

THE ORIGINS OF LONERGAN'S NOTION
OF THE DIALECTIC OF HISTORY

A Study of Lonergan's Early Writings on History

Michael Shute

To Joyce West

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the copyright owner, The Lonergan Estate for permission to quote from unpublished materials of Bernard Lonergan from the archives of the Lonergan Research Institute of Toronto.

Grateful acknowledgement is made for permission to reprint selected passages from previously published material.

From *Method in Theology* (c) 1972. Used by Permission of University of Toronto Press.

From "Questionnaire on Philosophy: Responses by Bernard Lonergan." Published in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*. (c) 1984. Used by permission of the copyright owner, The Bernard Lonergan Estate.

From *A Third Collection* (c) 1985. Used by permission of the copyright owner, The Bernard Lonergan Estate.

From *A Second Collection* (c) 1974. Used by permission of the copyright owner, The Bernard Lonergan Estate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements / iii
Preface / vii

Introduction / ix
 1 The State of the Question / xv
 2 Method and Goal of the Study / xviii

1 Foundations / 1
 1 The Historical Situation / 1
 2 Introduction to Foundations / 9
 3 The Notion of the Subject / 11
 4 The Subject as a Compound-in-Tension / 17
 5 Human Development and the Duality of Consciousness / 18
 6 The Dramatic Subject and the Duality of Consciousness / 20
 7 Subjects in Community / 23
 8 The Structure of Choice / 28
 9 The Form of Dialectic / 30
 10 Summary / 33

2 The Dialectic of History / 34
 1 Historical Process / 34
 1 A Scientific Approach / 35
 3 Method of Approximation / 37
 4 The First Approximation: Progress / 38
 5 The Second Approximation: Decline / 40
 5.1 Bias / 40
 5.2 The Cycles of Decline / 44
 5.3 Cosmopolis and the Problem of Reversal / 47
 6 The Third Approximation: Redemption / 50
 7 Dialectic of History and Praxis / 54
 8 Summary / 56

- 3 The Order and Dating of the Manuscripts / 58
 - 1 The Manuscripts of File 713 / 58
 - 2 Division of the Manuscripts / 60
 - 3 Dating of the Manuscripts / 62

- 4 Documents of Batch A / 67
 - 1 "Essay in Fundamental Sociology" / 68
 - 1.1 The Problem of Liberalism / 70
 - 1.2 Philosophical Foundations / 72
 - 1.3 The Phases of History / 78
 - 1.4 The Dialectical Division of History / 84
 - 1.5 The Necessity of the Supernatural / 86
 - 1.6 The Supernatural Component of the Dialectic / 87
 - 1.7 The Meaning of History / 89
 - 1.8 Summary Remarks / 90
 - 2 "*Pantôn Anakephalaiôsis: A Theory of Human Solidarity*" / 90
 - 2.1 The Preface to *Pantôn Anakephalaiôsis* / 91
 - 2.2 Liberty as a Disjunctive Determination / 94
 - 2.3 The Historical Determination of Intellect / 94
 - 2.4 The Unity of Human Operation / 97
 - 2.5 *Pantôn Anakephalaiôsis* / 101
 - 2.6 Summary Remarks / 105
 - 3 "*Pantôn Anakephalaiôsis*" / 105
 - 4 "Sketch for a Metaphysic of Human Solidarity" / 108
 - 5 Concluding Remarks on the Documents of Batch A / 109

- 5 Documents of Batch B / 111
 - 1 "A Theory of History" / 112
 - 1.1 Material and Formal Elements / 112
 - 1.2 Procedure / 113
 - 1.3 The Natural Dialectic / 114
 - 1.4 The Dialectic of Sin / 116
 - 1.5 The Supernatural Dialectic / 116
 - 1.6 The Significance of Human History / 118
 - 1.7 Summary Remarks / 120
 - 2 The Analytic Conception of History / 111
 - 2.1 Analytic Concepts / 121
 - 2.2 History / 122
 - 2.3 Dialectic / 124
 - 2.4 The Three Categories / 127
 - 2.5 The Ideal Line of History / 129
 - 2.6 Decline / 133
 - 2.7 Renaissance / 137
 - 2.8 The Multiple Dialectic / 141
 - 3 Concluding Remarks on the Documents of Batch B / 144

