In 1980, he again explicitly stated his position on the fifth level,¹⁰⁸ and in 1981 and 1982, he was forced to address for the second and third times the issue of functional specialties in relation to his affirmation of a fifth level of consciousness.¹⁰⁹ Also in 1982, Lonergan seemed at first to deny the existence of a fifth level,¹¹⁰ before reaffirming a distinct fifth

¹⁰³ 85200DTE070.

¹⁰⁴ 91600DTE070.

¹⁰⁵ 94500DTE070.

¹⁰⁶ 94500DTE070.

¹⁰⁷ 29660DTE070.

¹⁰⁸ 97700DTE080.

¹⁰⁹ 98700DTE080 and 9993ADTE080.

¹¹⁰ 9993ADTE080.

level in an exchange the following day—an exchange that revealed a continuing lack of clarity about the fifth level on the part of his hearers.¹¹¹

Although much more detailed than the evidence concerning the emergence of the fourth level, the concrete historical parallels between these events suggest that the emergence of love as a distinct fifth level in Lonergan's later development was the same sort of event as the emergence of moral decision-making as a distinct fourth level had been in his earlier development. For both, there was an initial stage during which Lonergan struggled to fit material into a scheme (fitting moral deliberation into the three-level scheme of *Insight*; fitting love into the four-level scheme of *Method*). For both, this struggle was brought to a head as he worked to compose a manuscript, and shortly thereafter, possibly because of the clarification(s) that his writing had afforded him, he was able to affirm a distinct level to account for the data he was struggling to fit into the smaller scheme (the moral realm was affirmed as a distinct fourth level shortly after the publication of *Insight*; love was affirmed as a distinct fifth level shortly after the publication of *Method*). Finally, for both, there was a period during which, despite his clear affirmations, confusion and questions persisted among those who followed his work.

4.3. THE KEY INSIGHT

A major source of the difficulty for Lonergan scholars has been the absence of any explicit statement of the key insight by which Lonergan understood the need to

¹¹¹ 9993BDTE080.

affirm love as a distinct fifth level. In 1972, something happened between the publication of *Method in Theology* and Lonergan's affirmation of a fifth level in the December question session. He had by then made it clear that he wanted to replace the spatial metaphor of 'levels' of consciousness with the more explanatory term 'sublation,' but in *Method in Theology*, Lonergan did not affirm explicitly that love sublated any conscious operations (and so was not a level). Yet in that same text love lacked only one characteristic of sublation (and so was seemingly only one characteristic away from being identified as a distinct fifth level): the introduction of new operations.

In light of the totality of the evidence, I suggest that, with respect to love, Lonergan had an insight in 1972 into something that would fulfill the "new operations" characteristic of sublation. If he wanted to replace the spatial metaphor of 'levels' of consciousness with the concept of sublation, and his lists of characteristics of sublation in *Method in Theology* were in light of and applied to all the (then accepted) levels with respect to those below them, then, unless we are to suppose that it was a mere turn of terminological whimsy, his move from identifying love as a near-sublating fulfillment of human experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding to identifying love as a distinct level of consciousness was likely rooted in an insight into something about love that fit that single remaining characteristic of a sublating level: my hypothesis is that he found something operative about love.

That 'something' is, I suggest, to be found in his analysis of sanctifying grace. Lonergan identified sanctifying grace, when it was understood as an entitative habit in a scholastic metaphysical context, as "only notionally different" from the dynamic state of

unrestricted being-in-love of which he spoke in *Method in Theology*.¹¹² He explicitly noted “that the dynamic state of itself is operative grace, but the same state as principle of acts of love, hope, faith, repentance, and so on, is grace as cooperative,”¹¹³ an understanding which owed a great deal to his dissertation and the subsequent published articles. There, he had established that for Aquinas, operative grace worked, not in opposition to free individual acts, but in a manner that (in a later context) might be called sublative.¹¹⁴ A higher context (the divine operation) drew up the individual actor, broadened the horizon of his possibilities, and, while retaining the integrity of the individual actor as such, opened the possibility of a higher achievement, the “*productio creaturae rationalis in vitam aeternam*.”¹¹⁵

Secondly, Lonergan developed this in *De Deo Trino* by affirming that sanctifying grace was the created contingent term of a relation by which it is true to say that the Holy Spirit indwells the believer.¹¹⁶ Even the operative ontological change identified as a new entitative habit, then, was understood relationally: a new relation effected the ontological change, and the ontological change made true the new relation to the Holy Spirit. While not all changes in relation are entries into higher contexts, it would appear that this change in relation is such an entry, because this new relation to the Holy Spirit certainly is part of “bringing a rational creature to eternal life.” In fact, this relational change was

¹¹² Lonergan, *Method*, 107. See Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, “Sanctifying Grace in a ‘Methodical Theology,’” *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 52–76, at 53.

¹¹³ Lonergan, *Method*, 107.

¹¹⁴ See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000), 433–434. See my “Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness,” *MJLS* n.s. 2, no. 2 (2011): 143–161.

¹¹⁵ [“... bringing a rational creature to eternal life.”] Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 434.

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, TGS, 439–443 and 455–479. See also Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History, vol. 1: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012), Chapter Three.

understood as the entry into the state of grace, a new interpersonal situation founded on the relational interpersonal situation obtaining among the three divine Persons in the Trinity.¹¹⁷

Finally, that changed relation was predicated on the presence of a beloved to a lover, a presence Lonergan was at pains to articulate in both *Verbum* and *De Deo Trino*.¹¹⁸ In both works (separated, of course, by a span of fifteen years interspersed with earlier versions of the latter), it became clear that Lonergan, both in his interpretation of St. Thomas and in his own personal affirmations, held that the presence of the beloved was not distinct from the operations of intellect and will, but was instead constituted by the willing of the lover toward the beloved. That is, the presence of the beloved to the lover is nothing other than the change in willing insofar as it shifts from not willing the good of the beloved to willing the good of the beloved. Nothing other than this shift in the already-present faculty is needed for the relation to obtain.

What, then, was the new operative element into which Lonergan may have had an insight between the publication of *Method* and December of 1972? I am suggesting that it was the operative role of a state, in this case the dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly. Let me explain:

In the scholastic context, Lonergan knew that the state of grace (1) was linked to a changed interpersonal relation (2), which was in turn linked to an operative ontological change in which that operation *was* the change in operations consequent on the changed relation (3), all three of them hanging together as if by one thread. By the publication of

¹¹⁷ See Robert M. Doran, "Ignatian Themes in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 22 (2006): 39–54, at 47.

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, *Verbum*, 109–110 and 209–210 and Lonergan, TGS, 219–229, 623–625, and 675–677.

Method, he likewise knew that, in an intentionality context, love was a changed state (1) linked to changed interpersonal relations (2), which functioned in consciousness with all the characteristics of a new level save that of something explicitly operative (3). In the scholastic context, although the new relation was operative, the presence of the beloved to the lover was not a new operation; instead, it was the changed *manner* of operation insofar as the presence was in the new operating of already-existent faculties. At some point during 1972, Lonergan may have realized that in a parallel, transposed way, love did not provide a new intentional operation in the standard intentionality-context sense but was instead found in the changed *manner* of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding following on the changed interpersonal relations. But this did not mean that love was *not* operative; rather it meant that it *was* operative in precisely the same way that its genetic antecedent, sanctifying grace, had been operative. He did not need to find a distinct new intentional operation similar to insights, judgments, or decisions, because the dynamic state of unrestricted being in love concomitant with changed interpersonal relations was itself operative *in* the changed operations of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding.

Such an insight would have brought together the four threads of Lonergan's development by providing a genetic destination for each of the strands of development. The key insight met the earlier insight into the openness of limited individual subjectivity by grasping why new relations constituted a fulfilling higher context. It met the earlier insight into the interpersonal nature of that fulfillment by grasping the link between interpersonal relations and operated individual change. It met the earlier insight into the concrete and historical nature of that new interpersonal relation by grasping that the very

meaning of the term ‘created consequent condition’ involves concrete, historical, dynamic process. Finally, it met the insight into the re-horizoned subjectivity consequent on this interpersonal relation by grasping that changed relations’ operativity lay precisely in their effects on subjects’ horizons, experiences, understandings, judgments, and decisions. Thus, as he had noted of God’s gift of God’s love, “a single human reality, in its many aspects, and through its many realizations, at once is alive and intersubjective, communal and historic, ecumenical and universalist and eschatological.”¹¹⁹

4.4. CONCLUSION: TWO KEY QUESTIONS

Let me return, then, to the pair of questions I asked at the outset of this chapter: Did Bernard Lonergan understand love to be a sublating operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations? The answer here is a qualified Yes. Firstly, he clearly understood love to be sublating. Secondly, and more importantly, while he did not understand it to be an operation or set of operations, my suggestion is that he did understand love to be an operative interpersonal state. Thus, although the answer to the question as initially formulated must be No, the key insight I am suggesting means that that formulation is limited, although it arises out of the most common understandings about levels of consciousness that are currently accepted among Lonergan scholars. To the extent that this insight advances beyond that framework to include an operative state that addresses the intended meaning of the question by affirming a new type of operative function not envisioned by the

¹¹⁹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “A New Pastoral Theology,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 232.

question, the answer must be Yes: this insight would have allowed Lonergan to affirm that love was an operative *state*, the function of which was a sublation that fulfilled the vertical finality of the lower levels.

But, did Bernard Lonergan understand that sublating operative state to be conscious? The answer to this question is likewise qualified. While he did not portray love as identifiable in consciousness in the same way that the operations of understanding, judgment, and decision were identifiable, still he did portray it as identifiable through a reflection on one's life and a discernment of the work of grace in that process. It is tempting to discuss the consciousness of conscious operations simply as an awareness concomitant with those operations, in which case we may be led to seek something in our conscious experience of which we are aware when we are in love but which is absent when we are not. However, this is not what Lonergan meant by 'awareness' in this context,¹²⁰ and anyone who has been in any sort of committed, long-term relationship can tell you that if you are honest with yourself, you do not always feel differently because you are in love. In fact, if you are seeking a different feeling, a difference in your conscious experience that is always identifiable when you are in a relationship with someone you think you love, then after time you are in danger of being sorely misled and too easily pulled away by various persons and objects that make you feel far more strongly than does your original partner.

Setting up the discussion in that mode can be misleading for another reason, as well, for we are not always aware of—in the sense of advertent to—our operations, even when they are going on. In fact, a major point of Lonergan's entire project in both *Insight*

¹²⁰ On a related point, see Mark D. Morelli, "Consciousness Is Not Another Operation," *Lonergan Workshop* 23, ed. Fred Lawrence (forthcoming 2012).

and *Method in Theology* was to make us aware of—again, in the sense of making us advert to—these operations in our conscious goings-on. Instead, a better language is that of self-presence, and if we ask the question about love in this mode, we get a different answer. Are we made self-present in love as we are in our experiences, our understandings, our judgments, and our decisions? For Lonergan, it seems, the initial answer to this question as formulated would be No, for we are not made self-present in love *as we are in our experience, understanding, judgments, and decisions*. In love, the self-presence is not strictly that of me to myself, but of the mutually self-mediated you-and-me to you-and-me, “us” to “us,” “we” to “we.” It is clear that for Lonergan, a lover is by definition already part of a larger unit, an “us,” and it is the “us” that is present to itself in a lover’s reflection on the processes of her life as revealing that “us.”¹²¹ To the extent that a single consciousness in love is mutually self-mediating with another consciousness in love and that single consciousness as bonded into a “we” is, in love, participating in the self-presence of the community that that love is, then as it makes self-present the community of which the subject is a constitutive part, love does make the subject self-present in a way not reducible to the self-presences of experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding: the answer to the second question must also be Yes.

If this interpretation of “what was going forward” in Lonergan’s development on love is accepted, and especially if this suggestion of a key, unifying insight that held these issues together is accepted, then we are left with no other option but to affirm that Bernard Lonergan understood love to be an operative state of interpersonal relations that

¹²¹ This would seem to have been at least part of the meaning of his narratives about the Scottish girl and her fiancée.

sublated other conscious operations and made subjects self-present as members of a community, and that he identified such a state as the “fifth level of consciousness.”

5. THE SCHOLARLY DISCUSSION ON LOVE AND THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN LONERGAN

The scholarly discussion about the fifth level of consciousness in Lonergan's work has proceeded without the benefit of either a comprehensive analysis or a comprehensive synthesis such as those put forward here. That has been its most significant limitation. The foregoing examination of Lonergan's own development on love and the fifth level of consciousness together with the key, unifying insight suggested in the previous chapter allow us to examine the scholarly discussion and evaluate its contents from a better-informed viewpoint. Positive contributions can be highlighted and unnecessary detours avoided with an eye toward furthering future developments, both of our understanding of the role of love as a fifth level of consciousness and of theological positions that might be grounded on the notion of love as a fifth level of consciousness.

5.1. THE INITIAL DISCUSSION

From 1993 to 1997, an initial conversation erupted in response to Robert M. Doran's article, "Consciousness and Grace," in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, in which he suggested that a theology of sanctifying grace in terms of Lonergan's account of interiority would look to Lonergan's references to a fifth level of consciousness.¹ Over the next several years, a dialogue took place between Patrick Byrne, Tad Dunne, Doran, and Michael Vertin, which revealed a significant lack of consensus among Lonergan

¹ Robert M. Doran, "Consciousness and Grace," *MJLS* 11 (1993): 51–75, at 51.

scholars as to what Lonergan's references to a fifth level had meant and how they might be developed in systematic theology.

5.1.1. ROBERT M. DORAN I

The controversy focused on Doran's 1993 article, "Consciousness and Grace," but his initial sustained foray into issues relevant to the discussion occurred in the 1990 book, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*.² The foregoing account of Lonergan's development shows that, even though it was published more than twenty years ago, Doran's initial position on the fifth level accorded for the most part with Lonergan's development on the fifth level.

The position on the subject as falling in love and being in love, and specifically the position on a dimension of love as constituting a fifth level of consciousness is already present, and far more than inchoately so, in the frame provided by the second stage's position on existential subjectivity. But only after *Method in Theology*, and so after 1972, is there mention, albeit brief and even somewhat offhand, in Lonergan's writings of a fifth level of consciousness. What is important, I believe, is not so much the question of an additional level, but the increasing centrality of love.³

I would, of course, qualify some of the statements toward the end of this quote, most importantly the suggestion that Lonergan's statements on the fifth level were "brief

² Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990). While fifth-level material was by no means the focus of TDH, Michael Vertin brought its references to the fifth level into the discussion in his 1994 response to Doran. [*Theology and the Dialectics of History* will hereafter be abbreviated TDH.]

³ Doran, TDH, 30–31.

and even somewhat offhand” after *Method in Theology*. It has been made clear that his post-*Method* statements were far more frequent and direct than has typically been supposed in the dialogue.⁴ Still, it is clear that the human consciousness of which Doran wrote in TDH was a five-leveled consciousness, and he was attempting to ground that position on Lonergan’s own statements.⁵ As did Lonergan, Doran more than once suggested that consciousness reaches its summit beyond the fourth level in a love “that . . . is not so much dependent on our knowing and deciding as constitutive of the horizon in which they occur.”⁶

Doran’s 1993 article further developed the suggestions in TDH, arguing that the fifth level was the key to the transposition of sanctifying grace into a methodical theology grounded on interiority. He focused on the meaning of a “created communication of the divine nature,” identified by Lonergan in his 1946 treatise, *De ente supernaturali*,⁷ and sought to identify what such a created communication might be “in a theology whose basic terms and relations are found in interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness.”⁸ Noting that Lonergan had identified this created communication of the

⁴ See above, Chapter Three.

⁵ Doran, TDH, 222–225.

⁶ Doran, TDH, 245. He stated that the summit is reached “when we are drawn to move beyond all of [the] previous levels and to rest in the state of being in love, to rest in the goodness of another, or in the truth, or in the discovery of intelligibility, or in beauty. Moreover, our relationship of love may be with an unqualified good, an unconditioned reality, a complete intelligibility, a beauty that is the earthly reflection of the eternal light of glory. Then we are resting in the mystery of God, the world-transcendent measure of the integrity of all of our intentional operations” (Doran, TDH, 224–225). For an extended account of Doran’s understanding of love in TDH, see 243–253.

⁷ Doran, “Consciousness,” 52. “There exists a created communication of the divine nature, that is, a created, proportionate, and remote principle by which there are present in the creature operations by which God is attained as God is in God’s own self” (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Supernatural Order,” in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011], 65).

⁸ Doran, “Consciousness,” 52. Also see 51.

divine nature with the sanctifying or habitual grace discussed in scholastic theologies,⁹

Doran suggested

that we speak of a distinct level or enlargement of consciousness that is created in us by the gift of God's love for us as a relational disposition to receive that love (and ultimately as a participation in the relations of the divine persons) and that we identify this level of consciousness with the created communication of the divine nature of which the first thesis in *De ente supernaturali* speaks, that is, with sanctifying grace.¹⁰

The article followed this with a discussion of created and uncreated grace, a discussion which, although important to Doran's overall position, was largely ignored in the following series of articles because (I would suggest) of its seeming disconnection from the question of the fifth level of consciousness.

Doran was right to pursue the transposition of the metaphysical element, sanctifying grace, into the categories of an intentionality analysis, and his initial suggestions have served as an impetus to clarify both that transposition and the existence and/or structure of the fifth level. While in TDH, Doran had maintained that the fifth

⁹ Doran, "Consciousness," 55.

