2011

Ignatius, Lonergan, and the Catholic University

Richard M Liddy, *Seton Hall University*

Ignatius, Lonergan and the Catholic University

Msgr. Richard M. Liddy
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ

A version of this appeared as "Ignatius, Lonergan and the Catholic University," Lonergan Workshop: Lonergan & Loyola: "I Will Be Propitious to You in Rome," Vol. 22, ed. Fred Lawrence, Boston: Boston College, 2011, 153-192.

IGNATIUS, LONERGAN AND THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

Msgr. Richard M. Liddy

> *Never has adequately differentiated consciousness been more difficult to achieve. Never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater.*[1]

In recent years, especially since the publication of ***Ex corde ecclesiae***, much has been written on the nature of the Catholic university. Some light can be shed on this topic, I believe, by recalling the Ignatian and early Jesuit move from immediate pastoral concerns to the ministry of education in the context of Renaissance humanism. But the humanism within which the early Jesuits established their schools is quite different from the historically conscious, pluralist and pragmatic culture within which Catholic universities labor today. It was to the credit of Bernard Lonergan to have highlighted these differences and to have created a refined philosophical tool for thinking about a Gospel-informed humanistic education today.

In the first part of this article, therefore, we will outline the Ignatian and early Jesuit move to the ministry of education in the context of Renaissance humanism. In the second part we will highlight Bernard Lonergan's contribution to the integration of contemporary pluralist culture. Finally, in the third part we will draw some concrete conclusions about the possibilities of the Catholic university participating in that transformative role today.

Ignatius, the First Jesuits and the Ministry of Education

Spiritual experience was at the heart of Ignatius of Loyola's own story and at the heart of the life of the first Jesuits. John O'Malley in his work **The First Jesuits** notes that the experience of the early Society was rooted in Ignatius' own story, especially as articulated in his **Autobiography**.

> …Ignatius's story was somehow the story of every Jesuit and, hence, revelatory of the deepest meaning of the Society as a whole. The story was basically one of the inner life of the soul. It moved in this sequence: a conversion to God from a previously unsatisfying or disordered life; visitations from God in the form of consolations, clarification of vision, dispositions to give oneself in God's service that resulted in an "election" to follow these dispositions; a period of probation and trial like that Ignatius experienced at Manresa; and a life thenceforth inspired by the desire "to help souls." Just as God had guided and aided Ignatius in this course, so God guided and aided every Jesuit.[2]

Ignatius wrote his **Spiritual Exercises** out of his own personal experience. In them he seeks to bring other persons to a <u>radical openness</u> to God's plan both for the world and for oneself. The

exercises of prayer, imagination, meditation and contemplation seek to bring a person to the point where they are genuinely open to cooperating with the coming of God's kingdom – even at the cost of themselves and their own riches, reputation and health. The **Exercises** are a handbook for hearing the Gospel message: "Repent! The Kingdom of God is at hand" and for responding to that message effectively. They set the conditions for hearing the Word of God and responding to that Word by conversion of life and by a Spirit-guided "election." Actual and imaginative exercises in hearing the Word allow one to discern the movement of God's "consolation" in the soul as opposed to the movements of "desolation" occasioned by "inordinate attachments" and the "enemy of our nature." The presence of a gifted spiritual director allows God to move in the soul while personally presenting the call of God's external Word, the call of Christ the King. .

From the **Exercises** flowed a Jesuit "way of proceeding" which the early Jesuit, Jerónimo Nadal described as "*spiritu, corde, practice*" - in the Spirit, from the heart, practically. "In the Spirit" meant that the Jesuits were to be guided by a direct and ongoing sense of God's presence. "From the heart" indicated how they were to deal with others in their ministries, that is, affectively - bringing their feelings to bear on their ministries. Finally, "practical" was synonymous with "pastoral:" that is, always they were to act to "help souls."

