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Below, are 61 key terms that appear in Lonergan’s works, followed by the main primary sources. Full bibliographic data of works cited appear at the end


Absence of relevant questions, virtually unconditioned. This criterion for judgment may be found in “The Transformation of the Notion of Science: From the Certain to the Probable: Science, Judgment, and Wisdom,” ch. 6, sec 2.1 in Topics in Education, pp 146-53. See also “A Clarification,” ch. 7, sec. 7, and “Critical History” of ch. 8, sec. 3 in Method in Theology (165-67, 185-96). The absence of relevant questions is the experiential equivalent to Lonergan’s more formal designation of this criterion as a “virtually unconditioned.” See “The General Form of Reflective Insight,” Insight, 305-06 (280-81), et passim.

Affective movement. See “Healing and Creating in History” in A Third Collection, 100-09, and “The Dialectic of History,” sec. 3 of “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” also in A Third Collection, 176-82.

Alienation and ideology. Lonergan uses “alienation” to refer to unauthenticity, or the refusal of self-transcendence. He uses “ideology” to refer to the intellectual justifications of this alienation. See “Progress and Decline,” ch. 2, sec. 7 (and the index) in Method in Theology, 52-55. In a later work (1977-78), Lonergan identifies a socio-cultural “alienation” that occurs between persons at earlier and later expansions of horizons: from commonsense, to theoretical, to method. The alienation affects both our social systems and the cultural systems that justify and critique specific social systems. In proposals for social systems, the earlier find the later incomprehensible while the later find the earlier simplistic. Among cultural initiatives, the earlier feel little appreciation for the creations of the later, while the later regard the creations of the earlier as crude. See “Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon,” in Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980, 391-08, particularly 404-08.

Authenticity. This theme may be found throughout Lonergan’s post-Insight works. A summary treatment may be found in “Self-Transcendence,” ch. 4, sec. 2 in Method in Theology, 104-05.

Belief. For material on belief as comprising most of our knowledge see “Beliefs,” ch. 2, sec. 5 in Method in Theology, 41-47. See also “Belief: Today’s Issue” in A Second Collection, 87-99.
Bias and scotoma. The analogy between an intellectual bias and a physical blind spot is developed at length in “Dramatic Bias,” ch. 6, sec. 2.7 in *Insight*, 215-27. While Lonergan restricts the metaphor of a *scotoma* to the dramatic bias, where *repression* of images occurs without our realizing it, I expand the metaphor to include the deliberate *suppression* of questions that occurs in egotism, loyalism, and commonsensism.

Biases. Material on four biases appear throughout Lonergan’s works. A comprehensive presentation can be found in “Dramatic Bias,” ch. 6, sec. 2.7, in “Individual Bias,” “Group Bias,” and in “General Bias,” ch. 7, secs. 6-8 in *Insight*, 214-26, 244-56. In later works, he refers to them variously as (1) “the neurotic,” (2) “the individual egotist,” (3) “group egoism,” and (4) “the overconfident shortsightedness of common sense.” See “Healing and Creating in History,” and “Mission and the Spirit,” in *A Third Collection*, 100-09, 23-34. Lonergan identifies these as an illustration of how fruitful insight into insight can be, presumably leaving open the field to identifying further blind spots.


Choices. Materials on three kinds of choices as corresponding to the three analogous meanings of “good” are found throughout Lonergan’s works. See “The Structure of the Human Good,” ch. 2, sec. 6 in *Method in Theology* 47-52.

Conscience. For the methodological context of a definition of conscience, see “Foundational Reality,” ch. 11, sec. 1 in *Method in Theology*, 267-69.


Consistency among the norms of consciousness. See *Insight*, 623 (600).

Criteria for value judgments. See “The Notion of Value” and “Judgments of Value,” of ch. 2, secs. 3-4 in *Method in Theology*, 34-41 and “What Are Judgments of Value” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980*, 140-56. Formally, the criterion for a judgment of value is the same as for a judgment of fact or of reasonableness: the fulfillment of conditions on a proposition, or more succinctly, a virtually unconditioned. With both kinds of judgments we experience an absence of relevant questions. Still, on the level of judgments of value, the question of my own self-transcendence is far more prominently relevant because of the enlarged engagement of my entire self, an engagement that always occurs in the context of my affective horizon.