¹⁰ Doran, "Consciousness," 62–63. See also 54: "The gift of God's love for us poured forth into our hearts is an uncreated grace that effects in us, as a relational disposition to receive it, and so as the consequent condition of its being given, the created grace of a fifth level of consciousness, at which we experience ourselves as loved unconditionally by God and invited to love God in return. This experience of being loved unconditionally and of being invited to love in return is the conscious basis of (1) our share in the inner life of God, (2) our consequent falling in love with God, and (3) the dynamic state of our being in love with God. The dynamic state of being in love with God, in turn, as equivalent to what the Scholastic tradition called the infused virtue of charity, is the proximate principle of the operations of charity whereby God is attained as God is in God's own self. But the created, remote, and proportionate principle of these operations—what Scholastic theology called the entitative habit or sanctifying grace or a created communication of the divine nature—is the fifth level of consciousness, the experience of resting in God's unconditional love for us and of being invited to love in return, the real relation to, and constituted by, the indwelling God as term of the relation."

level of consciousness has an intentional orientation toward transcendent mystery,¹¹ a position that was somewhat at odds with Lonergan's final, relational, and largely non-intentional position on the question, Doran's 1993 article resituated that question insofar as it insisted on the relational aspect of the fifth level of consciousness.¹² This has been the context of the overall discussion, even when the focus has fallen more on the fifth level question itself than on the theology of grace.

5.1.2. MICHAEL VERTIN

Michael Vertin began his response to Doran by highlighting Lonergan's published statements on the fifth level,¹³ after which he asked a pair of questions, revealing that his points of reference were, first, Lonergan's own development as displayed in his writings and, second, our own experience of being a human subject.¹⁴ From these points of departure, Vertin offered his own response to the fifth level question: "Personally, I think

¹¹ Doran, TDH, 564–565.

¹² Doran also suggested in TDH that Lonergan's scale of values is isomorphic with the levels of consciousness, leading him to the conclusion that "religious values correspond, perhaps, to a fifth level of consciousness" (Doran, TDH, 88; see also 178–179, 476, 530). While this is a very important argument for Doran in TDH and it further affirms his position on the fifth level of consciousness in that book, it is less important with respect to the controversy over the fifth level of consciousness *per se*.

¹³ Michael Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness: Is There a Fifth Level?" *MJLS* 12 (1994): 1–37. Like all of the early participants in this conversation, he was confined, of course, to those statements of which he was aware. He referred to "Philosophy of God, and Theology," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004) and indicated in a footnote (2 n 4) that Frederick Crowe recalled Lonergan's reference to the fifth level in the interview for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation program, *Concern*. (See Frederick E. Crowe, "An Exploration of Lonergan's New Notion of Value," in *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin [Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989], 57 n 32).

¹⁴ First, he asked, "Should Lonergan's remarks be treated as merely passing comments, at most adversions to a notion he toyed with, tested, and soon dropped? Or do they indicate an incipient development of some significance, something that Lonergan might well have pursued and that his successors ought to follow up on?" Second, he asked, "Not just in Lonergan's writings, but in the actual features of my concrete human living, are there grounds for asserting a distinct level of consciousness beyond the four well-defined levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding?" (Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness," 2–3). I agree with the basic centrality of these questions, as evidenced the two sets of questions I established in the Introduction. However, my answers differ from Vertin's.

the question of whether there is a fifth level of consciousness must be answered in the negative, at least insofar as the word ‘level’ retains the meaning it ordinarily possesses in Lonergan’s work.”¹⁵ To support this affirmation, first, Vertin addressed the evidence of which he was aware in Lonergan’s published and unpublished materials and offered the argument that “Lonergan’s writings offer very little basis for claiming that Lonergan himself was headed toward presenting the human subject as operating on five rather than four levels of consciousness, at least if the word ‘level’ remains univocal.”¹⁶ He offered a seven-fold interpretation of Lonergan’s published work that disallowed the possibility of a fifth level of consciousness (if ‘level’ is taken to have a univocal meaning for Lonergan).¹⁷ This addressed the first of his opening questions and made his position on Lonergan’s own development quite clear.

Yet the materials he had highlighted presented interpretative difficulties, and so as a second move, Vertin, quite explicitly noting that “the linchpin of [his] interpretation is the suggestion that the word ‘level’ as used by Lonergan has more than one sense,”¹⁸ suggested a distinction between a “strict” sense of the word and a “wide” sense of the word. The “strict” sense is that in which data of consciousness and sense, together with the three transcendental notions (the intelligible, the true, and the good) yield four—and *only* four—levels.¹⁹ The “wide” sense would then mean any “place occupied by some element in an intelligible pattern whose basic elements are (a) *ordinary data*, (b) *the*

¹⁵ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 13.

¹⁶ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 13.

¹⁷ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 14–15. This was followed by a discussion of three of Lonergan’s oral remarks at a Lonergan Workshop, the first two from June 16, 1982, and the third from June 17, 1982 (Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 16–20). All three of these were discussed above in Chapter Three (see 9993ADTE080 and 993BDTE080).

¹⁸ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 21.

¹⁹ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 21–22.

transcendental notions, and (c) what [Vertin called] the *agapic datum*, namely, religious experience, the feeling of unrestricted being in love, the fundamental datum of religious consciousness.”²⁰ Vertin held that the “wide” meaning of ‘level’ did allow for five levels, insofar as the fifth level incorporates this so-called “agapic datum.”

The key to the distinction between the two senses of the term ‘level,’ for Vertin, was to be found in the distinction between the agapic datum and the transcendental notions. While

the distinction between the absence and presence of the agapic datum is analogous to the distinction between the respective absences and presences of the first, second, and third transcendental notions as such . . . [and thus] the *similarity* is that all four distinctions are distinctions between the absence and presence of some basic dynamic factor[,]. . . . the *difference* is that the transcendental notions as such are purely heuristic yearnings presupposing nothing [while] the agapic datum . . . presupposes the transcendental notions. . . .²¹

This argument was based largely on Vertin’s interpretation of Lonergan’s statements about the relation between the dynamic state of unrestricted being in love and the transcendental notions. He understood Lonergan as most often using the word ‘level’ in its strict sense, in which the agapic datum “inchoatively fulfills and structurally enriches” the four levels of consciousness without constituting a fifth level of consciousness.²² While that usage highlighted the difference between the agapic datum

²⁰ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 21.

²¹ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 24–25.

²² Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 25.

and the transcendental notions, at other times, Lonergan minimized the difference while highlighting the similarity, leading to the wide sense of the term ‘level,’ in which “one’s awareness of ordinary data and one’s (pure) intending of intelligibility, reality, and goodness (plus the consequent operations) are sublated by one’s (enriched) intending of holiness (along with the consequent operations).”²³

After highlighting that these terminological concerns express more fundamental concerns at the foundational methodological level,²⁴ Vertin turned his attention to Doran’s proposals in TDH and “Consciousness and Grace.”²⁵ While noting his appreciation for Doran’s work in bringing the issues to light, Vertin rejected the positions on love Doran had taken in both publications and suggested instead that

the fundamental issue is the following twofold methodical foundational one: (1) Beyond the transcendental notions of intelligibility, reality, and goodness, is there a distinct transcendental notion of unconditional love? (2) If not, at least is there a real distinction between my experience of being loved unconditionally and my experience of being in love unconditionally? As far as I can tell, Doran initially replies *yes* to the first, and later *no* to the first but *yes* to the second; whereas my own answer to both is *no*. Here is where our basic disagreement lies. Our disagreement over whether a ‘fifth level’ of consciousness should be affirmed is secondary and derivative.²⁶

²³ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 25–26.

²⁴ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 26–28, referring to Lonergan’s understanding of theological method (see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* [London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999], Chapters Five and Eleven, Twelve, and Thirteen).

²⁵ He had initially reviewed Doran’s works early in his own article (see Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 3–13).

²⁶ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 36.

Vertin's distinction between the "strict" and the "wide" senses of 'level' in part grasped a fundamental fact about the levels of consciousness: while the four levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding are properly intentional, the fifth level seems to have transcended intentionality as Lonergan held it at the end of his career. In other words, Vertin's distinction between the 'strict' and the 'wide' levels resulted from his grasp of a difference between properly intentional levels and a level which provides the grounds and horizon for intentionality, even if the full witness of Lonergan's development on this issue forces us to raise questions about Vertin's formulation of that grasp and its meaning.

Vertin was also certainly correct to recognize that the terminological discussion over the meaning of 'level' and whether or not there are four or five levels really relies on a disagreement at a more fundamental level. However, it does not appear that the disagreement truly lies at the point where he thought it should be placed. While Vertin had focused on transcendental intention, Doran had attempted to emphasize the interpersonal character of the fifth level of consciousness in "Consciousness and Grace," and the foregoing investigation into Lonergan's development suggests not only that the fifth level of consciousness is relational and interpersonal and that such interpersonal relationality is a key element distinguishing the character of the fifth level from that of the four below it, but also that its interpersonal relations provide a horizon grounding the very possibility of authentic intentionality. Despite Doran's effort to highlight the relational character of the fifth level of consciousness, Vertin's attempt to deal with it almost completely neglected interpersonal relationality as a constitutive element of the

fifth level of consciousness, focusing instead upon individual experience and prescinding from its situatedness in a realm of interpersonal relations.²⁷

This lacuna was linked with another—the assumption that the primary referent for the derivation of a level in Lonergan’s work was transcendental intention. If one assumes that transcendental intention is key for the identification of a level of consciousness, then it becomes difficult to identify as a “level of consciousness” any conscious experience, the key identifier of which is an experience of interpersonal relation as opposed to the intention of a transcendental object. However, Lonergan’s emphasis in developing his language of levels of consciousness was on operations and operators,²⁸ and as his thought developed it became clear that the key elements were sets of operations grouped around operators, which were in turn sublated by another set of operations grouped around another operator, and so on. Although it is true that the central operations and operators at any given level can be identified, at least in part, in terms of transcendental intention, still sublation—not, strictly speaking, intentionality—was the key to the levels *as levels*, as highlighted by Lonergan’s (apparently abortive) attempt to replace ‘level’ language with ‘sublation’ language. When the sublation of operations and operators by other operations and operators is acknowledged as the key to the identification of *levels* of consciousness, it sheds new light on statements like, “one’s awareness of ordinary data and one’s (pure) intending of intelligibility, reality, and goodness (plus the consequent operations) are sublated by one’s (enriched) intending of holiness (along with the consequent

²⁷ In fact, close examination of Vertin’s references to Doran’s article reveals that they covered pages 52–54, 57–64, and 74–75, notably omitting the heart of the section (64–75) in which Doran had articulated the relational understanding of grace that underpinned his similarly relational understanding of the fifth level of consciousness.

²⁸ See, for example, Lonergan, *Method*, 6–13 and 340.

operations).”²⁹ Insofar as sublation is a key, though not the only, identifier of levels of consciousness, this sort of statement indicates that what Vertin identified as the agapic datum does, in fact, suggest a distinct level of consciousness.

5.1.3. PATRICK BYRNE

Patrick Byrne’s contribution to the discussion took place in his 1995 article, “Consciousness: Levels, Sublations, and the Subject As Subject.”³⁰ His first proposal was that “the phrase ‘level of consciousness,’ refers primarily and directly to the subject as subject, and only derivatively and indirectly to acts of consciousness.”³¹ Because Lonergan had characterized consciousness in terms of self-presence,³² Byrne affirmed that “the term ‘level of consciousness’ refers primarily to different modes or qualities of ‘being present to oneself.’”³³ Those modes or qualities can include an experiential, intelligent, reasonable, or responsible self-presence (the four commonly-accepted levels), and early on in his article, Byrne made it clear that he held it possible to be self-present “religiously (= unrestrictedly in love).”³⁴ The corollary, as he called it, to this position is that “whatever act a concrete subject performs when he or she is present-to-self on a given level would truly be an act on that level.”³⁵ That is, if one is self-present

²⁹ Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 25–26.

³⁰ Patrick H. Byrne, “Consciousness: Levels, Sublations, and the Subject As Subject,” *MJLS* 13 (1995) 131–150.

³¹ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 132.

³² Byrne, “Consciousness,” 132–133, citing Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being: The Halifax Lectures on Insight*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), 16.

³³ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 133.

³⁴ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 134.

³⁵ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 134.

responsibly, then one's acts of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding would *all* be fourth-level acts.

Byrne was also quick to admit a difficulty, however. If self-presence is situated as the key to the issue, then how does one justify the use of the spatial metaphor 'levels' to describe the intelligible interrelation of these different modes of self-presence?³⁶ As a solution, Byrne proposed "that while an act can occur on any appropriately high level of consciousness, there is a lowest level of consciousness below which it cannot occur."³⁷ That is, decisions cannot occur unless one is responsibly self-present, judgments cannot occur unless one is reasonably self-present, and so on. There are then intelligible relations between the minimum levels at which certain operations may be performed, and because Lonergan had identified the essential characteristic of the intelligible relation between levels to be the operators' promotion of the subject from one level to another,³⁸ Byrne affirmed that "the levels themselves are determined by the subject-as-operator bringing herself or himself from a lower to a higher level."³⁹

According to Byrne, Lonergan's understanding of sublation emphasized "the subject sublating itself by 'operating,'"⁴⁰ focusing attention on the fact that "sublation applies primarily to the subject as subject, and only derivatively to acts of consciousness.

³⁶ Byrne, "Consciousness," 134–136.

³⁷ Byrne, "Consciousness," 136–137.

³⁸ Byrne referred to Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 391–408, at 396.

³⁹ Byrne, "Consciousness," 138.

⁴⁰ He continued, "that is to say, the conscious subject as the agent of the transcendental operators that transform *the subject present-to-self on a lower level* into *the subject present-to-self on a higher level*" (Byrne, "Consciousness," 139, emphasizes original, citing an unpublished essay by Mark Doorley entitled "The Notion of Sublation").

Strictly speaking, acts do not sublimate other acts; the subject sublimes acts.”⁴¹ Lower level acts, then, are sublated, not by higher acts, but by a subject self-present to itself at a level higher than the minimum level at which that act could have occurred. For Byrne, Lonergan’s work suggested that “the ‘operators’ . . . are the primary, and perhaps sole instances of sublating operations,”⁴² meaning that one could use sublation to identify, distinguish, and intelligibly interrelate different kinds of self-presence in terms of the operators and operations that are or are not sublated thereby. Given all this, Byrne insisted that fifth-level consciousness simply could be characterized in terms of a self-presence described as “being in love in an unrestricted fashion.”⁴³ Because all acts performed within a particular mode of self-presence occur on the level of that self-presence, then any act performed in a mode of self-presence characterized as “being in love in an unrestricted fashion” would be a fifth-level act.

From this viewpoint, Byrne offered some criticisms of Vertin’s position, suggesting that the root of the difference between his position and Vertin’s had to do with “what [he and Vertin] take to be Lonergan’s ordinary meaning of ‘level of consciousness.’”⁴⁴ He noted that there was no explanatory account of the meaning of the spatial metaphor, “place occupied,” in Vertin’s definition of the term ‘level.’⁴⁵ Further, that definition introduced the term ‘data’ into the basic terms and relations that defined a ‘level,’ an addition with which Byrne was understandably uncomfortable, given that he had highlighted Lonergan’s insistence on self-presence, operators, and sublation as

⁴¹ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 140.

⁴² Byrne, “Consciousness,” 140–141.

⁴³ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 141.

⁴⁴ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 142.

⁴⁵ See Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 21.

defining levels.⁴⁶ Byrne paralleled Vertin's object (data)-oriented approach with Aristotle's procedure in the *De anima*, in which one moves from objects to acts to potencies to souls in order to understand the nature of the human knower, and he highlighted Lonergan's objections to such a procedure. The most important of those objections was Lonergan's insistence that if one looks for conscious acts as such rather than acts as coordinated with particular objects, one finds them immediately accessible in consciousness and one finds revealed in them the acting subject,⁴⁷ but such immediate access to acts and subject is missed if one pursues acts primarily as coordinated with particular objects. Thus, Byrne could suggest that Vertin had misunderstood the meaning of Lonergan's 1982 statement, "religious consciousness . . . takes over the moral."⁴⁸ Whereas Vertin had understood it as a denial of a fifth level of consciousness, Byrne argued that this comment fit well with his own conception: "the fourth level subject as subject is sublated into the subject as subject on the fifth level."⁴⁹

Byrne's response to Doran, in turn, questioned some of the distinctions he had made, particularly the distinction between sanctifying grace (the experience of *being loved* unrestrictedly) and the habit of charity (the experience of *loving* unrestrictedly).⁵⁰ He highlighted the statement in Lonergan's *De ente supernaturali* that Doran had used as

⁴⁶ Byrne, "Consciousness," 143 (compare to Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness," 21–22). Byrne suggested that Vertin's approach "may be related to his continuing interest in coordinating levels with metaphysical elements" (Byrne, "Consciousness," 144). On that point, see the exchange between Lonergan and a questioner in 1982, above, at 163–164: in his article, Vertin acknowledged that he was the questioner (Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness," 19–20).

⁴⁷ Byrne, "Consciousness," 144.

⁴⁸ See Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness," 17.

⁴⁹ Byrne, "Consciousness," 145. See, for example, this sentence, which follows the quote provided by Vertin: "Religious consciousness has a fuller horizon than a purely moral consciousness, and the two are conjoined inasmuch as grace perfects nature, the supernatural perfects the natural" (9993ADTE080).