In all of this it is interesting to note that education was not the first priority for Ignatius and the first Jesuits. Their ministries developed organically as they worked in hospitals, taught catechism, preached, and dispensed the sacraments. Their interest was primarily and immediately "pastoral" – "whatever worked" to communicate the call of Christ to souls. Nevertheless, learning was always part of the Jesuit "style." Thus, Ignatius in his **Autobiography** relates that after his return from Palestine in 1524, he felt inclined to study for some time and it was while studying at the University of Paris that he met his first companions. Paris is also where Ignatius was first exposed to Thomas Aquinas' theology, at that time the major source of theology for the Parisian Dominicans with whom Ignatius studied. In Ignatius' view, intellectual development was not unconnected to growth in the Spirit.

Gradually, therefore, a few years after the founding of the Society, Jesuit discernment led to the founding of schools.

> With the hindsight of over four hundred years, we see more clearly than they did that the **Spiritual Exercises** and the schools were the two most important institutional factors that, when taken in their full implications, shaped the distinctive character of the Society of Jesus.[3]

With the establishment of schools came an intensification of learning through teaching. Teaching in turn inserted the Jesuits into the culture of the day, a culture largely influenced by the Renaissance humanists. From the time of Petrarch the humanists had attacked the "scholastic" education of the day as having little relationship to the real lives of people.[4] Reacting against a largely decadent and nominalist scholasticism of the day, the humanists felt that what counted was virtue – and there should be a relationship between good literature and virtue.

Such humanism resonated with the early Jesuits. The humanist *pietas* or upright character cohered with the Jesuit *Christianitas* and they took for granted that learning and literacy were good in and of

themselves.[5] This ideal came to be expressed in the Jesuit **Ratio Studiorum** of 1599 that inculcated a classical model of liberal education, beginning with a "school of languages" and culminating in the higher levels of philosophy and theology. The students studied the Greek and Latin classics so that they might be brought into contact with the noblest minds of antiquity. They focused on the intricacies of language as expressing the subtleties of thought and refinements of taste. Such a formation of mind with its sensibilities and powers of eloquent debate was seen as providing the preparation for the further study of philosophy and theology. The aim was the production of the cultivated person where "cultivated" meant a culturally specific model of human perfection. It was a monumental achievement in its day frequently bringing order into the chaos of what previously had passed for education. In its original structure, perhaps even more so than its content, the **Ratio Studiorum** provided an integral vision of the connections among the various aspects of the world and the theological contemplation of God and revelation. Only the introduction of a new historical consciousness in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries eventually sundered the seamless garment of this classical ideal in education.

Furthermore, from the manner of teaching that Ignatius and the first Jesuits experienced in Paris they took not only the idea of a classically ordered curriculum, but also the idea of pedagogy as an active appropriation of the material taught – an "exercitium."

> In an era when the typical schoolmaster was often a feared tyrant or an untrained novice, the Jesuit instructor described in the **Ratio** was committed to motivating students in positive ways, and appreciating their individual characteristics. He was to be informative, articulate, and flexible, encouraging classroom competition while emphasizing social courtesy. There was even a provision, unheard of in its day, for students to provide "feedback" to their teachers after their lectures![6]

Through it all, the theology that informed the Jesuit curriculum, especially at the beginning, was described as "mystical" as contrasted with the "purely speculative" theology of some of their Catholic contemporaries. According to Jerónimo Nadal, this meant not ecstasies and transports but "an inner relish of the truth translated into the way one lived."[7] It was also a theology more directly related to ministry than a purely speculative theology.
According to John O'Malley, the cultivation by the Jesuits of classical rhetoric, the discipline that taught how to touch the human heart, was not simply conforming to the received wisdom of the day but a pursuit that correlated with their deepest pastoral impulses.[8]

The Jesuits did not, however, take over the humanist program uncritically. There was much in the new literary interests that might encourage a new paganism and Erasmus had experienced this tension before them.