Dialectic. Materials on dialectic appear throughout Lonergan’s works. Definitions may be found in *Insight*, 242-44, 268-69, 446-48 (217-18, 243-44, 421-23). For material on dialectic as one of four heuristic anticipations of...
scientific method (with classical, statistical, and genetic) see *Insight*, 507-11, 766-68 (483-87, 745-47). Applications of the notion may be found in “Dialectic,” sec. 4 of “The Ongoing Genesis of Methods,” and in “The Dialectic of History,” sec. 3 of “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” in *A Third Collection* (176-82).

**Dialectical Analysis.** Lonergan warns about the difficulty of an inquiry into the dialectics of authority in concrete situations, calling the effort “complex, lengthy, tedious, and often inconclusive.” In its place he proposes a “synthetic” or integrated view that simultaneously incorporates elements for progress, elements for decline, and elements for redemption. See “Dialectic of Authority,” in *A Third Collection* (at pp. 8-10).

**Differentiations of consciousness.** See “Pluralism in Expression,” and “Pluralism in Religious Language,” secs. 3 and 4 of ch. 11 in *Method in Theology*, 271-81.

**Double process of historical investigation.** See “Critical History,” ch. 8, sec. 3 in *Method in Theology*, 185-96.

**Duality of knowing.** See “Introduction” in *Insight*, 11 and 14-15 (xvii, xx-xxi), as well as “Bodies” 276-79 (250-54). The discovery of this duality in oneself is a *sine qua non* for understanding Lonergan’s work on method. He refers to the “discovery—and one has not made it yet if one has no clear memory of its startling strangeness—that there are two quite different realisms.” See “Introduction” in *Insight*, 22 (xxviii).

**Emergent probability.** Lonergan sets the notion of a vertical finality within a framework of world design he names “emergent probability.” See *Insight*, 144-51 (121-28). The very idea that the universe has an unfolding, upwardly-directed design is what prompted me to select “exigence” as a category for tracing the emergence of specifically moral patterns within the universal order.

**Ethics of Law, Ethics of Achievement.** See *Topics in Education*, 103, 106.

**Evil.** Lonergan treats this under three headings: basic sin, moral evils, and physical evils. See “The Notion of God,” ch. 19, sec. 9 in *Insight*, 689-92. Basic sin corresponds to what I refer to as “acting against our better judgment,” “willfulness,” or “sin,” depending on the context. Moral evils correspond to the distortions of situations that result from this basic sin. Physical evils correspond to the shortcomings inherent in a world that is evolving, in the sense that even such “evils” demand responsible action to overcome them through promoting development, as far as possible. See also Lonergan’s discussion of typical escapes from moral responsibility (avoiding self-consciousness, rationalization, and moral renunciation) in “The Notion of Will,” ch. 18, sec. 1.3 in *Insight*, 622-24.
**Evolution.** Lonergan discusses the properties of an evolving world order under the term “emergent probability.” See *Insight*, 144-61 (121-39).

**Existential ethics.** For Lonergan's overall description of how the conversions unfold into the multiple elements of an explicit existential ethics, see “Foundational Reality,” ch. 11, sec. 1 in *Method in Theology*, 267-69. See also “Philosophic Significance of the Theme [on ‘being oneself’],” ch. 10, sec. 7 in *Phenomenology and Logic*, 242-46. See also “Questionnaire on Philosophy, Response” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980*, 357-59. There he lists “existential ethics” as a fourth step following upon cognitional theory, epistemology, and metaphysics. This step is founded on the discovery that we are responsible for the life we lead. It becomes established when we live in love. It becomes transformed when God's own love floods our hearts, a love without limits. It becomes thematized as a concern of a theology which can encompass the whole of human living only by “broadening its horizon by uniting itself with philosophy as the basic and total science”, 359.

**Feelings, value judgments.** Material on feelings and other elements that enter into judgments of value can be found in “Feelings” and “Judgments of Value,” of ch. 2, secs. 2 and 4 in *Method in Theology*, 30-34, 36-41.

**Fourfold battery of methods.** This analysis of four basic kinds of trouble is based on Lonergan’s analysis of four basic methods of science—classical, statistical, genetic, and dialectical. As each method relies on a unique sort of insight, and insights are always into images, we can anticipate four basic images. See *Insight* pp. 630, 57-58, 76-81, 476-504, 242-44, 718-25 (607, 33-46, 53-69, 451-79, 217-18, and 696-703)—particularly in this order.

**Freely-formed images.** See *Understanding and Being*, vol. 5 of the Collected Works, pages 313-15. For empirical evidence that for experimental knowledge, apes are incapable of freely forming images while humans are, Lonergan cites Wolfgang Kohler’s classic work, *The Mentality of Apes* (Penguin, 1925, 1957), originally appearing in German in 1917.