⁵⁰ Vertin had also taken issue with Doran's construal of this distinction (Vertin, "Lonergan on Consciousness," 32–33).

a point of departure⁵¹ and focused on effecting a transposed understanding of the term ‘remote principle.’ Because Lonergan had noted in DES that “materially, substance and nature are the same [but] formally, nature differs from substance inasmuch as nature is substance not as substance but as proportionate and remote principle in relation to operations,”⁵² Byrne suggested that “‘substance’ becomes ‘the subject as subject, precisely as present-to-self in Lonergan’s third sense of presence’ . . . [while] ‘nature’ . . . is ‘the self *as* present-to-self on one or another of the levels, and as such, the principle of acts of that level.’”⁵³ From this understanding of the transposed meanings of ‘substance’ and ‘nature,’ Byrne hypothesized that the remote principle discussed in DES would be the “new self” described in Scripture, which in terms of an intentionality analysis would be a self “made new by a radically new mode of self-transcendence. . . . transformed beyond any of its four natural levels of consciousness . . . by an operator, not of its own, but of God’s operation.”⁵⁴

Byrne then went on to suggest that “sanctifying grace would be the *experience* of self-present-to-self as unrestrictedly being in love . . . [while] the habit of charity would be the experience of self-present-to-self as unrestrictedly being in love *as the patterning continuity to a series of acts of charity.*”⁵⁵ For Byrne, the difficulty would be, however,

⁵¹ “There exists a created communication of the divine nature, or a created, proportioned [sic], and remote principle whereby there are in the creature operations through which the creature attains God as God is in God’s own self [*uti in se est*]” (Byrne, “Consciousness,” 146, citing “The Supernatural Order,” 65, and referring to Doran, “Consciousness,” 52). Doran had distinguished between (a) uncreated grace, which is the gift of God’s love poured into our hearts, (b) a relational disposition to receive that grace, (c) our falling in love with God as a consequence of that reception, and (d) the dynamic state of being in love with God (which Doran equated with the scholastic notion of the habit of charity) (this a–d scheme was Byrne’s [see “Consciousness,” 146]).

⁵² “The Supernatural Order,” 65, cited in Byrne, “Consciousness,” 147.

⁵³ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 147.

⁵⁴ Byrne, “Consciousness, 147–148, citing 2 Corinthians 5:17, Ephesians 4:24, and Colossians 3:10 on the notion of a new creation.

⁵⁵ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 148, emphases original.

that, *as experience*, (a) the self who is self-present in love, (b) that self's unrestricted loving, and (c) the one with whom that self is in love are scarcely distinguishable from one another. That is, in purely experiential terms, it is difficult to distinguish one's own self, one's being loved, and one's loving, suggesting that an intentionality analysis, based as it is on human *experience* of subjectivity, might not want to make those distinctions too sharply.

In his contribution, Byrne emphasized the underlying self-presence of the subject, as distinguished (but not separated) from the subject's operations. With this as his starting point, he granted the possibility of a fifth level of consciousness insofar as the subject as subject can perform operations out of a self-presence characterized as the state of being in love unrestrictedly.⁵⁶ For him, the key issue lay in considering the subject as subject, and that allowed him to challenge Vertin's characterization of 'levels of consciousness,' centering the meaning of the term instead on the sublation of self by self. That same focus also put Byrne in a position to challenge Doran's distinction between the experience of being loved unrestrictedly, on the one hand, and loving unrestrictedly, on the other hand.

5.1.4. TAD DUNNE

The final participant in the original mid-1990s conversation, Tad Dunne, basically agreed with Vertin and raised significant questions that still demand recognition by those

⁵⁶ Byrne, "Consciousness," 141.

pursuing the issue.⁵⁷ Dunne's main goal was to bring forward evidence that had not been available to Doran and Vertin.⁵⁸ Based on those materials, he affirmed "that Lonergan did not intend to posit a fifth and distinct level of consciousness,"⁵⁹ but he also critiqued both Doran and Vertin for assuming that Lonergan's references to a fifth level were always references to religious consciousness of some sort⁶⁰ and Doran specifically for assuming that Lonergan, in citing Romans 5:5, was always referring to God's love *for us* flooding our hearts.⁶¹

Dunne's argument grew out of his observation that nowhere does Lonergan appear to have used the whole phrase, "fifth level of consciousness."⁶² Although it is clear that he spoke of the "fifth level," Dunne proposed that the absence of the two words, "of consciousness," pointed to a significant difference in the meaning of 'level' when Lonergan spoke of the "levels of consciousness" (the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding) versus when he spoke of the "fifth level" (the level of love).⁶³ He drew on Lonergan's use of 'level' in "Finality, Love, Marriage,"⁶⁴

⁵⁷ Tad Dunne, "Being in Love," *MJLS* 13 (1995): 161–176.

⁵⁸ The publication date of Dunne's article suggests that he had not seen Byrne's article by the time the former had submitted his own contribution to the discussion.

Given the depth of attention devoted to Lonergan's own writings and unpublished remarks in the first three chapters above, I will not herein engage Dunne's citations in detail. All but one of the materials he mentioned is covered in Chapter Three, above, the one exception appearing less significant in light of the other material now available.

⁵⁹ Dunne, "Being in Love," 161 (Byrne likely would have been guilty of this criticism in addition to Doran, had Dunne seen Byrne's article).

⁶⁰ Dunne, "Being in Love," 162. Dunne qualified this with respect to Vertin.

⁶¹ Dunne, "Being in Love," 162.

⁶² Dunne, "Being in Love," 162.

⁶³ Dunne, "Being in Love," 162–163.

⁶⁴ Dunne, "Being in Love," 164. See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, *CWL* 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 17–52.

“Mission and the Spirit,”⁶⁵ and “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon”⁶⁶ to make the summary statement,

what Lonergan meant by his occasional references⁶⁷ to a “fifth level” is a level of operations that are intrinsically *cooperations*. . . . The level at which such operations occur may be numbered “five” or “six” from the point of view of vertical finality. However, from the point of view of intentionality analysis, the top level of consciousness is better numbered “four.”⁶⁸

In evaluating Dunne’s article, it is important to note that he correctly argued that the fifth level need not be identified as exclusively religious, a position that is a virtual certainty in light of the evidence from Lonergan’s whole development on love.⁶⁹

Moreover, with respect to some of Doran’s key distinctions, he agreed with Vertin⁷⁰ that it was virtually impossible to distinguish between our experiences of (1) being loved by

⁶⁵ Dunne, “Being in Love, 164–165. See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 23–34.

⁶⁶ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 165–166.

⁶⁷ Notice once again the assumed infrequency of Lonergan’s statements on the fifth level.

⁶⁸ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 166. Dunne wanted to highlight a “strict sense” of the term ‘level’ that Vertin had not noted in his article. He argued that the term ‘level’ in FLM “can include conscious and intentional operations of the individual, but [it can also] include activities done in common with fellow human beings and the operations of divine grace as they affect consciousness” (Dunne, “Being in Love,” 164). He then suggested that in “Mission and the Spirit,” Lonergan “apparently conceives that being in love constitutes a fifth level in the ascent of vertical finality, counting human attentiveness as level one. This fifth level is both conscious and intentional. But its operator is not a question It does not depend on an individual’s wonder alone to come to its proper term. . . . It constitutes the subject as the term of an interpersonal relation, which the four lower levels do not When we cooperate with being in love, our consciousness becomes also a common consciousness with friend, family, country, or God. The first four levels may be active without also giving that common consciousness. Given these differences, it makes sense that Lonergan would hesitate to use the expression, ‘level of consciousness’ lest his listeners take it to mean a level defined by operator questions in the same manner as the previous levels” (Dunne, “Being in Love,” 164–165).

⁶⁹ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 166–169. When treated in terms of religious consciousness, however, the fifth level is closely connected to Lonergan’s frequent references to Romans 5:5, and Dunne used his third section to make clear his disagreement with Doran on the interpretation of that verse: whereas he understood Doran as affirming that the verse referred to God’s love for us, Dunne suggested that Lonergan interpreted it as having to do with our love for God (Dunne, “Being in Love,” 169–173).

⁷⁰ We can see that he agreed with Byrne, as well, in hindsight (see Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 32–33, and Byrne, “Consciousness,” 147–148).

God and (2) loving God.⁷¹ With regard to the fifth level issue in particular, it is important to ask, first, whether the absence of the two words, “of consciousness” is as significant as he suggested, and, second, whether the question-operator (as opposed to some other kind of operator) is a requirement for the affirmation of a level of consciousness.⁷²

I, too, have failed to find an instance in which Lonergan used the four-word phrase, “fifth level of consciousness.”⁷³ I also would agree that Lonergan held the fifth level to be different than the more commonly accepted first, second, third, and fourth levels, and that Lonergan *may* have refrained from using “of consciousness” when he spoke of the fifth level in order to avoid a confusion similar to that which Dunne highlighted.⁷⁴ However, the absence of the words “of consciousness” may not be as significant as Dunne proposed. Not only did Lonergan pass up opportunities to add the words “of consciousness” to “fifth level”—he also passed up opportunities to explicitly correct individuals who used the four-word phrase, “fifth level of consciousness.” For example, in a 1981 exchange, after Lonergan stated that the context of intentionality analysis demanded that sanctifying grace be thought of in terms of a change in community rather than in terms of entitative change, a questioner asked, “Is that shift in the nature of man, is that the condition of the fifth level of consciousness?” to which

⁷¹ See especially Dunne, “Being in Love,” 169–171.

⁷² With these two questions, one once again runs up against the meaning of the phrase ‘level of consciousness’ in Lonergan. I cannot give as complete an answer to this question as some of the participants in the debate might wish (I am leaving to someone else the possible dissertation project investigating the meaning of ‘level of consciousness’ in Lonergan). However, what has been presented in the preceding chapters does give enough data to determine whether Lonergan held the fifth level to be a level of consciousness, to determine the key characteristics of that level, and to determine that level’s relations to attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible consciousness. From that material, one can then determine, backhandedly as it were, a working meaning for ‘level of consciousness’ that incorporates Lonergan’s position on the fifth level. For the meaning of ‘level of consciousness’ operative in this dissertation, see above, at 168.

⁷³ But see Lonergan’s language in the “Concern” radio show interview, above. It comes very close to the meaning of “fifth level of consciousness.”

⁷⁴ See Dunne, “Being in Love,” 162–163.

Lonergan simply replied, “Yes.”⁷⁵ Were Lonergan very concerned about the inaccuracy or potentially confusing implications of the words “of consciousness,” this would have been a simple opportunity for him to clarify that point, yet we see no such effort in this exchange, or in any other exchange about the fifth level.⁷⁶ This can be compared, moreover, to instances in which Lonergan did take the opportunity to correct those who placed fifth-level operations or issues onto the fourth level, such as the exchange in 1978 in which he broke in and insisted to his interlocutor that religious experience was a fifth-level, rather than fourth-level, occurrence.⁷⁷ Dunne’s argument was one from silence, insofar as it was predicated on the lack of the words “of consciousness” in Lonergan’s own expressions concerning the fifth level, yet that silence cuts both ways: while it may very well be that Lonergan had some deliberate reason to refrain from adding those two words to expressions about the fifth level, we have no direct data on what that reason might have been and we have ample reason to suspect that, whatever it might have been, it was not serious enough for Lonergan to have insisted that others follow that same limitation in their own expressions. Although the data do suggest that there is a difference between the fifth level and the fourth, third, second, and first levels, and it is quite possible that this difference is highlighted by, for example, the absence of “intentionality” when Lonergan mentioned “an analysis that distinguishes six levels,”⁷⁸ I suggest that neither Lonergan’s failure to use “of consciousness” when discussing the fifth level nor

⁷⁵ 98700DTE080.

⁷⁶ Note that in one of the examples Dunne cited, not only did Lonergan not correct the questioner, but in his reply he did not use “of consciousness” with respect to level three or four, either (see Dunne, “Being in Love,” 162, citing Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness,” 19–20). Rather than supporting Dunne’s contention, I suggest that such exchanges support the hypothesis that any meaning behind the lack of those two words is incidental to the major issues at hand.

⁷⁷ See 94500DTE070.

⁷⁸ Dunne, “Being in Love,” 166.

the difference between the first four levels and the fifth is sufficient to deny the overall viability of the four-word phrase, “fifth level of consciousness.”

Dunne’s insistence on question-operators likewise may not be as significant as he suggested. Formulated questions, after all, are the *expressions* of an inner dynamism—they are not the dynamism itself. In my own experience, I rarely derive an explicit formulation for a question *prior* to a move to a higher level.⁷⁹ Instead, my formulation of exactly what it is that I’m after occurs *as part of* my efforts at that higher level; that is, when I encounter a set of data on the meaning of which I am unclear, it is in the pursuit of that meaning that I am able clearly to formulate the question that I find myself pursuing. Likewise, it is in the pursuit of the verification of a grasp of possible meaning that I am able clearly to express my question. I would suggest that this is because our questions are expressions of the dynamism of our consciousness, and it is that dynamism that primarily moves us from one level to the next (“a sublation of self by self,” as Byrne put it⁸⁰). Expressions suggesting that formulated questions are the operators fall into the category of less explanatory and more descriptive statements that are on the way to an implicitly defined understanding of conscious experience, to make further use of Byrne’s suggestions.⁸¹ In the more explanatory, implicitly defined grasp of the intelligibility of consciousness, however, the inner dynamism takes priority, moving the focus to changes in self-presence intelligibly related by sublation, opening the door to the possibility of a

⁷⁹ Here, by “move to a higher level,” I am working with Byrne’s understanding of subjects’ movements to higher levels. See Byrne, “Consciousness,” 132–141.

⁸⁰ See Byrne, “Consciousness,” 139.

⁸¹ See Byrne, “Consciousness,” 137–138. I am aware of no one in Lonergan scholarship who has claimed explicitly that “formulated questions are the operators.” However, this is certainly implicit in the claim that question-operators as such are key indicators of levels *of consciousness* as such.

sublating self-presence characterized by being in love unrestrictedly, and lessening the significance of any lack of intentional questions at the fifth level.⁸²

5.1.5. ROBERT M. DORAN II

In that same 1995 issue of *MJLS*, Doran returned to the topic with the brief “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace.’”⁸³ He avoided direct engagement with Vertin’s arguments,⁸⁴ endeavoring instead to clarify his language and to incorporate material from another of Lonergan’s Latin works, *De Deo trino: Pars systematica*,⁸⁵ in addition to the *De Ente supernaturali* quote of which he had made use in “Consciousness and Grace.” In TGS, Doran identified a passage relating the four absolutely supernatural created realities (sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, the secondary act of existence of the incarnation, and the light of glory) to the four real Trinitarian relations (active spiration, passive spiration, paternity, and filiation), and this suggested to him that, in terms of systematic-theological work,⁸⁶ the distinction between sanctifying grace and the habit of charity would be a valuable one.⁸⁷ To incorporate this material, to address some issues that had

⁸² Dunne has since made available a slightly updated version of this article. The body of the work contains no significant changes, but three addenda offer brief reflections on archival materials, all of which have been discussed above.

⁸³ Robert M. Doran, “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace,’” *MJLS* 13 (1995): 151–159. This publication date meant that Doran had not seen Dunne’s article prior to the submission of “Revisiting.”

⁸⁴ He noted that he “deliberately avoided here the issue of the *number* of levels of consciousness, especially since the discovery and publication of Lonergan’s ‘Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon’ further complicates this (secondary) issue” (Doran, “Revisiting,” 154). Note that the issue of the number of levels of consciousness was secondary to the work he was actually attempting to accomplish in this and the previous article.

⁸⁵ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 12 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007); originally published as *De Deo trino: Pars systematica, editio altera et recognita (Romae: Universitatis Gregoriana, 1964)*.

⁸⁶ On this point, see Doran, “Revisiting,” 153.

⁸⁷ See Doran, “Revisiting,” 151–152, for his identification of this passage in *De Deo trino*. On Doran’s reasons for wanting to affirm the sanctifying grace/habit of charity distinction in a theology based on an

been raised to him by Joseph Komonchak,⁸⁸ and to attempt to deal with some of the confusion arising from his first article, Doran reformulated his thesis, following it with a brief seventeen-point explication.

First, Doran affirmed that the created communication of the divine nature mentioned in DES is experienced consciously as “a nonintentional dimension or level of consciousness which . . . is distinct from the four intentional levels”⁸⁹ and which is “a conscious state that has a content but no apprehended object”⁹⁰ and is “conscious but not known, in the sense of the full human knowing that consists in experience, understanding, and judging.”⁹¹ Underlying this nonintentional dimension of consciousness are the four intentional levels, which “constitute an obediential potency for the reception of the created grace of this nonintentional experience.”⁹² The nonintentional experience itself fulfills those levels’ intentional strivings,⁹³ and it “can be objectified in the terms of Christian revelation, and *only because of this revelation*, as an experience of *being loved in an unqualified fashion*.”⁹⁴ Such nonintentional resting in fulfillment⁹⁵ releases the

analysis of consciousness, see 154–155. The passage in *De Deo trino*, again, reads as follows: “There are four real divine relations, really identical with the divine substance, and therefore four quite special modes of grounding an external imitation of the divine substance. Furthermore, there are four absolutely supernatural realities, never found unformed, namely, the secondary act of existence of the incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, and the light of glory. Therefore, it may fittingly be said that the secondary act of existence of the incarnation is a created participation of paternity, and so that it has a special relation to the Son; that sanctifying grace is a participation of active spiration, and therefore that it has a special relation to the Holy Spirit; that the habit of charity is a participation of passive spiration, and therefore that it has a special relation to the Father and the Son; and that the light of glory is a participation of filiation, and so that it leads the children of adoption perfectly back to the Father” (TGS, 470–473).

⁸⁸ See Doran, “Revisiting,” 151.

⁸⁹ Doran, “Revisiting,” 157 (point 4).

⁹⁰ Doran, “Revisiting,” 157 (point 6).

⁹¹ Doran, “Revisiting,” 157 (point 7). He also suggested that “perhaps [this state] is best *known* through the revelation that is manifest in Christ Jesus.”

⁹² Doran, “Revisiting,” 157 (point 5).

⁹³ Doran, “Revisiting,” 158 (point 8).

⁹⁴ Doran, “Revisiting,” 158 (point 9).