> Erasmus experienced great tension between his Christian commitment to humility, and the humanist value assigned to pride and praise, between the Christian desire for pure, simple belief and the humanist respect for sophisticated refinement. He thus recognized a central difficulty of Renaissance humanism in the clash between ethical and aesthetic standards, a tension that was particularly pronounced in the ideal of the courtier.[9]

And so the Jesuit program of liberal education involved a pruning of Renaissance excess and a redirection of humanist education in a Gospel direction. As Bernard Lonergan put it, "The renewal of Greek and Latin studies contained a threat of a revival of paganism, and the Jesuits became the schoolmasters of Europe."[10]

In addition, in spite of current humanist criticisms of scholastic philosophy and theology, Jesuit education postulated an ultimate compatibility between an education in "humane letters" and Aristotelian/Thomistic philosophy and theology. This can be seen in Ignatius' "Rules for Thinking with the Church" in the **Exericses.** "We should praise both positive theology and that of the scholastics." For the humanist current in education had always been liable to discounting the importance of "theory." As Bernard Lonergan put it, while Plato and Aristotle had clearly distinguished the realms of common sense living and theory,

> …humanism immediately stepped in and obliterated that difference. Isocrates said: "What differentiates man from the animals is speech." And the rhetoricians are the people who know how to speak. Subsequent philosophy in general – with rare exceptions – has been the work of people in the humanist tradition who did *not* want to have any distinction between the world of common sense and the world of theory. It is modern science – with Eddington's two tables – that has forced that distinction on us again.[11]

Ignatius' praise for both positive and scholastic theology, then, is not without significance. For the Jesuits did esteem Thomas' **Summa Theologiae,** especially the moral theology of the second part, where "moderation" was extolled. They also resonated with Thomas' doctrine on the basic goodness of creation celebrated by Ignatius in the **Exercises** in the "Contemplation on the Love of God." Finally, a theme later developed in Bernard Lonergan's doctoral dissertation, the Jesuits believed in the intrinsic compatibility of divine grace and human freedom: an "operative grace" bringing persons to desire what previously they had not wanted; and a "cooperative grace" helping persons actually to do the good they so desired.

The early Jesuit dedication to teaching and learning, then, was rooted in the experience of God fostered by the **Exercises**. That experience informed everything they did, including their founding of schools. This ministry of education was within their larger pastoral end of "helping souls." In order to effectively do that the first Jesuits, while not condemning scholasticism, took on the Renaissance humanist program of speaking to the heart of people through literature. They took the best cultural tools of the times and adapted them to their program of human and spiritual growth. Such education, of course, had social and cultural implications. It was education "for the reform of cities."[12] Thus, Pedro de Ribadeneira at the urging of Ignatius wrote to Philip II of Spain in 1556 explaining why the Society was so committed to its schools: "All the well-being of Christianity and of the whole world depends on the proper education of youth."[13]

2. Bernard Lonergan: Theology Informing Culture

In November of 1537 Ignatius, on his way to Rome with his companions, experienced an illumination in prayer at the little hamlet of La Storta. He was granted a vision of Jesus carrying the cross with God the Father at his side. "I wish you to serve us," said Jesus to Ignatius, and the

Father added "I will be good to you in Rome" - "Romae vobis propitius ero."[14] Almost four hundred years later, Bernard Lonergan was sent to study in Rome. He had been experiencing difficulty in his life as a Jesuit, and his superiors' show of confidence was a great "consolation."
.

> It was a magnificent vote of confidence which, combined with the great encouragement I had had from Fr. Smeaton after years of painful introversion and with the words over the high altar in the church of St. Ignatius here "Romae vobis propitius ero," was consolation indeed.[15]

And indeed, it would seem, that the Father was very propitious to Bernard Lonergan in Rome. It was in Rome that he followed up on the above "consolation" and dedicated himself to serious study and reflection. It was in Rome that in 1936 he was ordained to the Catholic priesthood in the same church of St. Ignatius. It was in Rome that he experienced what he called his "intellectual conversion."[16]. It was in Rome that he wrote his doctoral dissertation on St. Thomas' notion of divine grace and human freedom. It was back to Rome where he was sent in 1953 to teach for 12 years his courses on the Trinity and on the Incarnate Word. It was while in Rome in 1957 that his classic, **Insight: An Essay on Human Understanding,** was published. And it was in Rome in February of 1965 that he experienced his intellectual breakthrough to the notion of functional specialties in theology, a breakthrough eventually issuing in his 1972 **Method in Theology.**

Lonergan's own theology was rooted in his spiritual life. Perhaps a hint of that life can be gleaned from his description of the experience of the hidden workings of the Lord in the life of a religious. The religious begins with what he called the "the being of substance in Christ Jesus," that is, growth in the spiritual life without awareness of what is going on. This "being of substance in Christ Jesus" can, however, grow into "the being of subject in Christ Jesus," that is, one who is consciously aware of the gentleness and deftness of the Lord's operation within him or her.