**Functional specialties.** An overview is presented in *Method in Theology*, ch. 5, 125-45. While Lonergan’s focus is on theology, some brief material on how the scope of his discussion covers all human studies can be found in “Society, State, Church” and “The Christian Church and its Contemporary Situation,” ch. 14, secs. 3 and 4 in *Method in Theology*, 358-67.


**Good as concrete history.** This view (as opposed to “good” as an abstract quality) is found throughout Lonergan’s works. See the section, “The
Existential Subject” of “The Subject” in A Second Collection, 79-84. See also “The General Notion of the Human Good,” Ch. 2, section 9 of Topics in Education, 32-33.

**Healing and creating.** See “Healing and Creating in History” in A Third Collection, 100-09. See also “The Dialectic of History,” sec. 3 of “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” also in A Third Collection, 176-82. I have used the term “doing better” as the outcome of these two movements in the perspective of ethics.

**Hermeneutics of suspicion and recovery.** See “Dialectic,” sec. 4 of “The Ongoing Genesis of Methods” in A Third Collection, 155-59. Lonergan relies on Paul Ricoeur for these terms.

**Hierarchy/scale of values.** See Insight, 624-25 (601-02). See also the material on scales of preference in “The Structure of the Human Good,” ch. 2, sec. 6 and “Verstehen,” ch. 9, sec. 4 in Method in Theology, 47-52, 208-14. Material on the development of values and a corresponding reorientation of feelings along this scale from self-regarding to self-transcending may be found in “Natural Right in Historicity,” sec. 2 of “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness” in A Third Collection, 171-75.

**Historical mindedness and human nature.** See “The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness” in A Second Collection, 1-9. Also, “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” ch. 11 in A Third Collection, 169-83.

**Horizon and conversion.** See “Horizons” and “Conversions and Breakdowns,” ch. 10, secs. 1-2 in Method in Theology, 235-44.

**Human Studies.** Lonergan generally reserves “human studies” to scholarly studies (hermeneutics, history, etc.), relegating “human sciences” (psychology, anthropology, sociology, etc.) to an instrumental role in the study of humanity. See Method in Theology, 212, 233-34; Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965-1980, 370-72; A Third Collection, 63-65, 429.

**Integral heuristic structure.** This corresponds to Lonergan’s definition of metaphysics as “the conception, affirmation, and implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being” See Insight 416 (391).

**Intellectual conversion.** See “Pluralism and Conversion,” sec. 3 of “Unity and Plurality” in A Third Collection, 247-49 and “Conversions and Breakdowns” in Method in Theology, 237-40.

**Known known.** Lonergan discusses three parcels in the context of a person’s horizon: the known known, the known unknown, and the unknown unknown. See “Horizon,” ch. 4, sec. 2.2 in Topics in Education, 88-91.

**Macroeconomics.** For Lonergan’s early but clear introduction to the basic issues and the model he proposes, see For A New Political Economy, pp. 3-
75. For an overview of the macroeconomic issues in general and Lonergan’s proposed solutions, see, in *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, the “Editors’ Introduction” by Frederick G. Lawrence, pp. xxv-lxxii. Lonergan’s later and more complete analysis appears in Part One. Part Two, “Healing and Creating in History” gives the wider moral and religious context. Part Three gives earlier texts that provide more detail and more mathematical analyses.


**Mere preference.** Lonergan defines moral conversion as a change in the criterion of one’s decisions and choices from satisfactions to values. See “Conversions and Breakdowns” ch. 10, sec. 2 of *Method in Theology*, 240).

**Method.** See “Method,” ch. 1 in *Method in Theology*, 3-25. It is essential to note that the “method” is not a recipe proposed by Lonergan. Rather it constitutes the innate methods of mind and heart that Lonergan asks his readers to verify, adding, “…we cannot succeed without an exceptional amount of exertion and activity on the part of the reader”, 7.

**Mutual exposure of horizons.** In Lonergan’s discussion of the theological specialty, dialectic, the strategy, Lonergan proposes, is neither to prove one’s position nor refute the other’s but rather “…to exhibit diversity and to point to the evidence for its roots. In this manner he will be attractive to those that appreciate full human authenticity and he will convince those that attain it. Indeed, the basic idea of the method we are trying to develop takes its stand on discovering what human authenticity is and showing how to appeal to it. It is not an infallible method, for men easily are unauthentic, but it is a powerful method, for man’s deepest need and most prized achievement is authenticity.” See “The Dialectic of Methods: Part One,” ch. 10, sec. 7 in *Method in Theology*, 253-57.