⁹⁵ Which had been identified as sanctifying grace in scholastic metaphysical theology.

dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly,⁹⁶ thus situating the nonintentional level of consciousness and the dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly as the remote and proximate principles, respectively, “of acts or operations of love elicited in us whereby God is attained in God’s own being.”⁹⁷ When these statements are viewed in light of the material from *De Deo trino*, the nonintentional experience, as the conscious-intentional transposition of sanctifying grace, is a real relation to the Holy Spirit, while the dynamic state of being in love, as the conscious-intentional transposition of the habit of charity, is a real relation to the Father and the Son.⁹⁸

These statements find Doran very close to the position Lonergan appeared to have held at the end of his career, especially if the suggested hypothesis about a key insight linking Lonergan’s conception of the fifth level to his scholastic, metaphysical theology of grace is held to be true. While it did not deal directly with the issues raised by Vertin, “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace’” brought the focus back to where Doran had intended it to be—on the systematic-theological issues of a theology of grace in a context derived from intentionality analysis. By doing so, this article brought the fifth-level question squarely out of an abstracted analysis in terms of “pure” conscious experience and resituated it into a context of grace, which I have suggested was the key to Lonergan’s identification of love as a fifth level of consciousness.

On the other hand, this same move seems to have kept Doran squarely in the sights of Dunne’s critique, namely, that Lonergan’s conception of love and the fifth level

⁹⁶ Which had been identified as the habit of charity in scholastic metaphysical theology (Doran, “Revisiting,” 159 [point 13]).

⁹⁷ Doran, “Revisiting,” 159 (point 14).

⁹⁸ Doran, “Revisiting,” 155–159 (see especially 156 and 158–159, points 11, 13, 15, 16).

was not concerned solely with divine love and grace, but also included human love.⁹⁹

With respect to Lonergan's conceiving of fifth-level love, Dunne was correct, but it should be noted that Doran's systematic-theological concern to elaborate a systematics of grace in an intentionality-analysis context kept his dealings with the fifth level in that realm—the systematics of grace—and were not an attempt to elaborate on the fifth level *per se*, as indicated by his statement that the fifth level question was “secondary” to his actual project.

Doran's second later entry, the 1997 article, “‘Complacency and Concern’ and a Basic Thesis on Grace,”¹⁰⁰ was an attempt to bring into the discussion a three-part work by Frederick E. Crowe, “Complacency and Concern in the Thought of St. Thomas.”¹⁰¹

Doran reaffirmed the secondary status of the levels question, but he was also comfortable stating both that “Lonergan clearly affirmed more levels of consciousness than the four levels of *intentional* consciousness that are the centerpiece of his work” and that “how we are to talk about these additional levels . . . is now [in 1997] the central issue.”¹⁰² With that in mind, Doran described his work in all three of his articles¹⁰³ as “inviting reflection on our understanding of an ‘upper’ operator, when that operator is the gift of God's love.”¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ See Dunne, “Being in Love,” 166–169.

¹⁰⁰ Robert M. Doran, “‘Complacency and Concern’ and a Basic Thesis on Grace,” *Lonergan Workshop* 13 (1997): 57–78. <http://www.lonerganresource.com/book.php?1>.

¹⁰¹ Frederick E. Crowe, “Complacency and Concern in the Thought of St. Thomas,” in *Three Thomist Studies*, ed. Michael Vertin, Supplementary Issue of Lonergan Workshop 16 (Boston: Boston College, 2000); originally published as *Theological Studies* 20 (1959): 1–39, 198–230, 343–395. A full account of these rich articles is not workable here. I am offering only as much as is needed to explain the content of Doran's article.

¹⁰² Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 8 note 23, emphasis original.

¹⁰³ That is, “Consciousness and Grace,” “Revisiting ‘Consciousness and Grace,’” and “‘Complacency and Concern’ and a Basic Thesis on Grace.”

¹⁰⁴ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 8 n 23.

The Trinitarian paragraph in *De Deo trino*¹⁰⁵ had suggested to Doran that he look for “mutually opposed relations of origin at the level of religious love [the level of that upper operator] in human consciousness,” which would be participative in the mutually opposed relations in the Trinity (specifically, in this case, active and passive spiration, since those were the real relations in which sanctifying grace and charity, respectively, participated).¹⁰⁶ He insisted that Lonergan’s simple phrase “being in love” was too compact to account for both participations if one wished to strive for a fully explanatory account, and so a more complex way of speaking was required, a more complex way to which he found a clue in Crowe’s articles.

Crowe had argued that “there are two distinct attitudes of willing or loving [in St. Thomas’s writings], which may be called complacency and concern.”¹⁰⁷ The former comes at the end of a process of reception and is found in the passive aspect of willing; there is a “simple harmony, agreement, correspondence resulting when the will is adjusted affectively to the good independently of all desire.”¹⁰⁸ The latter comes at the beginning of a process of movement and is found in the desire and pursuit of an end.¹⁰⁹

To effect the transposition,¹¹⁰ Doran reaffirmed that sanctifying grace ought to be conceived in a conscious-intentional context as “some kind of reception of love, some kind of awareness that can then . . . be objectified as being on the receiving end of the

¹⁰⁵ See TGS, 470–473.

¹⁰⁶ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 7.

¹⁰⁷ Crowe, *Three Thomist Studies*, 113, cited in Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 9.

¹⁰⁸ Crowe, *Three Thomist Studies*, 113, cited in Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 9.

¹⁰⁹ Crowe, *Three Thomist Studies*, 113, cited in Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 9–10.

¹¹⁰ For Doran, the transposition was not as simple as identifying sanctifying grace with complacency and charity with concern: “both aspects of love . . . are aspects of charity, and charity in the Thomist system is radicated in the will, whereas sanctifying grace is radicated in the essence of the soul.” However, because “Aquinas himself never adequately integrated these two[, then] perhaps room is left to others to try to do so” (Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 20–21).

actively spirating Love and Word that are the divine foundation of the universe that is created through the eternal Word.”¹¹¹ This corresponded to one of the meanings Crowe had given to complacency,¹¹² and Doran noted further that “as there are mutually opposed relations of origin between *complacentia boni* [complacency] and *intentio boni* [concern], so there are mutually opposed relations of origin between active spiration and passive spiration.”¹¹³ He then situated the state of rest in God’s love as an “initial and grounding ‘complacency’ [which] can be theologically objectified as the conscious reflection of our share in the inner trinitarian life of God,”¹¹⁴ and he affirmed that this complacency involves as part of its constitutive formation a distinct dimension of consciousness[, a] nonintentional experience . . . [that] entails a real relation of origin to the indwelling God [that is] a created participation of the active spiration that gives, breathes, the Holy Spirit; and the charity that it releases is a created participation of the Spirit that is proceeding Love, and as such, is a special relation to the Father and Word from whom it proceeds.¹¹⁵

Although he altogether avoided explicit discussion of the fifth level question itself in the body of this article, still because the nonintentional state of complacency he affirmed clearly corresponded to what he had earlier conceived of as the fifth level of consciousness, Doran’s suggestions again highlighted the link between questions about the fifth level and Lonergan’s theology of grace, specifically the aspects of that theology having to do with grace as establishing new relations between persons. In doing so,

¹¹¹ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 24. Notice that here, he makes no reference to levels of consciousness.

¹¹² Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 24.

¹¹³ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 25.

¹¹⁴ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 26.

¹¹⁵ Doran, “Basic Thesis,” 26–27.

Doran, knowingly or unknowingly, was again linking the fifth level to Lonergan's conception of it, while at the same time making it clear just what the systematic-theological¹¹⁶ location of the fifth level question would be.

5.2. THE SECOND DISCUSSION

After Doran's direct engagement with the relevant issues in his "Basic Thesis" article, there followed a long break in Lonergan scholarship having to do with the fifth-level question. While mention of the fifth level did occur from time to time (usually accompanied by a qualification emphasizing the "possible" status of the level), no significant work engaged the issue directly.¹¹⁷

5.2.1. CHRISTIAAN JACOBS-VANDEGEER

That break ended with the 2007 publication of Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer's "Sanctifying Grace in a 'Methodical' Theology."¹¹⁸ This article was a significant development in the transposition of sanctifying grace into the terms of a theology based on the categories of interiority—the project on which Doran had been working at the outset of the controversial articles in the 1990's. Relying on Lonergan's assertion that

¹¹⁶ To be clear, let me state once again that Dunne was right to have affirmed that Lonergan conceived of the fifth level as involving both divine love (grace) and human love. *In terms of systematic theology*, however, the fifth level is relevant to the human subject's experience of the new relation to the Trinity, one of the created contingent terms of which is sanctifying grace; that was the focus of Doran's work in all three of these articles.

¹¹⁷ Many scholars have mentioned the fifth level, but none outside these writers have made it a central focus, and when it does arise, the fifth level typically is mentioned cautiously.

¹¹⁸ Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, "Sanctifying Grace in a 'Methodical' Theology," *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 52–76.

“for every term and relation there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness,”¹¹⁹ Jacobs-Vandegeer sought, like Doran, to specify the element in intentional consciousness corresponding to the metaphysical concept, sanctifying grace. He returned to the original point of departure: in a metaphysical theology, sanctifying grace is an entitative habit, residing in the essence of the soul. This presents a problem for Lonergan scholars engaged in efforts at transposition because the dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly, which Lonergan had described as only notionally different from sanctifying grace,¹²⁰ seems in fact not entitative but accidental. Noting this, Jacobs-Vandegeer identified the entitative element of human being as central form,¹²¹ and, turning to consciousness itself, he suggested that the unity of central form is manifested by the unity of consciousness (“the unity of consciousness *reveals* the concrete, intelligible form of the whole person”¹²²), marking the enduring “I” of consciousness as the conscious-intentional correlate of central form. He therefore suggested that the entitative change, which is understood in a metaphysical theology as sanctifying grace, is manifested in consciousness as the enlargement of the unified whole of consciousness, an enlargement Lonergan had described as the dynamic state of being in love with God.¹²³

With respect to the fifth level specifically, Jacobs-Vandegeer concluded that because sanctifying grace is an entitative habit and it involves the whole of one’s consciousness, “a coherent explanation of sanctifying grace in a methodical theology . . . will not identify the ‘dynamic state’ itself with a particular level in any sense of the

¹¹⁹ Lonergan, *Method*, 343. Doran had been relying on this statement, as well.

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *Method*, 107.

¹²¹ On Lonergan’s understanding of central form, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992), 462–463 and 542–543.

¹²² Jacobs-Vandegeer, “Sanctifying Grace,” 71.

¹²³ Jacobs-Vandegeer, “Sanctifying Grace,” 72.

word.”¹²⁴ For him, fifth level references in Lonergan most likely pertained to actual grace, and a fully transposed account of actual grace would require a more developed notion of human cooperation.

Jacobs-Vandegeer’s article was significant in that it shifted attention from the “remote principle” in Lonergan’s DES, which had occupied both Doran and Byrne, to sanctifying grace as an “entitative habit” in metaphysical scholastic theology.¹²⁵ While Byrne had attended to Lonergan’s understandings of ‘substance’ and ‘nature’ and suggested that the ‘remote principle’ discussed in DES would be St. Paul’s “new self,”¹²⁶ Jacobs-Vandegeer’s hypothesis gave a more explanatorily conscious-intentional cast to that suggestion.¹²⁷ His hypothesis suggested, in effect, that the conscious-intentional correlate of Byrne’s ‘new self’ would be a new, enlarged, unity of consciousness. In so doing, however, it also cleanly disengaged the fifth-level question as such from the issue of sanctifying grace.

¹²⁴ Jacobs-Vandegeer, “Sanctifying Grace,” 75.

¹²⁵ While the ‘remote principle’ is the entitative habit, still one can distinguish between the entitative change *as remote principle* and the entitative change itself. That is one of the clearer distinctions Jacobs-Vandegeer effected with his article.

¹²⁶ Byrne, “Consciousness,” 147.

¹²⁷ Byrne had suggested that the “new self” involved “a radically [148] new mode of self-transcendence. . . transformed beyond any of its four natural levels of consciousness . . . by an operator, not of its own, but of God’s operation” (Byrne, “Consciousness, 147–148). While this is headed in the right direction, it stood in need of further explanatory specification. Although Jacobs-Vandegeer did not specifically set up his hypothesis as an explanatory specification of Byrne’s suggestion, that was its effect. For Jacobs-Vandegeer’s (quite positive) comments on Byrne’s article, see Jacobs-Vandegeer, “Sanctifying Grace,” 68.

5.2.2. JEREMY W. BLACKWOOD

My own initial foray into the discussion¹²⁸ took place in a presentation at the West Coast Methods Institute, a conference in Los Angeles dedicated to Lonergan's thought. It resulted from an insight into a pair of demands imposed by Jacobs-Vandegeer's article. First, while his insistence on an enlarged or elevated unity of consciousness is an apt identification of the conscious-intentional correlate of the entitative character of sanctifying grace, just what occurs in this elevation of central form and consequent enlargement of horizon is not given full explanatory specification. Second, although Jacobs-Vandegeer's proposal allowed for a cleaner distinction between the two questions of, first, the transposition of sanctifying grace into conscious-intentional terms and, second, the existence and/or terminological construal of the fifth level of consciousness, still the notion of the elevation of central form pertains to the whole subject with all the levels of consciousness and it cannot be given a fully explanatory account without a correspondingly full account of the levels of consciousness.

On the first point, I made use of three works by Lonergan to offer an explanatory specification of 'elevation' in conscious-intentional experience.¹²⁹ The first, "The Natural Desire to See God,"¹³⁰ suggests epistemological elevations from philosophy to theology, and from theology to the beatific vision, which can be correlated with the scholastic light

¹²⁸ Jeremy W. Blackwood, "Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness," *MJLS*, n.s. 2, no. 2 (2011): 143–161. A shorter form of the article was originally presented as "Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness: Further Developments within Lonergan Studies," at *The 24th Annual Fallon Memorial Lonergan Symposium*, West Coast Methods Institute, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, California, April 16–18, 2009.

¹²⁹ Blackwood, "Sanctifying Grace," 145–149.

¹³⁰ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Natural Desire to See God," in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988).

of intellect, light of faith, and light of glory, prompting a turn to knowing as a point of departure from which to derive a systematic understanding of elevation. Because neither *gratia elevans* nor *gratia sanans* is specifically mentioned in “Natural Desire,” however, I turned to “Openness and Religious Experience,”¹³¹ in which both terms were addressed directly. Lonergan therein focused on openness, first as a primordial desire (openness as fact), then as a concrete horizon resulting from the desire in dialectical relation to bias and error (openness as achievement), and finally as a God-given enlargement that matches the full range of the primordial desire (openness as gift). The gift, as compensating for bias and error, is *gratia sanans*, but it is *gratia elevans* insofar as it provides a new, higher horizon beyond the possible achievement of any finite consciousness. The third article, Lonergan’s “Analysis of Faith,” helps to clarify that a given object is supernatural to a particular knower, not in virtue of the object itself, but in virtue of the light in which that object is obtained (the light of intellect, of faith, or of glory). Acts that have formal objects beyond the proportion of any finite intellect (“absolutely supernatural” objects) require a horizon commensurate with the full range of the desire to know, and thus they require *gratia elevans* for their actuation.¹³²

From these materials, I drew out the following characteristics of elevation:

1. Although Lonergan’s work focused on elevation as pertaining to judgment, there is no intrinsic reason why, in a conscious-intentionality context, the same principles could not be extended to all the levels of consciousness.

¹³¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Openness and Religious Experience,” in *Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988).

¹³² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Analysis of Faith,” in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011).

2. Therefore, elevation is the addition of absolutely supernatural formal objects for conscious operations.
3. The relation between the natural (proportionate) and supernatural (disproportionate) objects of any level is one of obediencial potency.
4. In terms of consciousness, an elevated act would be an act, the content of which is not fully accounted for by the act itself.¹³³

On the second question, that of the fifth level of consciousness itself, I presented evidence that, up to that point, had not been widely available.¹³⁴ After an analysis of the discussion in light of that evidence, I affirmed the existence of the fifth level and proposed an operation, a question, and an object that would characterize the fifth level of consciousness. I specified the operation as complete self-gift, “the self-possessed handing over of one’s central form to the determination of another,”¹³⁵ or, in conscious-intentional terms, the world of the lover coming to be made up of the values of the beloved. I proposed “What would you have me do?”¹³⁶ as a question that would identify the fifth level and specify the content of one’s self-gift. Finally, as an object, I suggested other conscious subjects, though other subjects not as objects, but *as subjects*, as *persons*. As elevated, this object would become the three Trinitarian Persons.¹³⁷

I ended my initial contribution by offering a summary statement, meant to contribute to the conversation and to offer a point of reference for any potential interlocutors:

¹³³ Blackwood, “Sanctifying Grace,” 148–149.

¹³⁴ These materials were dealt with in detail above.

¹³⁵ Blackwood, “Sanctifying Grace,” 158.

¹³⁶ Blackwood, “Sanctifying Grace,” 158. I owe this formulation to the suggestions of Matthew Peters, a doctoral student in the Marquette University Philosophy Department, and Anne Carpenter, a doctoral candidate in the Marquette University Theology Department.

¹³⁷ Blackwood, “Sanctifying Grace,” 159.