> …inasmuch as being in Christ Jesus is the being of subject, the hand of the Lord ceases to be hidden. In ways you have all 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 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.[17]

In **Method in Theology** Lonergan writes about this experience as "being in love with God." It is the fulfillment of our human capacity for total self-transcendence and it corresponds to Ignatius' consolation that has no external cause. The appropriation and ratification of such experience constitutes "religious conversion" and is the principle for the discernment of moral and intellectual conversion as well.

> …from a causal viewpoint, one would say that first there is God's gift of his love. Next, the eye of this love reveals values in their splendor, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion. Finally, among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths

> taught by the religious tradition, and in such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion.[18]

But the world in which Lonergan followed out his own calling was quite different than the one in which Ignatius followed out his. For one thing, a whole new culture, a whole new way of looking at things, had emerged, and this culture was quite different from Ignatius' classicist culture of Renaissance humanism. As Lonergan put the issue in 1971:

> The Renaissance period was the period of the *uomo universale*, the man who could turn his hand to anything. The command of all that there was to be known at that time was not a fantastic notion. There was one culture, culture with a capital C: a normative notion of culture. That you could acquire it – a career opened to talent, and so on – was fairly well understood in various ways, and either you got it or did not. Communication, fundamentally, occurred *within* that one culture. You made slight adaptations to the people who were uncultured – and they were not expected to understand things.[19]

Such was the "classicist" culture that Lonergan would describe so frequently in his writings, particularly in the papers gathered together in his 1974 publication, **A Second Collection**. There he described classicism's ancient lineage stemming from the Greek *paideia* and the Roman *doctrinae studium atque humanitatis*, as well as from "the exuberance of the Renaissance and its pruning in the Counter-reformation schools of the Jesuits."[20]

The contemporary notion of culture, however, is something quite different. It is not a normative notion but an empirical one: that is, one that is aware of the diversity of cultures and their histories. It is historically conscious, pluralist and specialized.

> At the present time we don't have only to speak Latin, write Greek, and read Hebrew. We have all the modern languages with their modern literatures; the modern nations and the different worlds; instantaneous communication, perpetually available entertainment; terrific development in industry, in finance and all this sort of thing. No mathematician knows all mathematics, no physicist knows all physics, no chemist, all chemistry; and, least of all, no theologian knows all theology. With this transformation that has taken place, the world is a world of specialization.[21]

So it is that modern historically conscious culture is the culture that knows about other cultures. It is also quite aware that each of these cultures is "man-made," that is, the result of human decisions. In this sense modern culture is "pragmatic:" its focus is on social and cultural change.

> …modern culture is culture on the move. It is historicist. Because human cultures are man-made, they can be changed by man. They not only can but also should be changed. Modern man is not concerned simply to perpetuate the wisdom of his ancestors. For him the past is just the springboard to the future and the future, if it is to be good, will improve on all that is good in the past and it will liquidate all that is evil. The classicist was aware that men individually are

> responsible for the lives they lead. Modern man is aware that men collectively are responsible for the world in which they lead them. So a contemporary humanism is dynamic. It holds forth not an ideal of fixity but a program of change.[22]

Confronted with the fact of the modern pluralistic and historically conscious culture, the question for the Christian is how to preach the Gospel in this culture. "Far more open than classicist culture, far better informed, far more discerning, it lacks the convictions of its predecessor, its clear-cut norms, its elemental strength."[23] How can the Gospel call for conversion, so emphasized by Ignatius's **Spiritual Exercises**, penetrate such modern historical diversity and pluralism? How avoid understanding human history as merely a series of unconnected fragments in which knowledge seems to lie "scattered around us, in great, unconnected pieces, like lonely mesas jutting up in a trackless waste."[24] How even think about such fragmentation and apparently incommensurable pluralism? In a word, what "method" can one use in doing theology today?