6 Development in The Notion of the Dialectic of History: 1933-1938 / 145

1 Foundations / 146

2 Differentials, Dialectic, and Stages / 150

3 Development in the Notion of Dialectic / 154

4 Summary / 158

Epilogue / 160

Tables/ 163

Abbreviations / 167

Bibliography / 168

Index of Names / 189

PREFACE

This book is the first fruit of a project which I conceived some ten years ago. The idea was to advance an account of Bernard Lonergan's intellectual development which would highlight his contribution to social philosophy. My reason for wanting to do this had to do with the conviction, since reinforced by this study, that his thought is especially relevant to the social crisis of our age. Of particular importance, I believe, is the development of an adequate framework for collaboration among scientists, scholars, artists, the practically minded, the religiously committed, and people of good will in meeting the crisis. Of contemporary thinkers, it is Lonergan that I have found the best for approaching this task. My particular interest in his development itself stems from the observation that Lonergan is one of those rare thinkers who exhibit remarkable development throughout their lives. Attention to the development of such a thinker of the first rank increases the probabilities for our enlightenment on important issues. But I also admit to imitating Lonergan's own example, for his first work was a study of a development in the thought of Thomas Aquinas.

As those conversant in his thought know, and I have come to appreciate, ascending to the mind of Lonergan is a compelling, if daunting, task. Consequently, my original intent was honed by the realization that "great problems are solved by being broken down into little problems," and by the practical need to write a thesis. This counsel was reinforced by a providential event. My original intent was to work on the notion of the dialectic of history as it informed Lonergan's Insight. After I had gone some distance in my research my thesis director, Robert Doran, brought to my attention the existence of a group of early manuscripts on the subject matter of history which he had uncovered among Lonergan's personal papers. It became clear to me after reading them that they were especially valuable, and as a consequence, the focus of my work shifted. The result is a work that highlights basic research into documents rather than the interpretation of the broad lines of a life's work. As such, this study slowly spirals through the material, returning again and again to the significant benchmarks that constitute Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history. This approach features the slow accumulation of evidence which over time led to the exciting realization that something quite novel emerged in

the writings of a Canadian student of theology in Rome while Europe prepared for World War II.

The completion of this project would not have been possible without the generous assistance and support of many kind people. I would like to mention in particular Jean and Jerry West, my parents Terence and Margaret Shute, Fred and Bertha Deschenes, and Wilma McCagg. David Hawkin of Memorial University, Philip McShane of Mount St. Vincent University, and Michael Vertin of St. Michael's College, Toronto were kind enough to read and comment on earlier versions of this book. Conversations with Bob Henman of Mount St. Vincent University were very helpful in developing my understanding of Lonergan's existential focus. William Mathews, S.J. of the Milltown Institute, Dublin was most helpful in providing biographical information on Lonergan. I would like to acknowledge the critical suggestions of Matthew Lamb of Boston College which have led to a refinement of some portions of the text. I would like to thank Frederick Crowe, S.J., and Michael Shields, S.J. of the Lonergan Research Institute for making available to me the materials for this study from the archives of that institute. Both were ever gracious with their valuable time, patient with my inquiries, and helpful with their suggestions. I am especially grateful to Robert Doran, S.J. who directed the thesis from which this work comes. I owe a considerable debt to Mary Walsh, secretary of the Religious Studies Department of Memorial University, who attended with great skill to the proof-reading of this document and generally assisted with the many details of production and to Ron Dawe who helped assemble the Index. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the biggest debt of all to my wife Joyce West whose support, encouragement, friendship, and love made this project possible. To her I dedicate this work.