Sanctifying grace is to be transposed into the terms of a theology derived from the categories of interiority by identifying it with the elevation of central form manifested in consciousness as an intrinsic enrichment of the unity of consciousness. Such elevation is constituted by the addition of an absolutely supernatural formal object for each operation of consciousness, which in terms of conscious experience is to be identified as an act attaining an object which cannot fully be accounted for in terms of that act. The consciousness of the human subject of these operations is constituted by five levels, the topmost of which is the level of loving self-gift, the consummation of unconscious desire, which is to be understood as a self-possessed handing over of one's central form to the determination of another in which is effected the co-presence of the operator and the person who is the object of the operation.¹³⁸

In my initial attempt to engage this issue, I made several contributions to the conversation, but overall I was too bound to a typical understanding of a level of consciousness. I sought to specify an object, operation, and question for the fifth level of consciousness, without fully appreciating the fundamental differences between the level of love and the other, intentional, levels of consciousness. By discussing an operation in terms of the world of the lover coming to be made up of the values of the beloved, I assumed that there must be an identifiable operation in an individual consciousness and, in effect, I reduced the level of love to the level of decision, at which resides value. By discussing a question for the fifth level of consciousness, I granted too much weight to the notion that a formulated question operates one from a lower to a higher level and I

¹³⁸ Blackwood, "Sanctifying Grace," 161–162.

chose a question that, again, reduced the fifth level to the fourth—“What would you have me *do*?” is a question about decision and existential action. Finally, although I attempted to distinguish between the type of intentionality at the fifth level and the type of intentionality at the fourth, third, second, and first levels by positing an object for the fifth level of consciousness, I still confused the issue: how does a nonintentional level have an object, at all?

Perhaps the key contribution in my initial effort, however, was the explanatory conscious-intentional specification of elevation. The hypothesis that conscious acts, which cannot account for their own contents, are conscious manifestations of the enriched unity of consciousness, which is in turn the conscious-intentional correlate of the elevation of central form, drew Byrne’s initial suggestion about a “new self” and Jacobs-Vandegeer’s hypothesis about an enriched unity of consciousness more fully into an explanatory conscious-intentional context.

5.2.3. ROBERT M. DORAN III

Two final contributions from Doran deserve mention. The first, a 2009 lecture given at the Lonergan Workshop at Boston College, addressed “how the divine self-communication, constituted by God alone, allows each of the persons of the Trinity to be present to those to whom the created grace of God’s favor (*gratia gratum faciens*) has been given.”¹³⁹ Doran appealed once again to the relational passage from Lonergan’s *De*

¹³⁹ Robert M. Doran, “Sanctifying Grace, Charity, and Divine Indwelling: A Key to the *Nexus Mysteriorum Fidei*,” *Lonergan Workshop* 23, ed. Fred Lawrence (forthcoming 2012), 6. <http://www.lonerganresource.com/book.php?1>.

Deo trino,¹⁴⁰ to which he was now consistently referring as the “four-point hypothesis.” This forced him to address once again the sanctifying grace/habit of charity distinction, and to do so he argued that the distinction is found in Aquinas and is repeated in Lonergan up until the point where, in *Method in Theology*, Lonergan offered an “amalgam” of the two in his statements about the dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly.¹⁴¹ Doran’s option was “to [again] present an argument for [the] continuing systematic (and so hypothetical) fruitfulness” of the distinction, and he argued for a way to understand the dynamic state of being in love in a more differentiated way that would correspond to the distinction between sanctifying grace and the habit of charity.¹⁴²

First, he agreed with Jacobs-Vandegeer’s suggestion that sanctifying grace would elevate the central form of the person so graced and thereby enrich the unity of consciousness.¹⁴³ Such an elevation, he argued further, is similar to Augustine’s notion of *memoria*¹⁴⁴ and can be “retrospectively interpreted as a gift of being on the receiving end of a love that is without qualification.”¹⁴⁵ This elevation would include a judgment of value¹⁴⁶ on the goodness of being so beloved,¹⁴⁷ and it would give rise to charity—Doran deliberately used the word “spirate”¹⁴⁸—in a relation that “is analogous to the relation

¹⁴⁰ TGS, 470–473.

¹⁴¹ It was Lonergan who used the term ‘amalgam’ with respect to sanctifying grace and charity in the dynamic state of being in love. See 81500DTE070 and 81500A0E070.

¹⁴² Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 8. See also 24: “I want to back track a bit so as to avoid that amalgam, or rather to differentiate it in terms of interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness in a manner analogous to Aquinas’s metaphysical differentiation between sanctifying grace and charity.”

¹⁴³ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 15–16. See also 25: “The moment I saw Jacobs-Vandegeer’s statement to this effect, I knew it was correct.”

¹⁴⁴ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 18. See also 21 n 24.

¹⁴⁵ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 17.

¹⁴⁶ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 16.

¹⁴⁷ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 21.

¹⁴⁸ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 16

between active and passive spiration in God.”¹⁴⁹ Thus, sanctifying grace is the gift of God’s love that is an elevation of the central form of the human subject manifesting in conscious experience as a *memoria* that, together with its accompanying judgment of value on the goodness of that gift, gives rise to the disposition of charity in that subject; *memoria* and the judgment of value stand to charity as the Father and Son stand to the Holy Spirit, while charity stands to *memoria* and the judgment of value as the Holy Spirit stands to the Father and the Son. With this position, Doran affirmed that he had identified the conscious-intentional correlates of two of the four absolutely supernatural realities that, in *De Deo trino*, Lonergan had hypothesized would serve as created terms of contingent relations to the Trinitarian persons.

This is the developed position that Doran was beginning to work out in “Consciousness and Grace,” but which he felt was largely missed in the controversy over the fifth level of consciousness.¹⁵⁰ Although Jacobs-Vandegeer had distinguished the two issues, they remained unseparated, a point Doran at least implicitly acknowledged when he finished his Lonergan Workshop lecture by summarizing the presentation I had given to the Los Angeles conference two months earlier.¹⁵¹ In so doing, he admitted to having missed the fact that the fifth level needn’t be only supernatural when he initially began the conversation in “Consciousness and Grace.”¹⁵² He also noted that the fifth level of consciousness, in the terms in which I had construed it, did not negate Jacobs-

¹⁴⁹ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 18.

¹⁵⁰ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 24–25.

¹⁵¹ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 25–30.

¹⁵² Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 27.

Vandegeer's contribution, because "the fifth level is the elevation of central form¹⁵³ itself in complete self-transcendence to God."¹⁵⁴

The final contribution from Doran is to be found in his book *The Trinity in History*.¹⁵⁵ It is commonly acknowledged, he argues therein, that Lonergan's four-level structure cannot account fully for love, and "there results the acknowledgement of a distinct, interpersonal level of personal consciousness," which he construes as the point at which primordial intersubjectivity reaches the level of truly interpersonal community in virtue of the subject(s)'s authentic attentiveness, intelligence, reasonability, and responsibility.¹⁵⁶ Here, once again drawing in part both on Jacobs-Vandegeer's article and on a summary of my Los Angeles presentation, Doran affirms that "the fifth level, the level of love, is itself interpersonal. It is the level of total self-transcendence to another, whether in the love of intimacy or in love in the community or in the love of God, or in some combination of these. It is a level of consciousness effected by the gift of another's love and the challenge and decision to love in return."¹⁵⁷ He further argues that, if one kept in mind the context of the Thomist debate on whether love constituted or produced the presence of the beloved in the lover, one could argue that "there is a continuous line from [Lonergan's affirmation] that the presence of the beloved in the lover is constituted by love and so is not distinct from love [to] the late acknowledgment of an interpersonal core of personal identity conceived at times by the post-*Method*

¹⁵³ Note that Doran did not use the phrase "is the *elevated* central form."

¹⁵⁴ Doran, "Divine Indwelling," 30.

¹⁵⁵ Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History, vol. 1: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012). I am referring to a draft of the text that was made available for a course Doran taught in the spring of 2010 at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

¹⁵⁶ Doran, *Trinity in History*, 168.

¹⁵⁷ Doran, *Trinity in History*, 522.

Lonergan in terms of a fifth level of consciousness.”¹⁵⁸ In other words, just as in the Thomist context, Lonergan affirmed that the presence of the beloved in the lover is constituted, not produced, by love, so in the conscious-intentional context, the fifth level of consciousness could be understood in terms of interpersonal relations that do not *result from* love, but rather *are* love.

Doran’s position here finds him close to Lonergan’s final position on the issue. However, it is not entirely clear in what way Doran would hold together the positions both that the fifth level needn’t be only supernatural and that “the fifth level is the elevation of central form itself in complete self-transcendence to God.”¹⁵⁹ It certainly moves things forward to conceive of the fifth level as “a level of consciousness effected by the gift of another’s love and the challenge and decision to love in return,”¹⁶⁰ because one could conceive of human loves so described as being in obediencial potency to an analogous situation in which the other is a divine Other, but this does not completely solve the problem. Most likely, this difficulty is related to a similar difficulty in Lonergan’s presentation of the material on the fifth level: he simply did not clarify systematically his position on the issue, and contemporary work on the fifth level of consciousness has, at least on this point, surpassed the degree to which Lonergan had developed it.

¹⁵⁸ Doran, *Trinity in History*, 522.

¹⁵⁹ Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 30.

¹⁶⁰ Doran, *Trinity in History*, 522.

5.3. THE SCHOLARLY DISCUSSION IN LIGHT OF LONERGAN'S DEVELOPMENT

On the question of the fifth level of consciousness, the main limitations for Lonergan scholarship have been the lack of a comprehensive presentation of the data and the lack of a full synthetic statement of Lonergan's position on the question. Nearly all of the earlier contributions assumed that Lonergan's references to a fifth level were sparse and occasional, and the only attempt at linking the development of the fifth level of consciousness in Lonergan's thought to the development of his understanding of love appeared first in Doran's hypothetical and in-process systematics and, much later, in Jacobs-Vandegeer's and my own articles.

The first conversation about the fifth level of consciousness served to clarify the main relevant affirmations and objections that would guide the secondary development of the question. Doran began by situating the question in a theology of grace, in which he emphasized the centrality of love and affirmed a fifth level of consciousness. Vertin then denied the fifth level in ordinary terms, but allowed for it through a distinction between a 'strict' and a 'wide' sense of the term 'level.' He thereby expressed his grasp of a distinction between the fifth level and the other four levels,¹⁶¹ but he left open the issue of interpersonal relationality and perhaps over-emphasized the role of data as constitutive of a level of consciousness. Byrne then affirmed the fifth level of consciousness by focusing on qualities of self-presence and sublation as constitutive of levels of consciousness. This allowed him to turn his attention to a conscious-intentional understanding of 'remote principle,' linking back to Doran's theology of grace and affirming a "new self" in a state

¹⁶¹ I am deliberately setting aside the issue of a lower, psychic level.

of unrestricted being-in-love as a ‘remote principle,’ even as he questioned Doran’s distinction between the experience of being loved and the experience of being in love. Agreeing with Vertin in his denial of a fifth level of consciousness in an ordinary sense, Dunne clarified that Lonergan held the fifth level to be both natural and supernatural, and he offered a way of understanding ‘level’ that incorporated but, I would argue, improved upon Vertin’s distinction between ‘strict’ and ‘wide’ understandings of the term. On the other hand, his emphases on Lonergan’s failure to mention a “fifth level *of consciousness*” and on the non-questioning, nonintentional operator of the fifth level may not be as significant as he thought at the time. Doran, in concluding this segment of the conversation, returned once again to a systematics of grace, clarifying the systematic ground for affirming an experiential distinction between being loved and being in love while intensifying the relational aspect of love and the fifth level of consciousness.

After a hiatus of nearly ten years, the second round of conversation on the topic has turned toward further specifying an explanatory account of the fifth level of consciousness, largely, though not exclusively, in terms of and with reference to a theology of grace. Jacobs-Vandeger focused on the entitative element, emphasizing the elevation of central form and the corresponding conscious experience of an enrichment of the unity of consciousness. He further contributed a clearer distinction between the systematic-theological understanding of sanctifying grace and a systematic understanding of the fifth level of consciousness. My work followed on his to develop an explanatory understanding of elevation and clarify its conscious-intentional correlates, while also reaffirming a fifth level of consciousness and offering a hypothetical account of its operation, question, and object in light of new evidence. Doran, finally, has recently

reaffirmed the link between interpersonal relationality, the being loved/being in love distinction, and the fifth level of consciousness, offering his clearest articulation to date of the theology of grace that incorporates the fifth level of consciousness.

Four key remaining problems present themselves. First, the initial conversation made it clear that it cannot be assumed that we can accurately say the phrase, “fifth level of consciousness” or that the fifth level is a priori in the same sense that the first, second, third, and fourth levels are a priori. My own response to Dunne notwithstanding, it is far from settled that we can affirm that entire four-word phrase. While no one has publicly questioned Doran’s form of expression since Dunne, that question must be addressed in any attempt at a full systematic account of the fifth level of consciousness. Likewise, it must be determined in what sense the fifth level is or is not a priori, so that the relation between that level and the other four is as clearly articulated as possible.

Second, and much more importantly in the long run, it remains to be seen what the proper conception and expression of the natural and supernatural might be with respect to the fifth level of consciousness. While Lonergan clearly affirmed that the fifth level is not always supernatural, still the vast majority of the work on the issue has been done with an eye toward a theology of grace, limiting the development of the natural/supernatural relation at the fifth level itself.

Third, there is a difficulty about the fifth level and ontology. While Lonergan clearly affirmed some sort of real change in the being of the subject (“*being in love*” is an ontological phrase in some sense, at least), he just as clearly understood the level as relational and as having to do with interpersonal engagement. The problematic interaction between relation and ontology must be negotiated in a full account of the fifth level.

Fourth, and finally, there is a significant lack of attention to the cosmic implications of the fifth level in the secondary literature. Because Lonergan clearly linked the fifth level to issues of cosmic order, this must be incorporated into a full account of the fifth level.

With those issues squarely in mind, we now turn to a full, systematic, explanatory account of the fifth level of consciousness in terms of conscious intentionality.

6. LOVE AS A FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Doran's work has already distinguished between the fifth level of consciousness and the dynamic state of being in love, and he has contributed a great deal of nuance and development to the relevant questions. The current situation, therefore, has moved beyond the point to which Lonergan developed his thought on love and the fifth level of consciousness and has moved past what I was able to say in Chapter Four's synthetic statement on Lonergan's final position. In order to make a more comprehensive, contemporary systematic statement on the fifth level of consciousness, I must address the problems illustrated by the development beyond Lonergan contained in the secondary literature.

This chapter, accordingly, will review those problems and address them before offering a final evaluation of Lonergan on the fifth level of consciousness. There will follow a concise but comprehensive systematic statement on the fifth level of consciousness, incorporating important post-Lonergan developments and moving beyond the controversies presented by the past twenty years of secondary development.

6.1. PROBLEMS FROM LONERGAN AND THE SECONDARY CONVERSATION

Not only have the secondary contributors—Doran, Vertin, Byrne, Dunne, Jacobs-Vandegeer, and I—raised and contributed to difficulties in the systematic understanding of love and the fifth level of consciousness, but also Lonergan's own development presented difficulties at the very roots of our claims.

6.1.1. A FIFTH LEVEL “OF CONSCIOUSNESS” AS (NOT?) A PRIORI

The objections put forward by Vertin and Dunne, while not identical, are similar in that they address the same aspect of the fifth level issue from two different directions. In many ways, the key to Vertin’s critique lay in his question about the a priori status of the fifth level—is it absolutely or only relatively a priori?¹ Dunne, on the other hand, focused on whether or not it is appropriate to talk about the “fifth level of consciousness” when evidence from Lonergan’s corpus indicates both that he never used that four-word phrase and that he conceived the level status of the fifth level as different from the level status of the fourth, third, second, and first levels.² Both objections focus on the same issue: in what way or ways is the fifth level like or unlike the other levels, and what does that mean for our conceptualization of the fifth level?

Difficulties with this issue arise from the complexity of the data in Lonergan’s development. While at some points, love and grace are to be identified through reflection on a process in one’s life and are not to be identified in singular data of consciousness,³ at others, love was a single datum that was not a compound of many conscious elements.⁴ If love is a single datum of consciousness, it would seem to be a priori like experiences and the intentions of intelligibility, truth, and goodness, but if love is arrived at through compound acts of knowing in reflection on a process in one’s life, then it would seem to be a posteriori or, at best, relatively a priori. However, is it possible that reflection on a process in one’s life reveals something that has been present but not adverted to in one’s

¹ Michael Vertin, “Lonergan on Consciousness: Is There a Fifth Level?” *MJLS* 12 (1994): 1–37, at 21–22.

² Tad Dunne, “Being in Love,” *MJLS* 13 (1995): 161–176, at 161–163.

³ See 812A0DTE070 and 85000DTE070.

⁴ See Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Religious Experience,” in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist, 1985), 126.

immediate experience? Does reflection serve to open one's eyes to an a priori datum of consciousness that perhaps one had not noticed previously but which one will be better able to notice subsequently?⁵

The data from Lonergan are unclear, although he seems to have resisted thinking of love as a priori. He situated the epistemological horizon given to us in God's love as "what [our] a priori, what [our] authentic subjectivity, is open to."⁶ Similarly, he distinguished between a "structure [that was] a matter of being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable, being responsible" and an "actuation of the structure [that] arises under social conditions and within cultural traditions."⁷ He insisted that although the Scottish girl was in love, "she wasn't born that way,"⁸ and he stated that there are "experiencing, understanding, judging, deciding, and *sometimes* falling in love."⁹ Even Doran is drawn into this hesitation, as when he states that the fifth level of consciousness "is . . . *effected* by the gift of another's love and the challenge and decision to love in return."¹⁰

At the same time, Lonergan treated interpersonal relations and concrete history, both of which were integral parts of his development on love, as unavoidable. He identified Robinson Crusoe as "a real abstraction," insisting further that "if he really is all

⁵ Notice that this way of looking at the question resembles the process by which we come to advert to the experience of the occurrence of insights, judgments, and decisions in Lonergan.

⁶ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J.," in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974), 228.

⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Questionnaire on Philosophy," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 378.

⁸ 91600DTE070.

⁹ 94500DTE070, emphasis mine.