Lonergan's solution in **Insight: A Study of Human Understanding** (1957) and **Method in Theology** (1972) was to create a quite refined account of the normative character of human consciousness itself and to use that account as a way of accounting for – and speaking to – the vast diversity of cultures created by human consciousness. Such an account is rooted in self-appropriation, a heightened awareness of the levels of one's own consciousness normatively and invariably operative in all our human activities. This basic structure is as operative in pleading a case of law as in coaching a baseball game. It is as operative in the creativity of one culture as it in another. It is this dynamic structure that makes it possible for a person of one culture to gradually come to understand a person of another culture. Living attentively, intelligently, reasonably and responsibly is the source of the human family's flourishing; and failure to live in such a way results in cultural and social decline.

Lonergan's account was theoretical but it was rooted in human interiority, the source of both common sense and theory. In **Method in Theology** Lonergan extends this analysis to religion and to history. The core of religion is the experience Ignatius pointed to in the **Exercises** and that Lonergan writes of as "being in love with God." That experience finds diverse expression in different cultural contexts and is interpreted differently according to various religious traditions. The Christian tradition understands this inner experience as the experience of the Holy Spirit, the "inner Word," that leads to discerning "the outer Word" of God's revelation in Christ. The role of Christian theology is to help in discerning that Word of God so that one may be able to speak that Word in one's world.

Since theology concerns understanding the past as well as taking a stand in the present, Lonergan conceives theology as a set of eight functional specialties, four of which deal with history and four of which concern teaching and preaching the Word of God in the world today. The first four functional specialties – research, interpretation, history, dialectic – concern hearing the Word of God out of the past. The second four – that is, foundations, doctrines, systematics and communications – concern discerning, affirming, understanding and communicating that Word of God to our world today. Central to Lonergan's understanding is that all these various specializations are "functionally" related to each other according to the dynamic structure of

human consciousness. The personal appropriation of one's own consciousness so stressed in **Insight** is key also to "integrating" all dimensions of theology: historical, dialectical, religious, doctrinal, systematic and pastoral.

In effect, Lonergan's method enables Catholic theology to move out of a classicist mode into an historically conscious mode. It provides a way of **integrating** the new methods of historical scholarship as well as the diverse cultures those methods aim at understanding. It enables one to distinguish differences based on a diversity of culture from differences based on a differentiation of consciousness. Most basically, it enables one to discern those differences based on the presence or absence of conversion. For "the real menace to unity of faith does not lie either in the many brands of common sense or the many differentiations of human consciousness. It lies in the absence of intellectual or moral or religious conversion."[25]

The key issue then is the one Ignatius focused on in the **Exercises**, that is, the issue of conversion to hearing the call of Christ and discerning what Christ is calling one to. That call comes to persons of diverse backgrounds and cultures. It comes to persons of differing cultural achievements. The call is to a radical personal conversion involving the mission to bring the Word of God to wherever one is "being sent." Thus, Lonergan's theological methodology explicitly includes within its sweep the final functional specialty of communications, an area the early Jesuits were well aware of as they founded their schools.

> Just as theology has to enter into the context of modern philosophy and science, so religion has to retain its identity yet penetrate into the cultures of mankind, into the manifold fabric of everyday meaning and feeling that directs and propels the lives of men. It has to know the uses of symbol and story, the resources of the arts and literature, the potentialities of the old and the new media of communication, the various motivations on which in any given area it can rely, the themes that in a given culture and class provide a carrying wave for the message.[26]

Thus, just as the early Jesuits found in Renaissance humanism the themes providing "a carrying wave for the message," so Catholic preachers and teachers today must seek similar "carrying waves" with which to proclaim the call to conversion. For, "there are the transpositions that theological thought has to develop if religion is to retain its identity and yet at the same time find access into the minds and hearts of men of all cultures and classes."[27] It would seem that the Catholic university is one place where such a union between Catholic theology and effective communications would need to take place.