**Natural Right.** See “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” ch. 11 in *A Third Collection*, 169-83.

**Norms of consciousness.** The notion that consciousness has norms appears throughout Lonergan’s works. For example, see “Generalized Empirical Method,” sec. 5 of “Religious Knowledge” in *A Third Collection*, 140-45.

**Notion of Value.** See “The Notion of Value,” sec. 3, ch. 2 in *Method in Theology*, 34-36. The commonsense meaning of notion is easily identified with “idea” or “concept,” while Lonergan’s technical meaning is the prior drive toward knowledge or values. He acknowledges that his own use is not uniformly technical. See “The Notion of Value,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965-1980*, p. 337.

**Openness.** Material on openness in a religious context may be found in “Openness and Religious Experience” in *Collection*, 198-201. Material on intellectual and moral contexts may be found under the terms horizon and conversion.

**Positions and counterpositions.** Lonergan uses these terms to discuss how amplifications and assessments result in developing statements compatible with conversion (which he calls “positions”) and reversing statements that are not compatible (“counterpositions”). The outcome is either a development or a reversal of horizons, be they intellectual, moral, or affective/religious. In other words, the specialty dialectic aims to achieve a mutual enlargement of one’s whole person. See “Dialectic: The Structure,” ch. 10 sec. 5, “The Sufficiency of the Foundational Reality,” ch. 11 sec. 2, and “Mystery and Problem,” ch. 13 sec. 4, in *Method in Theology*, 249-50, 269-71, 344-47.

**Praxis.** Lonergan describes the effort to reveal the level of personal development in investigators as a praxis. Where practice refers to what is done or produced, praxis refers to the doing and producing. Praxis employs a hermeneutic of suspicion regarding the horizons of investigators and a hermeneutic of recovery that acknowledges where genuine personal development occurred. His definition of praxis is aimed to give it explanatory status, as opposed to post-Marxist liberation philosophies which, he holds, do not sufficiently attend to the horizons of individuals. See “Theology and Praxis,” and “Praxis,” sec. 5 of “The Ongoing Genesis of Method,” both in *A Third Collection*, 184-201, 159-61.

**Progress, decline, redemption.** In many places, Lonergan treats historical analyses under the headings of “progress, decline, and redemption.” See “Progress and Decline” and “Faith,” ch. 2, sec. 7, and ch. 3, sec. 7 in *Method in Theology*, 52-55, 115-18. For a summary treatment, see “The People of God in the World of Today,” sec. 4 of “The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness” in *A Second Collection*, 1-9, at 7-8.

**Question of God.** Material on experiencing the question of God may be found in “The Question of God,” ch. 4, sec. 1 in *Method in Theology*, 101-03 and in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965-1980*, 205-08.
Realms of meaning. See “Realms of Meaning” and “Pluralism in Expression,” ch. 3, sec. 9 and ch. 11, sec. 3 in Method in Theology, 81-85, 271-76.

Religious/affective conversion. Lonergan generally uses religious conversion to discuss theological issues and affective conversion to discuss philosophical issues. While religious conversion has the divine as an explicit reality, an affective conversion opens onto the divine by recognizing at least the question of God and includes the love of human friendships and loyalties. For religious conversion, see “Conversions and Breakdowns,” ch. 10, sec. 2 in Method in Theology, 237-44. For affective conversion, see “The Dialectic of History,” sec. 3 of “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness” in A Third Collection, 176-82. For the present discussion of ethics and morality I use the term affective conversion to engage ethicists of any or no explicit religious commitments.


Self-transcendence. See “Self-Transcendence,” sec. 1 of “Religious Knowledge” in A Third Collection, 131-34.

Structure of the human good. See “The Structure of the Human Good,” ch. 2, sec. 6 in Method in Theology, 47-52.

Subject. See “The Subject,” A Second Collection, 69-86. This article explains the normative drives in the subject that ground the objectivity of truth and of value.

Sublation. To denote how higher systems integrate otherwise random elements in lower systems, Lonergan uses the term sublation. This relationship between higher and lower systems appears across the sciences, covering all orders of events, from the subatomic to the humanly affective. For a basic treatment see the subhead “The Existential Subject,” in “The Subject,” in A Second Collection, 79-84.

Symbol. See “Symbols,” ch. 3, sec. 4 in Method in Theology, 64-69.
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