¹⁰ Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History, vol. 1: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012), 522, emphasis mine.

alone, his history does not go beyond himself.”¹¹ The community retains priority for Lonergan,¹² precisely because it is an always-present field within which human beings go about their lives. In a similar vein, Lonergan situates God’s (inter)personal entrance into human history as that to which being-in-love is a response.¹³ Although, initially, one might argue that the personal entrance of God can’t be a priori because it occurs in space and time, Lonergan notes both that Christianity and “the religion of Israel”¹⁴ had such a character of response. This suggests that our love is not a response simply to the historical, space-time Incarnation. Likewise, Lonergan clearly saw the possibility of the Spirit filling hearts prior to an encounter with the outer word,¹⁵ and he paralleled this response—being in love with God—to Karl Rahner’s supernatural existential,¹⁶ which while not absolutely a priori, is, one might say, *more* a priori than the fifth level as Vertin conceived it. He was also clear that love was not reducible to new operations or new qualities of operations at the four lower levels,¹⁷ suggesting that it could not fit within the possibilities opened up by conceiving of the first four levels as the only a priori options, but while he affirmed as well that we are not present to grace as we are to experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding, the difference is not one of less, but of *more*. Grace

¹¹ Meaning, it seems, that no one would know of his story if he really were so isolated (85200DTE070).

¹² See Lonergan, *Insight*, 243.

¹³ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Horizons,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 21.

¹⁴ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 21.

¹⁵ Lonergan, “Horizons,” 21. See also Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being: The Halifax Lectures on Insight*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), 377, where the Incarnation is situated as the entrance of God into history. See also Frederick E. Crowe, “Son of God, Holy Spirit, and World Religions,” in *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989), 324–343.

¹⁶ On the dating of this document, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 402.

¹⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999), 242.

“is something much more fundamental in you”¹⁸ that, however, is discovered by analysis—the “relevant data on being in the state of grace” are found in scriptural accounts of the gifts of the spirit.¹⁹ Because all of these elements—love, interpersonal relations, concrete history, and being in love—are aspects of Lonergan’s development that led up to his affirmation of a fifth level, it is unclear whether that level is to be conceived as strictly a priori or not.

If the a priori status of the level is unclear, however, it is perhaps even more problematic to turn to the question of the use of the two words, “of consciousness.” On multiple occasions, Lonergan specified a question for the level of love, suggesting (even in Dunne’s terms) that one could identify the level as “of consciousness.”²⁰ Moreover, when discussing the sublations of sense by inquiry and understanding, of understanding by reflection, of factual judgment by deliberation, and of cognitional and moral operations by interpersonal commitments, Lonergan noted that these sublations were not Hegelian surmountings of problematic dialectics, but rather “the inner dynamic structure of our conscious living.”²¹ Likewise, in the *Concern* interview, he noted that “consciousness moves on different levels” before describing the levels of experience, understanding, judgment, decision, and love, the last of which, he said, “seems to be

¹⁸ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Discussion 2,” *Early Works on Theological Method I*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, CWL 22 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 582 (question session as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” [Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 485 (48500A0E060)]).

¹⁹ 649Q0DTE070.

²⁰ For example, “Christology Today,” 84, and Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 205–206.

²¹ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Variations in Fundamental Theology,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 248.

another level.”²² Even when he distinguished between the four operators and the two quasi-operators, he situated the lower and upper quasi-operators as not “sufficiently in consciousness to be thematized,” seemingly indicating that the quasi-operator is in consciousness, though in a different way than are the operators.²³

On the other hand, on that same day he insisted on the difference between “what is already in consciousness and is not thematized and what is going beyond consciousness.”²⁴ When, following that distinction, he said that “discovering a new world, falling in love: people don’t decide about that; it happens,” did he or did he not mean that love goes beyond decision and therefore beyond consciousness, and that love is to be distinguished from those things that are in consciousness but are not thematized? And how might that fit with his comments just before that on the same day, in which it seems that the upper quasi-operator *is* in consciousness, but not sufficiently so to be thematized? Did his comment that “the fourfold structure in *Method* corresponds to the fourfold structure of religious consciousness”²⁵ indicate that consciousness’ limit is at the apex of the fourth level, banishing the fifth level from consciousness? What of the fact that consciousness includes more than the intentional?²⁶

These and many other examples have made the secondary conversation problematic precisely because Lonergan did not answer every possible question, including these two that now seem so central. While it must be remembered that his

²² Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Interview for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program, ‘Concern,’” recorded May 7, 1973, Regis College, Toronto, aired October 24, 1973, Toronto, 3 Windows Media Audio files, PCD 753.wav (41:20), PCD 754.wav (39:53), and PCD 755.wav (16:23); 91600DTE070; 94000DTE070; 97700DTE080.

²³ 810A0DTE070.

²⁴ 810A0DTE070.

²⁵ 9993ADTE080.

²⁶ See, for example, Lonergan’s discussion of feelings in *Method*, 30–31.

thought was in process and that he neither articulated a fully systematic position on the fifth level of consciousness *nor* made significant use of it in systematic theology proper, still a full systematic statement on the fifth level, especially if it hopes to get beyond the difficulties of both Lonergan's own development and the issues raised by secondary interlocutors, must address these questions satisfactorily.

6.1.2. THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN BOTH SUPERNATURAL AND NATURAL TERMS

Another major issue has been the characterization of the fifth level as both natural and supernatural. While it has been acknowledged since Dunne's article that the fifth level is not solely supernatural, still work on the fifth level has been done almost exclusively with respect to a theology of grace, and as a result it is unclear how a natural or proportionate fifth level might be conceptualized as distinct from a supernatural or disproportionate fifth level.

Lonergan's own development laid a difficulty-laden groundwork for this issue. As early as 1964, the relation between grace and natural fourth level conscious operations was unclear.²⁷ The really significant difficulties, however, were highlighted when Lonergan moved on to the fifth level, as for example when Lonergan stated that the fifth level "puts religion into the other four" and that it is "the supernaturalizing of the other four."²⁸ How does this relate to the fact that the fifth level is the level of love and is, therefore, the level of not only religious, but also domestic and civil loves? What is the

²⁷ Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996), 240–241.

²⁸ 98700DTE080.

intelligible interrelation between the gift of God's love, the love between a husband and wife, and the fifth level?

Doran's initial contribution to the secondary conversation fell prey to this problem in Lonergan, as he treated the fifth level as created by sanctifying grace, making it solely supernatural. Vertin and Byrne followed this lead, while Dunne noted the problem: Lonergan had referred to love and the fifth level as *both natural and* supernatural. Doran later acknowledged this, and Jacobs-Vandegeer's hypothesis, together with my own contribution, allowed for a cleaner distinction between the issue of the fifth level and the issue of the transposition of sanctifying grace, but Doran's work since then has remained focused on the grace issues. Because of that, there has been no focused attempt to work out the relation of the natural and supernatural with respect to the fifth level, and it has left Doran in a position of affirming both that "the fifth level is the elevation of central form itself in complete self-transcendence to God" and that the fifth level needn't be only supernatural.²⁹

6.1.3. ONTOLOGY, RELATIONALITY, AND THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS

When asked about the ontological change effected by sanctifying grace or religious conversion, Lonergan, on two occasions and very directly, responded by saying that in an intentionality-analysis context, this change should not be conceived of in ontological terms but in terms of a change in citizenship from the Earthly City to the Heavenly City. Many years later, Doran, Byrne, Jacobs-Vandegeer, and I all pursued the

²⁹ Robert M. Doran, "Sanctifying Grace, Charity, and Divine Indwelling: A Key to the *Nexus Mysteriorum Fidei*," in *Lonergan Workshop 23*, ed. Fred Lawrence (forthcoming 2012), 30. <http://www.lonerganresource.com/book.php?1>.

question in terms of transposing substance, nature, remote principles, and entitative habits. In other words, we pursued the question in exactly the manner in which Lonergan had said it should *not* be done. Is Lonergan's stance to be emphasized? Or would this abandon the valuable insights achieved in the more ontological, albeit transposed, path?

This is a difficulty for the systematic construal of the fifth level, I suggest that it is rooted in the character of love as it appears in Lonergan's development. From the outset, love is both individual and social—two of the four simultaneous aspects of love are individual, while two are social. While there is a knowledge born of love and the presence of a beloved to a lover is in the lover's loving, both of which have to do with individual consciousness, still love is interpersonal and relational and it has to do with a field of interpersonal connections and commitments. In fact, for Lonergan the state of grace is a social reality,³⁰ even though grace has effects on individual consciousness.

6.1.4. THE FIFTH LEVEL AND THE COSMOS

Finally, there is a significant lacuna running throughout the entire conversation since the end of Lonergan's career. While Lonergan emphasized a link between love, the fifth level, and the entire ordered universe, this point has been almost completely neglected in reflection on the fifth level. Lonergan, first, strongly tied the affirmation of the good to the *complacentia* achieved in love.³¹ Although Lonergan effectively identified the dynamic state of being in love as the resting *complacentia* after which one

³⁰ "Experience of grace. . . is the experience of a new community" (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Mission and the Spirit," in *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe [New York: Paulist, 1985], 32–33).

³¹ See 52200DTE060.

seeks in striving for the good, thereby providing something of a foothold for Doran's work with that term, still Lonergan went on to connect this to an affirmation of the goodness of the entire universe: pursuit of the good is situated into a cosmic context by the dynamic state.³² This final element must also be incorporated into a full systematic presentation of the fifth level of consciousness.

6.2. ADDRESSING THE PROBLEMS

I will establish major elements of a systematic presentation of the fifth level of consciousness by addressing the problems outlined above.

6.2.1. A PRIORI AND "OF CONSCIOUSNESS"

We cannot treat even the levels of consciousness as a priori if by a priori we mean (or even unintentionally imply) "already out there now real."³³ That runs afoul of the major thrust of Lonergan's major work, *Insight*, and theologically, it runs afoul of the fact that no created thing is a priori *absolutely*. Theology seeks the concrete intelligibility of this world as it actually is, and it actually is graced. As Lonergan noted, "there are no divine afterthoughts,"³⁴ and the offer of God's love, God's self-giving advance to us to which we respond in being in love, is always and everywhere present and a constitutive condition of fully authentic subjectivity.³⁵ It is just as a priori, *relative to human*

³² Lonergan, *Method*, 241.

³³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 276–277.

³⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 717. See also 718.

³⁵ For a series of citations on this point, see above, at 168–171.

subjectivity as created and characterized in this concrete world, as are the transcendental intentions of intelligibility, truth, and goodness.³⁶

If we were to treat the fifth level of love as less a priori or more relatively a priori than the other levels, then we run the theological risk of making God's offer extrinsic to human subjectivity in much the same way as the *duplex ordo* was thought to have extrinsicized grace and allowed for an autonomous "natural" humanity.³⁷ Lonergan's understanding of the offer is in some ways very similar to Karl Rahner's understanding of the supernatural existential³⁸ but, where Rahner would distinguish between human quiddity as such and human quiddity under the existential (a move similar to Vertin's distinction between absolutely and relatively a priori), Lonergan's whole theology of grace understands human obediencial potency as open to God *uti in se est*.³⁹ That is, human nature is in vertical finality to God and human beings' attainment of God does not demand that an absolutely a priori structure be modified by a relatively a priori addition. The very difference between Rahner and Lonergan on this issue demands that we not fail

³⁶ As early as 1963, Lonergan noted that our status as "adoptive children of God the Father. . . . is something in us that is immediate and becomes mediated by the life of prayer," but "it is not immediate in the sense in which our bodies and our souls are immediate to us. They are ours by nature." On the other hand, "still, in the concrete, it is part of our concrete reality," and it is brought to "habitual conscious living," not by "study of oneself or analysis of oneself," but as "a living, a developing, a growing, in which one element is gradually added to another and a new whole merges. That transformation is the mediation of what is immediate in us [and] what is immediate in us is that de facto we are temples of the Spirit, members of Christ, and adoptive children of the Father, but in a vegetative sort of way. That can move into our conscious living, into our spontaneous living, into our deliberate living; and that is growth in prayer" (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6 [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996], 178).

³⁷ On this point and the following characterization of Karl Rahner's work on this topic, see Jeremy W. Blackwood, "Lonergan and Rahner on the Natural Desire to See God," *MJLS*, n.s. 1, no. 2 (2010): 85–103.

³⁸ Lonergan affirmed as much. See above, at 149.

³⁹ That is, Rahner would position human quiddity as such as oriented toward God-as-creator, but he proposed the supernatural existential in order to orient human nature toward God in Trinity. Lonergan's position, on the other hand, was that human nature as such had a vertical finality that was an obediencial potency for whatever God might be in God's essence, whether that was a monadic creator as understood in the mode of natural theology or a Trinity of persons as revealed in the Christian religion.

to see that the whole of human nature—human cognitional-intentional structure, in transposed terms—is, as such, oriented toward God, not by any extrinsic addition, but by its very constitution.

It must be admitted that the related issue, that of the use of the two words “of consciousness,” is simply a terminological issue. But it is a terminological issue weighed down by the implications of the two words. Doran and Dunne agreed that there is a difference between the fifth level and the fourth, third, second, and first levels. They agreed that that difference has to do with intentionality and that the first four levels are intentional, while the fifth level is nonintentional. But the two of them disagreed on whether or not one should use the four-word phrase “fifth level of *consciousness*.”

Dunne’s argument from Lonergan’s failure to use those two words does not convince me. Not only does this argument from silence cut both ways,⁴⁰ but also Lonergan came very close to the meaning of the phrase “fifth level of consciousness” in his *Concern* interview in 1973. He stated clearly that “consciousness moves on different levels” and he referred to a first, second, third, and fourth level, topping the sequence with a fifth—love—which he said “seems to be another level.”⁴¹ There is no internal evidence there to suggest that he would have distinguished the ‘level’ quality of love from the ‘level’ qualities of experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding. While his later expressions do indicate a difference between the ‘level’ quality of love and the ‘level’ qualities of the other four levels, it is not apparent that that difference demands a terminological distinction between the “fifth level” and the “levels of consciousness.”

⁴⁰ As I noted above, at 215–217.

⁴¹ Lonergan, “Interview for *Concern*.”

Byrne's account of 'levels' adds to this argument. If the key is experienced, sublative self-presence, and if love and interpersonal relations are both experienceable and sublative, this would indicate that, while there are differences in the level qualities between one through four, on the one hand, and five, on the other hand, still those differences are not sufficient to disqualify the fifth level as a level of consciousness.

6.2.2. NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL

In terms of the fifth level as both natural and supernatural, an evaluation of the difficulties is quite simple. While Lonergan had clearly affirmed that the level was not only supernatural, he never offered a systematic account of the level and thus never was in a position to work out the relation between the natural and the supernatural at that level. The later work on the fifth level—Doran's in particular—is in a similar situation: the fifth level has been conceived almost exclusively with reference to a theology of grace, and scholarship has never had to address fully the issue of the relation between natural and supernatural at the fifth level.

It seems that the best option is to affirm with Lonergan that the fifth level need not be supernatural. If the fifth level is understood as having to do with love, human experience illuminates for us that love is not only supernatural, but is also (at least) familial and civic. Once that affirmation is made, the elements of love having to do with the supernatural and those having to do with the natural can be distinguished. Moreover, statements by Lonergan or others that seem to compress the two realms into one another can be adjudicated. Thus, for example, when Doran affirms that "the fifth level is the

elevation of central form itself in complete self-transcendence to God,”⁴² we can distinguish the fifth level as such from a supernaturally elevated fifth level at which the subject is in *complete* self-transcendence to God.

6.2.3. ONTOLOGY AND RELATIONALITY

The key with respect to the ontological and relational at the fifth level was contained in the insight I hypothesized in Chapter Four. If Lonergan grasped the link between the state of grace (1), changed interpersonal relations (2), and ontological operativity in the change in operations consequent on the changed relation (3), and if he linked this to the dynamic state of being in love (1) tied to changed interpersonal relations (2) that was operative in changes in sublated conscious operations (3), then the relational and the ontological already fit together. The ontological change is the change in citizenship from the Earthly to the Heavenly City. There is an ontological change—the elevated operations—that is intelligible as term of a new relation, and vice versa.

This illuminates any question about the intentionality or nonintentionality of the fifth level of consciousness. Fifth level interpersonal relation is subject-to-subject, not subject-to-object—on this point, Lonergan was very clear. This removes the ‘object’ as a characteristic of the fifth level, thus removing intentionality. The operative changed state relates subjects, not just intersubjectively, but interpersonally. In our own immediate experience, Lonergan identified a sense of belovedness and loving, and Doran has developed this and expressed it as the changed self-presence (*memoria*) that can, in

⁴² Doran, “Divine Indwelling,” 30.

reflection, be identified as belovedness.⁴³ As experienced, it is a content without an object, but as the experienced correlate of a relation, reflection can identify a relation to the other subject, if not an intentional object strictly speaking.⁴⁴

6.2.4. THE FIFTH LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE COSMOS

This, then, provides the opportunity to link the fifth level of consciousness back to the cosmos, as Lonergan's conception originally had it. To the extent that such an interpersonal relation corresponds to the good of order—which in itself has to do with ordered relation—it is a participation in the order of the cosmos. It fits into the ordered relations of the cosmos and, insofar as it is sensible, it is beautiful in its expression of the transcendental norms finding authentic achievement through those relations.⁴⁵

6.3. EVALUATING LONERGAN

Let me begin by addressing the two remaining questions from the fourth chapter. There, I asked two questions about Lonergan's own immanent development: Did Bernard Lonergan understand love to be a sublating operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations? Did Bernard Lonergan understand that sublating operator, operation, or set of operations to be conscious?

⁴³ Doran, "Divine Indwelling," 17.

⁴⁴ That is, X and Y can intelligibly be related without Y being the intentional object of X.

⁴⁵ This is a relational and communitarian way of expressing much of what I claimed in my article, "Elements of a Methodical Understanding of Eastern Christian Mysticism," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 76, no. 4 (2011): 339–356.