3. The Catholic University

> The correlation between the accelerating explosion of knowledge and socio-cultural change confronts the contemporary university with a grave problem. For the university has ceased to be a storehouse whence traditional wisdom and knowledge are dispensed. It is a center in which ever-increasing knowledge is disseminated to bring about ever-increasing social and cultural change.[28]

The contemporary university reflects contemporary historical consciousness. On the one hand, it reflects the tremendous specialization of knowledge; and on the other hand it reflects the consciousness that knowledge can and should have practical social and cultural effects. That is why "pragmatism" seems to be the reigning and operative humanism in America today.[29] The university today is not a dispenser of traditional wisdom in a classicist context. It is rather a "center" for various specialties, professions, cultures, all in the business of social and cultural change.

But what if such change is not authentic change? What if it contributes to cultural decline rather than to cultural progress? For in many instances that, in fact, seems to be the case. "Modernity lacks roots. Its values lack balance and depth. Much of its science is destructive of man."[30]

Since so much is changing and moving – disciplines, professions, historical situations – the Catholic university needs a very refined instrument for linking the basic Gospel message to all of these areas. That is the point of Lonergan's **Insight** and **Method in Theology**: to enable the Gospel message to link to all areas studied in the university and to contribute to the purification and integration of those areas for the good of the world - or, as Ignatius would put it, "to help souls."

> To put it more concretely, we go to great expense to have Catholic universities, but if our professors cannot be anything more than specialists in physics, specialists in chemistry, specialists in biology, specialists in history, if they can search and search for philosophic and theological aids to give them the orientation that would be specifically Catholic in their fields, and still not find them, because neither philosophy nor theology is doing its job of integrating, then we have a problem.[31]

The point of Lonergan's **Insight** and **Method in Theology** was to facilitate an intellectual conversion that on the one hand promotes radical self-knowledge, and on the other hand promotes the integration of all areas of knowledge: the sciences, the scholarly disciplines, the arts, religion, and the various worlds of common sense – including the various educational ideals, or humanisms.

> Intellectual conversion does not hinder you at all dealing with simple people or ordinary people or anything like that; it helps you to understand them better, what their difficulties may be. It isn't anything narrowing; it is something broadening, simplifying, clarifying.[32]

The point then, is conversion: the religious conversion so emphasized by Ignatius in his **Spiritual Exercises** and the moral and intellectual conversion that flows from that. This is what should distinguish the Christian humanism that inspires and informs Catholic higher education today. To put it in another way, the Catholic university should reflect its religious roots by fostering the purification and integration of knowledge for the good of the world. If Catholic theology in its communicative function is not fostering the transformation of the academic disciplines and contemporary culture, then it is "fruitless." Conversely, it is in the Catholic university fulfilling its role as a university that Catholic faith and Catholic theology can find their cultural fulfillment. "As

it is only in the university that all aspects of human living are under study, it is only in the Christian university that theology can attain its full development and exercise its full influence."[33]

But how in fact can a Catholic university, and specifically professors within the Catholic university, connect what they are doing to the religious origins of the university? Besides generalities, does Catholic theology have anything specific to offer the various disciplines in the university, the disciplines as such – history, psychology, sociology, etc.? In addressing this question Lonergan once pointed to the contemporary validity of Cardinal Newman's theorem in **The Idea of a University** that human knowing is a whole with its parts organically related. Newman then asked what would happen if a significant part of knowledge were omitted, overlooked, ignored, not just by the individual but by the cultural community. His response was that there would be three consequences:

> First, people in general would be ignorant of that area. Second, the rounded whole of human knowing would be mutilated. Third, the remaining parts would endeavor to round off the whole once more despite the omission of a part and, as a result, they would suffer distortion from their effort to perform a function for which they were not designed.[34]

Lonergan applies Newman's theorem by noting that theology has in fact for some time been dropped from most university curricula. Consequently, one may ask whether Newman's inferences have been confirmed in fact, whether there is a widespread ignorance of specifically theological areas, and whether this has resulted in a mutilation and distortion of human knowing generally? In the article we have been quoting Lonergan leaves this question open for further reflection, but he does indicate one concrete relevance of theology to the specifically human sciences. For the human sciences may be and often are pursued simply on the analogy of the natural sciences.

> For the human sciences may be and often are pursued simply on the analogy of the natural sciences. When this is done rigorously, when it is contended that a scientific explanation of human behavior is reached if the same behavior can be had in a robot, then everything specifically human disappears from the science…
> On the other hand, when human scientists reject such reductionism, then not only does the exactitude of the natural sciences vanish but also the human sciences risk becoming captives of some philosophy. For what the reductionist omits are the meaning and value that inform human living and acting. But meaning and value are notions that can be clarified only by painstakingly making one's way through the jungle of the philosophies.[35]

That was one point of Lonergan's **Insight** and **Method in Theology:** to provide the hints and models whereby the human sciences might avoid reductionism without, on the other hand, becoming captives of philosophical fads. Such theoretical issues cannot help but affect the humanities and the question of a contemporary humanistic education. For a humanism is an ideal of human living that can touch the hearts and minds of many people, not only the scientists, scholars and philosophers, but also the intelligent populace who are influenced by these theoreticians.

> …what moves men is the good, and good in the concrete...If at one time law was in the forefront of human development…still, at the present time it would seem that the immediate carrier of human aspiration is the more concrete apprehension of the human good effected through such theories of history as the liberal doctrine of progress, the Marxist doctrine of dialectical materialism and, most recently, Teilhard de Chardin's identification of cosmogenesis, anthropogenesis, and christogenesis.[36]

As is evident from the above quotes, some humanisms, some broad visions of the human life, are authentic; some are not. Some are open to self-transcendence and conversion; others consolidate the spirit of bias and unauthenticity. Some are open to theory with its normative implications; some are not. Some are open to God; some are not.

> Besides the sciences, there are the humanities, and, as I have no need to insist, much modern humanism is prone to ignore God and to ridicule religion, when it is not militantly atheistic. Whether certain youth movements indicate a significant break in the trend, I cannot say. But I venture to affirm that an authentic humanism is profoundly religious.[37]

Such an authentic religious humanism is in profound contradiction to any superficial humanism that locks social classes within themselves.

> The better educated become a class closed in upon themselves with no task proportionate to their training. They become effete. The less educated and the uneducated find themselves with a tradition that is beyond their means. They cannot maintain it. They lack the genius to transform it into some simpler vital and intelligible whole. It degenerates. The meaning and values of human living are impoverished. The will to achieve both slackens and narrows. Where once there were joys and sorrows, now there are just pleasures and pains. The culture has become a slum.[38]

Such has been the case with the humanism spawned by modern science.

> Just as philosophic theory begot humanism of common sense, so too modern science has its progeny. As a form of knowledge, it pertains to man's development and grounds a new and fuller humanism. As a rigorous form of knowledge, it calls forth teachers and popularizers and even the fantasy of science fiction.

Such a scientifically influenced humanism has become a principle of social transformation.

> …it also is a principle of action, and so it overflows into applied science, engineering, technology, industrialism. It is an acknowledged source of wealth and power, and the power is not merely material. It is the power of the mass media to write for, speak to, be seen by all men. **It is the power of an educational system to fashion the nation's youth in the image of the wise man**

> **or in the image of a fool, in the image of a free man or in the image prescribed for the Peoples' Democracies.**[39]

One's educational ideal, then, one's educational "mission," then, is extremely important. What is to be the guiding image, the humanism, informing Catholic university education today? Can it be found in John Paul II's ***Ex corde ecclesiae***? Can that vision be expanded and broadened to include various historical constituencies? How important are these questions about the humanism that will influence contemporary education? "In its third stage, then, meaning not merely differentiates into the realms of common sense, theory, and interiority, but also acquires the universal immediacy of the mass media and the molding power of universal education."

The point is that this question of the humanism that will inform contemporary Catholic university education is extremely important. "Never has adequately differentiated consciousness been more difficult to achieve. Never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater."[40]

It was to the credit of Bernard Lonergan to have outlined the nature of the differentiated consciousness necessary for the contemporary Catholic university. Like Ignatius in his day, Lonergan has provided a very important tool for allowing Gospel values to inform Jesuit and Catholic education today.