On the first, I offered a qualified answer of Yes. If my hypothesis about a key insight grasping a link between all of the threads of his development on love is correct, then although he did not conceive of love as an operator, operation, or set of operations, he did conceive of it as an operative state that fulfilled other operators, operations, or sets of operations. I likewise offered a qualified positive response to the second question. After affirming that the proper way to understand consciousness is in terms of self-presence, I suggested that while the self-presence in love is not that of a single consciousness, it is the self-presence of an “us” or a “we” as manifesting in the consciousness of a member of that “us” or “we.”

This left two remaining questions: Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to sublation? Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness? My answer to both questions is Yes, and in a fashion far less qualified than my responses to the first pair of questions. Conscious operations on the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding are sublated by changed interpersonal relations, which *are* love. This sublation is a form of self-presence that is not reducible to the self-presences of experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding. Although reflection on one’s life is required for advertence to and knowledge of this changed self-presence, it is discernable as a mode of self-presence that is, therefore, conscious.

Having addressed the issues in the development on love, both in Lonergan and in the secondary literature, and having positively evaluated Lonergan’s contribution to that development, I am in a position to offer my own contemporary statement on the fifth level of consciousness. While this statement expresses positions properly belonging to

Loneragan's functional specialty of Foundations,⁴⁶ insofar as it expresses the intelligible interrelation of theological truths it is an exercise in Systematics. As such, it is both hypothetical and revisable, and it remains open to further development.

6.4. A SYSTEMATIC STATEMENT

Loving is linked to lovableness: insofar as one authentically does the first (loving), one is authentically the second (lovable). There is good reason for the resemblance here to both Lonergan's and Doran's use of *complacentia*. For Lonergan, to the extent that one is in the state of being in love, one reaches *complacentia*, and, as Doran developed it, to the extent that one reaches *complacentia*, one also intends the good. Lonergan's early recognition of the link between our loving and our lovableness is the mirror image of Doran's account of *complacentia boni* and *intentio boni*: insofar as one authentically loves, to that extent is one lovable; insofar as one rests in the dynamic state of being in love, to that extent is one also then charitable. *Complacentia*, which for Doran is a changed self-presence (*memoria*), is really the subject's experience of her own lovableness. Lovableness, *complacentia*, and *memoria*⁴⁷ are ontological, faculty-psychological, and conscious-intentional transpositions, respectively, of the same reality.

As Lonergan's development demonstrated, the presence of a beloved to a lover is the love itself; it is the change in operations as they operate in relation to the beloved. The more lovable that beloved, then the more authentic that change in operations. Thus, the

⁴⁶ In terms of more recent developments, they belong to what Doran would identify as the functional specialty of Horizons. (See Robert M. Doran, "The Ninth Functional Specialty," *MJLS*, n.s. 2, no. 1 (2011): 13–16, at 13: "the specialty 'horizons' would have as its objective the thematization of the normative subject in all its concrete dimensions, no matter how many so-called 'levels' that might eventually entail.")

⁴⁷ As Doran conceives it, but not necessarily as Augustine conceived it.

more lovable a lover's beloved, the more lovable the lover becomes. When God gives to us God's own love for God (Romans 5:5), our beloved is God. As God is the very pinnacle of lovableness, then when we love God with God's own love, it makes our lovableness adequate to God's own love. In this way does the gift of God's love stand as the term of a new relation to God: in this way is it truly *gratia gratum faciens*—it makes us pleasing by making us adequate to God's own love. This is why changed self-presence—Doran's *memoria*—is the experiential conscious-intentional correlate of sanctifying grace. Changed *memoria* is the experience of being made adequate to God's love precisely by being given God's own love for God. The gift does not effect but *is* the change.

Not in addition to, but *as* such an operative gift, love is not only relational, but also ontologically elevating. This change, experienced consciously as a changed *memoria*, is an elevation that posits supernatural or disproportionate objects for conscious operations. That is, it is operative in human subjectivity by facilitating our operations' attainment of contents that cannot be accounted for by those operations as such. Doran's account of *memoria*, a consequent judgment of value, and a dynamic state of being in love unrestrictedly (charity) identifies conscious operations that reach absolutely disproportionate contents: the content of the changed *memoria* is absolutely disproportionate because it is a belovedness that participates in God's own lovableness; the content of the judgment of value on the goodness of that belovedness is absolutely disproportionate because it is a judgment upon God's own love and lovableness; and the content of the dynamic state of unrestricted being in love is the content-without-an-object Lonergan identified earlier in his career, a content that is mysterious precisely because it

has no restrictions. Neither human self-presence, nor human judgment, nor human dynamic states could—as such—achieve those absolutely disproportionate contents, and these contents are absolutely supernatural because these operations are Doran’s transposition of the operations by which, according to Lonergan, human beings attain God *uti in se est*.

The subject elevated by these interpersonal relations finds in her experience manifestations of that changed condition in these and perhaps other operations attaining contents beyond the reach of human subjectivity as such. The new relations achieve these disproportionate results by sublating the subject’s conscious and intentional operations and self-presences into a self-presence characterized by a nonintentional subject-to-subject relation. This new self-presence is a fifth level of consciousness.

While Lonergan identified that level as a dynamic state of being in love, Doran has specified that the dynamic state of being in love is part, not the whole, of that level of consciousness. This dynamic state can be, though is not always, a dynamic state of *unrestricted* being in love. When the state is one of *restricted* being in love, this signals a natural fifth level of consciousness, and the parameters change. Now, what are achieved are no longer absolutely disproportionate contents, but *relatively* disproportionate contents. There remain self-presence constituted by a relation, a judgment of value on that self-presence, and a dynamic state of being in love. However, the self-presence is no longer characterized by a lovable-ness granted by God’s own love, but is instead a self-presence characterized by a lovable-ness granted by the love of the human person to whom one is in relation. The judgment of value is a judgment on the self-presence

generated by that love. Finally, the dynamic state of being in love, while not unrestricted, is still the proximate principle of acts of loving that constitute the relation.

While not absolutely supernatural, the contents of these operations and states are still relatively supernatural. Thus, while the self-presence of a single subject is proportionate to a single subject, the self-presence of an “us” or a “we” is disproportionate to a single subject. That sort of self-presence, the mutual self-presence of mutually self-mediating subjects, is the sort of self-presence achieved in restricted, natural loves, and it requires a minimum of two subjects for its attainment. Likewise, though a judgment of value on the goodness of that belovedness and self-presence is in one sense possible for someone not in such a relation (one could, for example, affirm that it would be good to be in such a state, even if one were not, currently, in such a state) a fully authentic pronouncement of judgment on that goodness requires the relation itself and, hence, at least two subjects for its attainment. Authentic being in love cannot, by definition, be monadic, and so finally, the dynamic state of even restricted being in love demands the union of at least two people—the state is disproportionate to a single subject.

The changed self-presence, judgment of value, and dynamic state of being in love that occur in natural love are in obediencial potency to higher, disproportionate attainments because the relation grounding them all is in obediencial potency to a higher relation. The relation between two human subjects in love is in obediencial potency to a relation that would obtain between those two persons and the divine Persons. In that case, without annihilating the relation, self-presence, judgment of value, or dynamic state in the natural love, they are elevated into a higher relation, changed *memoria*,

disproportionate judgment of value, and dynamic state of *unrestricted* being in love. This potency obtains, in part, because both sets of relations—the natural and the supernatural—take hold in a realm that is always with us, always an aspect of our concrete living. To a greater or lesser extent, our self-presence is always characterized by the presence or absence of a relation to others, whether our mother in our infancy, our larger family in our youth, our society or state, our spouses or partners, or the three divine Persons. There is always a realm in our subjectivity for our self-presence to be the manifestation of a mutually self-mediated and mutually self-mediating mutual self-presence with another person. That realm is initially constituted by intersubjective relations, but those intersubjective relations mature through individuation as we perform our intentional conscious operations. At the summit of that maturation is mutual self-mediation, and two or more individuals in a condition of mutual self-mediation form a coincidental manifold that is ready to “snap”⁴⁸ into something higher: ordered interpersonal relations.

These relational units occur in concrete history and are most fully and authentically constituted by concrete historical affirmations of love. In either the natural or the supernatural case, relations at the fifth level of consciousness situate subjects into a historical good of order that, however small initially, begins to connect to other relations in webs ever more significant and ever more comprehensive. To use a spatial metaphor, while in individual conscious subjects, human loves work from the top-down, in a more comprehensive, communal, and historical sense, they work from the bottom-up, ever more thoroughly drawing the world of brute matters of fact into an intelligently

⁴⁸ 809A0DTE070. See above, at 175–176.

understood, reasonably ordered, and responsibly managed world of meaning.

Disproportionate or supernatural love, on the other hand, while it, too, works from the top-down in individual consciousness, also works from the top-down in the communal and historical sense, pulling human individuals and relations into line with the ordered meaning of the entire cosmos and facilitating ever more authentic human achievements in the bottom-up mode. This ultimate, cosmic, good of order to which disproportionate love draws human subjects and, through human subjects, the entire universe, is the Kingdom of God.

Beauty, it turns out, is indeed tied to love, for it is, as Lonergan said, “self-transcendence expressed through the sensible.”⁴⁹ Insofar as self-transcendence is a movement into the good of order of the whole cosmos, then beauty is the sensible expression of the proper situation of things in that good of order. Such self-transcendence is the authenticity fostered by and in the relations that are love, and so beauty is the sensible revelation of the content of love—it is the sensible expression of the relations that *are* love. The more lovable something is, the more authentic is that relation, the more it is in accord with the order of the universe, the more beautiful it is. The fifth level of consciousness, as the sublation of all the previous levels of consciousness by the mutual self-presence of mutually self-mediating subjects, is the locus both of the fullest expression and fullest apprehension of beauty.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ 52200DTE060.

⁵⁰ That is, taking Byrne’s hypothesis as a point of departure, conscious experience occurring within a self-presence characterized by a state of being in love is the highpoint of authentic apprehension of beauty (see above, at 205–207, and Byrne, “Consciousness,” 132–141).

6.5. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The problems generated by Lonergan's development and the secondary literature are significant, but not insurmountable. Though concise, the statement of a contemporary position on the fifth level given here is comprehensive and has been situated in a context addressing those problems. While, again, it is open to future revision and development, what has been achieved is a comprehensive statement on the fifth level of consciousness that affords a systematic-theological position from which future development may move forward.

CONCLUSION

The problem of the fifth level of consciousness in Lonergan studies had to do with its proper conception. There was agreement that Lonergan had talked about a fifth level and that it would reside, in spatial-metaphorical terms, above the fourth level of decision. It was unclear, however, how that level was to be understood in detail. Was it a level “of consciousness,” just as were the levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding? Was it a priori in the same manner as those four lower levels? The issue suffered from a lack of a comprehensive review of Lonergan’s development on the issue, and what discussion there had been made reference to a few isolated statements by Lonergan without their being situated in light of his whole development on love.

That development afforded significant insight into Lonergan’s understanding of the fifth level of consciousness. It progressed through three stages, beginning with an initial emphasis on a metaphysical faculty psychology that developed toward an intentionality analysis. As the intentionality-analysis method took hold, a second stage developed, in which Lonergan began to use progressive imagery to highlight the development of the subject through its levels of consciousness. This sequential imagery began to reach its summit in love, and eventually Lonergan was comfortable describing love as a “fifth level,” after which he engaged in further explications of his meaning, both in published texts and in engagements with questioners.

Through these three stages, Lonergan’s development drew on, and eventually drew together, four genetic trajectories: a potency of individual subjectivity for disproportionate fulfillment, which became an opening for grace and love provided by the limitations and unauthenticities of individual subjectivity; an interpersonal character

to that fulfillment, which became the sublation of individual subjectivity by interpersonal relations; a historical and concrete character to that fulfillment, which became a shift in the concrete interpersonal community to which a person belongs; and a capacity for the fulfillment to change the world of human meaning, which became an epistemological and horizontal change linking persons to one another and constituting new communities of meaning.

These four threads characterized his development and provided pointers to a unifying insight hypothesized herein. Just as in a metaphysical theology, where there is a link between the state of grace (1), changed interpersonal relations (2), and changed operations by which the state and relations were operative (3), so in Lonergan's intentionality analysis, there was a dynamic state (1) linked to interpersonal relations (2) operative through changed conscious operations (3).

Yet, even if grounded on such an insight, Lonergan's final position and his development were not without their difficulties, and these were highlighted by the secondary conversation on the topic beginning in the 1990's. While Doran began by linking sanctifying grace to the fifth level of consciousness, Vertin challenged his affirmation of a distinct fifth level of consciousness. Byrne made use of self-presence and sublation to affirm the fifth level of consciousness, while Dunne offered new reasons to question it. Doran revisited his original article and offered further reflections, but the conversation stalled without resolution.

Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer reignited the issue by linking sanctifying grace to an elevated, enriched unity of consciousness, and I developed on his position by specifying an explanatory meaning for 'elevation' and reaffirming the fifth level of consciousness.

Doran has made use of both of these later contributions and specified much more fully the character of the nonintentional level “effected by the gift of another’s love and the challenge and decision to love in return.”¹

Lonergan’s development and the secondary dialogue left open the questions of the a priori status of the fifth level, of whether or not it was appropriate to affirm a fifth level “of consciousness,” of how the natural and supernatural might relate at the fifth level, and of how the fifth level related to Lonergan’s repeated references to the link between love and the cosmic order. I have offered an affirmation of the validity of the four-word phrase, “fifth level of consciousness,” and of its a priori status, as well as an account of the relation between the natural and the supernatural at the fifth level of consciousness and that level’s relation to a universal good of order. In addition, I have suggested a systematic-theological account of the fifth level of consciousness. While comprehensive and concise, it is hypothetical and remains ever open to further development and revision.

POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE APPLICATIONS AND DIALOGUE

Future applications of the solution presented herein are multifaceted and rich. The clearest possibility is the further development of a theology of grace in a context of conscious intentionality as Lonergan, Doran, and others understood and understand it. My hope is that the systematic-theological account of the fifth level of consciousness provided in the final chapter contributes to this theology and affords an opportunity for advancement and development by those who continue to focus on that project.

¹ Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions, vol. 1: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012), 522.

A second space for development obtains in the field of ecclesiology. While some ecclesiological work has already been done with reference to a Lonerganian context,² efforts at a systematic understanding of the Church may be helped by the systematic-explanatory inclusion of the interpersonal realm. This would add to whatever contributions a Lonerganian intentionality analysis may offer to ecclesiology, and as it has been construed here, the systematic account of the fifth level of consciousness could prove fruitful in developing both the difference and the complementarity between the Kingdom of God and the Christian Church.

A third opportunity could be found in liberation theology. Doran and others have attempted some engagement with liberation theology from within a Lonerganian context,³ especially highlighting the significance of social grace and its impact on social structures. The interpersonal context of both grace and social structures could be developed with reference to a fully recognized and systematically-accounted fifth level of consciousness, offering an opportunity to work out even further the implications of a Lonerganian account of subjectivity for liberation concerns.

A fourth conversation partner for this fifth-level material may be the work of Hans Urs von Balthasar, whose emphasis on dramatic personhood and beauty resonates well with Lonergan's emphasis on authenticity and the link between love and cosmic

² For example, Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), Chapter Five and Chapter Thirteen.

³ For example, Doran, TDH, Chapter Thirteen; Rohan Curnow, "Robert Doran's Theology of History and the Liberation of the Poor," in *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, SJ*, ed. John D. Dadosky, Marquette Studies in Theology 68, ed. Andrew Tallon (Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2009), 51–70; and several of the contributions in Fred Lawrence, ed., *Communicating a Dangerous Memory: Soundings in Political Theology*, Supplementary Issue of Lonergan Workshop 6, ed. Fred Lawrence (Atlanta: Scholars, 1987).

beauty.⁴ Although some within the community of Lonergan scholars have long been convinced that Lonergan and von Balthasar are viable partners in a full systematic theology,⁵ the fifth level of consciousness, as it has been presented here, may offer significant technical links from the Lonerganian context to the Balthasarian material.

Finally, conversation may now be possible with a theologian whose work initially seems inimical to Lonergan's: Stanley Hauerwas. For Hauerwas, a human subject is both made a full human knower and made most fully human by her participation in a cross-centered community of witness.⁶ While the importance of community was recognized by Lonergan and has been important for some Lonerganian scholars, the understanding of the fifth level of consciousness worked out here would provide a fully systematic, explanatory account of that community importance that is linked to the entire Lonerganian account of subjectivity. This could be a starting point for dialogue—dialogue that I would insist can be very fruitful—between Lonerganian theologians and the work of Stanley Hauerwas.

⁴ See, for example, Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory, volume 3: The Dramatis Personae: The Person of Christ*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992).

⁵ See, for example, Robert M. Doran, "Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations," *Theological Studies* 58, no. 1 (1997): 569–607.

⁶ See, for example, Stanley Hauerwas, *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology: Being the Gifford Lectures Delivered at the University of St. Andrews in 2001* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2001).

FINAL STATEMENT

The objective of this dissertation has been identified with reference to a set of four questions:

- Did Bernard Lonergan understand love to be a sublating operator, operation, or set of operations that fulfills or is fulfilled by other operators, operations, or sets of operations?
- Did Bernard Lonergan understand that sublating operator, operation, or set of operations to be conscious?
- Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to sublation?
- Was Lonergan correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness?

I have answered these questions by affirming the following:

- While not affirming that love was a sublating operator, operations, or set of operations, Lonergan's final conception of love indicated that, for him, love was an operative state that fulfills other conscious operators, operations, and sets of operations.
- While not affirming that love was conscious in the way that experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding are conscious, Lonergan's final conception of love indicated that it was a unique form of self-presence not reducible to the self-presence obtaining in experiencing, understanding, judging, or deciding.