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY MSGR. RICHARD M. LIDDY

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] John W. O'Malley, **The First Jesuits** (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 65.
[3] Ibid. 372.
[4] Cf. Bruce A. Kimball, **Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education** (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986) 74-113.
[5] O'Malley, 208-212.
[6] Paul Shore, "The **Ratio Studiorum** at 400," in **Conversations on Jesuit Education**," 15 (Spring 1999) 37.
[7] Referred to in O'Malley, 243-244.
[8] Ibid. 371.
[9] Kimball, **Orators and Philosophers**, 89. The notion of the ideal of the courtier as a classical ideal passed into the later English notion of "the gentleman."
[10] **A Second Collection**, 182.
[11] **A Second Collection**, 226. Cf. also ibid., 234 where the danger comes from "the humanists, the orators, the schoolteachers…the men who simplified and watered down philosophic thought and then peddled it to give the slow-witted an exaggerated opinion of their wisdom and knowledge."
[12] O'Malley, 211.

[13] Ibid. 209.
[14] Ibid. 34.
[15] Letter of January 22, 1935, to Provincial, Fr. Henry Keane, S.J. This letter can be found at the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto.
[16] " I had the intellectual conversion myself when in doing theology I saw that you can't have one person in two natures in Christ unless there is a real distinction between natures and something else that is one. But that is the long way round." Presumably "the short way round" would be by reading **Insight**. (From an unpublished interview from the Lonergan Workshop at Boston College, 1978. This interview can be found at the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto). Cf. also Richard Liddy, **Transforming Light: Intellectual Conversion in the Early Lonergan** (Collegeville MN: The Liturgical Press, 1993).
[17] **Collection**, 231.
[18] **Method in Theology** (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) 243.
[19] **A Second Collection**, 209-210.
[20] Ibid. 101.
[21] Ibid. 210.
[22] **A Second Collection**, 93.
[23] Ibid. 92.
[24] James Turner, "The Catholic University in Modern Academe: Challenge and Dilemma," paper presented at a conference on "The Storm over the University" at the Univ. of Notre Dame, October 13, 1992.
[25] **Method in Theology**, 330.
[26] Ibid. 141.
[27] **Method in Theology**, 132-133.
[28] **A Second Collection**, 135.
[29] Cf. Bruce A. Kimball, **The Condition of American Liberal Education: Pragmatism and a Changing Tradition** (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1995). Also Louis Menand, **The Metaphysical Club** (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001).
[30] **A Second Collection**, 99.
31 **Understanding and Being**, **Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, Vol. 5** (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992) 98.
[32.] Notes by Nicholas Graham from discussion session at workshop on method in theology, Regis College, Willowdale, Ontario, July 10, 1969.

[33] Bernard Lonergan, "Questionnaire on Philosophy," **Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies**, 2/2 (October, 1984), 9. This coheres with what Lonergan says at the beginning of the chapter on communications in **Method in Theology**, namely, that theology "matures" in the functional specialty of communications. "…It is in this final stage that theological reflection bears fruit. Without the first seven stages, of course, there is no fruit to be borne. But without the last the first seven are in vain, for they fail to mature." **Method in Theology**, 355.
[34] Ibid. 142.
[34] **A Second Collection**, 135.
[34] **Method in Theology**, 132-133.
[34] **Understanding and Being,** 98.
[34] Bernard Lonergan, "Questionnaire on Philosophy," 9.
[34] **Method in Theology**, 355.
[34] **A Second Collection**, 141.
[34] Ibid. 142.
[35] Ibid. 143.
[36] **A Second Collection**, 6-7. Cf. also 93: "So a contemporary humanism is dynamic. It holds forth not an ideal of fixity but a program of change. It was or is the automatic progress of the liberal, the

dialectical materialism of the Marxist, **the identification of cosmogenesis and christogenesis** by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin."
[37] Ibid., 144.
[38] **Method in Theology**, 99.
[39] Ibid. My emphases.
[40] Ibid.