- Lonergan was correct in his understanding of love with respect to sublation: it can accurately be conceived of as an operative state that sublates other conscious operators, operations, and sets of operations.
- Lonergan was also correct in his understanding of love with respect to consciousness: love makes self-present, as a community conscious of itself, a plurality of mutually self-transcending subjects.

In sum, Bernard Lonergan held that love was a fifth level insofar as it was an operative state in which could be found a self-presence not reducible to the self-presence characterizing other levels of consciousness. He was right to regard the state as operative, and he was right to regard it as conscious. I therefore affirm that love is to be identified as a fifth level of consciousness, and I suggest that fruitful scholarship within a Lonerganian horizon ought to do the same.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Materials by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.

(Published, by title)

“The Absence of God in Modern Culture.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 103–116. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.

“The Analogy of Meaning.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 183–213. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.

“Analysis of Faith.” In *Early Latin Theology*, translated by Michael Shields, edited by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, 413–481. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 19. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011.

“Analysis of Meaning and Introduction to Religion.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 534–552. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Thursday, 11 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 491 [49100A0E060] and 492 [49200A0E060]).

“Aquinas Today: Tradition and Innovation.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 35–54. New York: Paulist, 1985.

“Beliefs and Carriers of Meaning.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 513–553. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Wednesday, 10 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 489 [48900A0E060] and 490 [49000A0E060]).

“Belief: Today’s Issue.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 87–102. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.

Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard Lonergan. Edited by Pierrot Lambert, Charlotte Tansey, and Cathleen M. Going. Montreal: Thomas More Institute, 1982.

- “Christ as Subject: A Reply.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 153–184. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Christology Today: Methodological Reflections.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 74–99. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Consciousness and the Trinity.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 122–141. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- “The Dialectic of Authority.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 5–12. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Dimensions of Meaning.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 232–246. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Discussion 2.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 580–593. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Question session as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 485 [48500A0E060]).
- “Doctrinal Pluralism.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 70–104. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Example of Gibson Winter.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 189–192. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “Exegesis and Dogma.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 142–159. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- “*Existenz* and *Aggiornamento*.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 222–231. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Faith and Beliefs.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 30–48. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “Finality, Love, Marriage.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 17–52. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.

- “The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics.’” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 179–198. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Future of Christianity.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 149–164. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “The Future of Thomism.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 43–54. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “The General Character of the Natural Theology of *Insight*.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 3–9. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 1. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000.
- “Healing and Creating in History.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 100–112. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Healing and Creating in History.” In *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, edited by Frederick G. Lawrence, Patrick H. Byrne, and Charles C. Hefling, Jr., 97–106. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 15. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999.
- “Horizons.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 10–29. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “Horizons and Categories.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 473–493. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Monday, 8 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 486 [48600A0E060]).
- “Horizons and Transpositions.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 409–431. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Human Good.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 332–351. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

- “The Human Good and Values.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 494–512. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Tuesday, 9 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 487 [48700A0E060] and 488 [48800A0E060]).
- “Interview for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program, ‘Concern.’” Recorded May 7, 1973, Regis College, Toronto. Aired October 24, 1973, Toronto. 3 Windows Media Audio files, PCD 753.wav (41:20), PCD 754.wav (39:53), and PCD 755.wav (16:23).
- “An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 209–232. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “*Insight Revisited.*” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 263–278. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 3. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992.
- “Is It Real?” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 119–139. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 160–182. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- “Merging Horizons: System, Common Sense, Scholarship.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 49–69. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “Metaphysics as Horizon.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 188–204. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Method in Catholic Theology.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 29–53. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- Method in Theology*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd: 1972. Reprinted. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999.

- “Method: Trend and Variations.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 13–22. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Mission and the Spirit.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 23–34. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Moral Theology and the Human Sciences.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 301–312. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Mystical Body of Christ.” In *Shorter Papers*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Robert M. Doran, and H. Daniel Monsour, 106–111. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 20*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007.
- “The Natural Desire to See God.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 81–91. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Natural Knowledge of God.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 117–134. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 169–183. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “A New Pastoral Theology.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 221–239. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Ongoing Genesis of Methods.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 146–168. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, translated by Michael G. Shields, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 7*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2002.
- “Openness and Religious Experience.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 185–187. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “The Origins of Christian Realism.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 239–262. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “The Origins of Christian Realism [1961].” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran,

80–93. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.

“PANTON ANAKEPHALAIOSIS.” *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 9 (1991): 139–172.

Phenomenology and Logic: The Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism, edited by Philip J. McShane. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 18. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2001.

“Philosophical Positions with Regard to Knowing.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 214–243. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.

“Philosophy and Theology.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 193–208. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.

“Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 391–408. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

“Philosophy of God.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 162–178. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

“Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty ‘Systematics.’” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 199–218. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

“Philosophy of God, and Theology.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 159–218. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

“The Philosophy of History.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 54–79. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.

“Pope John’s Intention.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 224–238. New York: Paulist, 1985.

“A Post-Hegelian Philosophy of Religion.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 202–223. New York: Paulist, 1985.

- “Prolegomena to the Study of the Emerging Religious Consciousness of Our Time.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 55–73. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Questionnaire on Philosophy.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 352–383. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “Reality, Myth, Symbol.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 384–390. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Redemption.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 3–28. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- “Religious Experience.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 113–128. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Religious Expression, Faith, Conversion.” In *Early Works on Theological Method I*, edited by Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken, 553–568. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 22*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010. Lecture delivered as part of a seminar on “Transcendental Philosophy and the Study of Religion” (Friday, 12 July 1968, Lauzon CD/MP3 493 [49300A0E060]).
- “Religious Knowledge.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 129–145. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “The Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle in the Modern World.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 165–188. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “Revolution in Catholic Theology.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 233–262. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World.” In *Collection*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 108–113. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 4*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988.
- “Sacralization and Secularization.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 259–281. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Scope of Renewal.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 282–299. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

- “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 313–331. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The Subject.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 69–86. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “The Supernatural Order.” In *Early Latin Theology*, translated by Michael Shields, edited by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, 53–255. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 19. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011.
- “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace.” In *Early Latin Theology*, translated by Michael Shields, edited by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, 563–665. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 19. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011.
- “Theology and Man’s Future.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 135–148. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “Theology and Praxis.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 184–201. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Theology as Christian Phenomenon.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 244–272. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- “Theology in its New Context.” In *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell, 55–68. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1974.
- “Time and Meaning.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, edited by Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, 94–121. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996.
- Topics in Education*. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 10, edited by Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1993.
- The Triune God: Doctrines*, translated by Michael G. Shields, edited by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 11. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009.
- The Triune God: Systematics*, translated by Michael G. Shields, edited by Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 12. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009.

- Understanding and Being: The Halifax Lectures on Insight*, edited by Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 5. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990.
- “Unity and Plurality: The Coherence of Christian Truth.” In *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, 239–250. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- “Variations in Fundamental Theology.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 240–258. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 2. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1997. Originally published as “The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas.” *Theological Studies* 7 (1946): 349–92; 8 (1947): 35–79, 404–44; 10 (1949): 3–40, 359–93.
- “What Are Judgments of Value?” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 140–156. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- “The World Mediated by Meaning.” In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, edited by Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, 107–118. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

(Unpublished archives, by bernardlonergan.com serial number)

- 16000DTE040 “Notes on the Grace of Justification and the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit,” translated by Michael G. Shields, edited by H. Daniel Monsour. Notes prepared for a course at the Jesuit Seminary, Toronto.
- 19110DTE070 Thursday, December 6, 1979, typed questions (19100DTE070) and notes (19110DTE070).
- 29620DTE070 Thursday, October 4, 1979, typed questions and notes (29620DTE070).
- 29660DTE070 Thursday, November 8, 1979, typed questions and notes (29660DTE070).
- 47200D0E060 February 5, 1965. Lonergan’s notation of his breakthrough to Functional Specialties.
- 51800DTE060 Tuesday, July 8, 1969, Lauzon CD/MP3 525-527 A2 (536R0A0E060 and 51800A0E060), transcript (51800DTE060).
- 52200DTE060 Thursday, July 10, 1969, Lauzon CD/MP3 525-527 B2 (541R0A0E060), transcript (52200DTE060).
- 52400DTE060 Friday, July 11, 1969, Lauzon CD/MP3 525-527 B2 (542R0A0E060), transcript (52400DTE060).
- 593BCDTE070/
594BCDTE070 Monday, June 15, 1970, Lauzon CD/MP3 593 (59300A0E070) & 594 (59400A0E070), transcript (593BCDTE070 & 594BCDTE070).
- 597BCDTE070/
598BCDTE070 Wednesday, June 17, 1970, Lauzon CD/MP3 597 (59700A0E070) & 598 (59800A0E070), transcript (597BCDTE070 & 598BCDTE070).
- 640Q0DTE070 Monday, August 2, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 643Q0DTE070 Monday, August 5, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 644Q0DTE070 Monday, August 6, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 645Q0DTE070 Monday, August 9, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 646Q0DTE070 Monday, August 10, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 648Q0DTE070 Monday, August 12, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.
- 649Q0DTE070 Monday, August 13, 1971, transcription edited by Robert M. Doran from an original by Nicholas Graham.

- 809A0DTE070 Monday, June 17, 1974, Lauzon CD/MP3 809 A & B (809A0A0E070), transcript (809A0DTE070), typed questions (13690DTE070) and notes (13700D0E070).
- 810A0DTE070 Tuesday, June 18, 1974, Lauzon CD/MP3 810 A & B (810A0A0E070), transcript (810A0DTE070), typed questions (13710DTE070) and notes (13720D0E070).
- 812A0DTE070 Wednesday, June 19, 1974, Lauzon CD/MP3 812 A & B (812A0A0E070), transcript (812A0DTE070), typed questions (13730DTE070) and notes (13740D0E070).
- 815A0DTE070 Friday, June 21, 1974, Lauzon CD/MP3 815 A & B (815A0A0E070), transcript (815A0DTE070), typed questions (13770DTE070) and notes (13780D0E070).
- 85000DTE070 Tuesday, June 17, 1975, Lauzon CD/MP3 850 (85000A0E070), transcript (85000DTE070), typed questions (1366DDTE070) and notes (1366ED0E070).
- 85200DTE070 Thursday, June 19, 1975, Lauzon CD/MP3 852 (85200A0E070), transcript (85200DTE070), typed questions (1366FDTE070) and notes (1366GD0E070).
- 85300DTE070 Thursday, June 19, 1975, Lauzon CD/MP3 853 (85300A0E070), transcript (85300DTE070).
- 85400DTE070 Friday, June 20, 1975, Lauzon CD/MP3 854 (85400A0E070), transcript (85400DTE070), typed questions (1366HDTE070) and notes (1366ID0E070).
- 88600DTE070 Tuesday, June 15, 1976, Lauzon CD/MP3 886 (88600A0E070), transcript (88600DTE070), typed questions and notes (27890DTE070).
- 89000DTE070 Friday, June 18, 1976, Lauzon CD/MP3 889 (89000A0E070), transcript (89000DTE070), typed questions and notes (27920DTE070).
- 91600DTE070 Monday, June 20, 1977, Lauzon CD/MP3 916 A & B (91600A0E070), transcript (91600DTE070), typed questions and notes (28880DTE070).
- 94000DTE070 Tuesday, June 13, 1978, Lauzon CD/MP3 940 A (94000A0E070) and 940 B (94100A0E070), transcript (94000DTE070), typed questions and notes (32340DTE070).
- 94400DTE070 Wednesday, June 14, 1978, Lauzon CD/MP3 942 A & B (94400A0E070), transcript (94400DTE070), typed questions and notes (32350DTE070).

- 94500DTE070 Thursday, June 15, 1978, Lauzon CD/MP3 943 A & B (94500A0E070), transcript (94500DTE070), typed questions and notes (32360DTE070).
- 97700DTE080 Wednesday, June 18, 1980, Lauzon CD/MP3 977 A & B (97700A0E080), transcript (97700DTE080).
- 98700DTE080 Tuesday, June 16, 1981, Lauzon CD/MP3 987 (98700A0E080), transcript (98700DTE080), typed questions (36080DTE080) and notes (36090DTE080).
- 9993ADTE080 Wednesday, June 16, 1982, Lauzon CD/MP3 999-3A (9993AA0E080), transcript (9993ADTE080), typed questions and notes (30420DTE080).
- 9993BDTE080 Thursday, June 17, 1982, Lauzon CD/MP3 999-3B (9993BA0E080), transcript (9993BDTE080), typed questions and notes (30430DTE080).

Secondary Materials

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory, volume 3: The Dramatis Personae: The Person of Christ*, translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992.
- Bathersby, John. "The Foundations of Christian Spirituality in Bernard Lonergan." Th.D. dissertation, Gregorian University, 1982.
- Blackwood, Jeremy W. "Elements of a Methodical Understanding of Eastern Christian Mysticism." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 76, no. 4 (2011): 339–356.
- . "Lonergan and Rahner on the Natural Desire to See God." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, n.s. 1, no. 2 (2010): 85–103.
- . "Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, n.s. 2, no. 2 (2011): 143–161. Originally given as "Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness: Further Developments within Lonergan Scholarship." Paper presented at *The 24th Annual Fallon Memorial Lonergan Symposium*, West Coast Methods Institute, Loyola Marymount University, April 2009.
- Buytendijk, Frederik J.J. *Phenomenologie de la rencontre*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952.
- Byrne, Patrick H. "Consciousness: Levels, Sublations, and the Subject as Subject." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 13 (1995): 131–150.
- Crowe, Frederick E. "Complacency and Concern in the Thought of St. Thomas." *Theological Studies* 20 (1959): 1–39; 198–230; 343–395.
- . "An Expansion of Lonergan's Notion of Value." In *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, edited by Michael Vertin, 344–359. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989.
- . "An Exploration of Lonergan's New Notion of Value." In *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, edited by Michael Vertin, 51–70. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989.
- . "Son of God, Holy Spirit, and World Religions." In *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, edited by Michael Vertin, 324–343. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1989.
- Curnow, Rohan. "Robert Doran's Theology of History and the Liberation of the Poor." In *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, SJ*, edited by John D. Dadosky, 51–70. Marquette Studies in Theology 68, edited by Andrew Tallon. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2009.

- Dadosky, John. "Is There a Fourth Stage of Meaning?" *Heythrop Journal* 48 (2009): 1–13.
- Doran, Robert M. "'Complacency and Concern' and a Basic Thesis on Grace." *Loneragan Workshop* 13 (1997): 57–78. <http://www.loneraganresource.com/book.php?1>.
- . "Consciousness and Grace." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11 (1993): 51–75.
- . "Ignatian Themes in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 22 (2006), 39–54.
- . "Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations." *Theological Studies* 58, no. 1 (1997): 569–607.
- . "The Ninth Functional Specialty." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, n.s. 2, no. 1 (2011): 13–16.
- . "Revisiting 'Consciousness and Grace.'" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 13 (1995): 151–159.
- . "Sanctifying Grace, Charity, and Divine Indwelling: A Key to the *Nexus Mysteriorum Fidei*." *Loneragan Workshop* 23, edited by Fred Lawrence. Forthcoming 2012. <http://www.loneraganresource.com/book.php?1>.
- . *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990.
- . *The Trinity in History, vol. I: Missions and Processions*. Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming 2012. Draft version made available for a course at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, spring 2010.
- . *What Is Systematic Theology?* Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005.
- Dunne, Tad. "Being in Love." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 13 (1995): 161–175.
- . *Loneragan and Spirituality*. Chicago: Loyola University, 1985.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology: Being the Gifford Lectures Delivered at the University of St. Andrews in 2001*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001.
- Jacobs-Vandegeer, Christiaan. "The Hermeneutics of Interiority: Transposition in the Third Stage of Meaning." In *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, SJ*, edited by John D. Dadosky, 191–216. Marquette Studies in Theology 68, edited by Andrew Tallon. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2009.
- . "Sanctifying Grace in a 'Methodical Theology.'" *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 52–76.

- Johnston, William. *Christian Zen*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- . *The Mysticism of the Cloud of Unknowing: A Modern Interpretation*. Foreword by Thomas Merton. New York: Desclée, 1967.
- . *Silent Music: The Science of Meditation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- . *The Still Point: Reflections on Zen and Christian Mysticism*. New York: Fordham University, 1970.
- Lawrence, Fred, ed. *Communicating a Dangerous Memory: Soundings in Political Theology*. Supplementary Issue of Lonergan Workshop 6, edited by Fred Lawrence. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- Morelli [Murray], Elizabeth A. "Reflections on the Appropriation of Moral Consciousness." *Lonergan Workshop* 13 (1995): 161–189.
- Morelli, Mark D. "Consciousness Is Not Another Operation." *Lonergan Workshop* 23, edited by Fred Lawrence. Forthcoming 2012.
- Panikkar, Raimundo. "Have 'Religions' the Monopoly on Religion?" *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* XI (1974): 515–517.
- . "Metatheology or Diacritical Theology as Fundamental Theology?" *Concilium* CLVI (1969): 43–55.
- Price, James Robertson, III. "Lonergan and the Foundation of a Contemporary Mystical Theology." *Lonergan Workshop* 5 (1985): 163–195.
- Rahner, Karl. *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, translated by William J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964. Originally published as *Das Dynamische in der Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1958).
- Shute, Michael. *Lonergan's Discovery of the Science of Economics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- Skrenes, Billie Carol. "Love and the Ways of Knowing." Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont School of Theology, 1979.
- Streeter, Carla Mae. "Religious Love in Bernard Lonergan as Hermeneutical and Transcultural." Th.D. dissertation, Toronto School of Theology, 1986.
- Vertin, Michael. "Lonergan on Consciousness: Is There a Fifth Level?" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 12 (1994): 1–36.
- Whitson, Robley Edward. *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*. New York: Newman, 1971.