INTRODUCTION

We have witnessed in the last two centuries the emergence of a new global context. Karl Jaspers writes: "It has revolutionized the world inwardly and outwardly as no other event since the dawn of recorded history. It has brought with it unprecedented opportunities and hazards."¹ According to Jaspers these changes indicate that we are now in a second axial age.² The first was a time of great cultural crisis in which there occurred an epochal breakthrough from myth to reason. There was a breakdown of cosmological religious forms and the development of the great world religions. In the current world crisis, we are witnesses to a breakdown of the classical notion of culture and the emergence of a modern empirical notion of culture.³ The shift presents a momentous challenge to religious traditions.

Theology as the mediator between religion and the cultural matrix is influenced by this shift and is profoundly involved in the task of articulating the meanings and values relevant to a global, empirical culture.⁴ On the whole theologians no longer orientate themselves in terms of the classical tasks of wisdom and rational knowledge but rather understand their responsibility to be that of a critical reflection on historical praxis. Consequently, a principal focus of theology is on the historical mission of the Church.⁵

Two secular intellectual developments are of particular significance.

¹*The Origin and Goal of History* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953), p. 61.

²Besides Jaspers several authors support this general claim. See Eric Voegelin, *Order and History*, 5 vols. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1956-1987). Bernard Lonergan, "Dimensions of Meaning," in CW4. Christopher Dawson, "Cycles of Civilization," in *Enquiries into Religion and Culture* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1934), pp. 67-115.

³See Bernard Lonergan, "Dimensions of Meaning," in CW4.

⁴See, for example, Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 20 (New York: Crossroads, 1981).

⁵See, for example, Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation*, eds. Sister Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 6.

First, the scientific revolution initiated a turn from deductivist logic to empirical methods. Second, the emergence of historical consciousness resulted in a dynamic and pluralistic notion of culture.⁶ Characteristic of this transitional stage in the last two centuries has been the control of praxis by secular philosophies of history.⁷ Despite the differences we can attribute to the two predominant secular views, the liberal and Marxist, and the antagonism between them which has dominated global relationships, both liberal and Marxist positions affirm the progressive and secular character of history. Liberalism asserts an automatic progress based upon an enlightenment faith in reason while Marxism, in contrast, declares that progress is a matter of class struggle.⁸ A consequence of these views is the denial of a supernatural component in history.⁹ It is this implication that disturbs Christian thinkers.

Many contemporary theologians have begun to re-examine Christian notions of history and praxis. Gutierrez remarks: "It is to a large extent due to Marxist influence that theological thought, searching for its own sources, has begun to reflect on the meaning of the transformation of this world and the action of man in history."¹⁰ C.T. McIntire argues that "a growing sense of the inadequacy of the secular and liberal beliefs about history and human nature which dominated the (western) civilization stimulated a quest for alternative certainties."¹¹ This search began in earnest in the 1930s and 1940s in response to the series of crises set off by the two world wars.¹² A generation of Christian thinkers questioned the notion of progress which underlay both liberal and Marxist views of history and sought alternative views. Efforts moved forward on a variety of fronts. Many writers explored the problems raised for traditional Christian beliefs and practices.¹³ Some considered the meaning of history in an age of crisis.¹⁴ Still others pondered

⁶See Bernard Lonergan, "Theology in its New Context," SC, pp. 55-67.

⁷For a discussion of the role of philosophies of history in secularization see Bernard Lonergan, "Questionnaire on Philosophy: Responses by Bernard Lonergan," ed. Mark Morelli, MET 2:2 (1984), 1-35, and Eric Voegelin, *The New Science of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952; reprinted 1983), pp. 162-89 (page references are to the reprint edition).

⁸For a review of the issue and a dialectical critique of the enlightenment project from a writer influenced by Lonergan see Matthew Lamb, *History, Method, and Theology: A Dialectical Comparison of Wilhelm Dilthey's Critique of Historical Reason and Bernard Lonergan's Meta-Methodology*, AAR Dissertation Series, no. 25 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978), pp. 93-155.

⁹See "Questionnaire on Philosophy," p. 17.

¹⁰Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, p. 10.

¹¹C.T. McIntire, ed., *God, History, and Historians: An Anthology of Modern Christian Views of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. i.

¹²See *ibid.*

¹³See T. M. Schoof, *A Survey of Catholic Theology 1800-1970* (New York: Paulist Press, 1970), pp. 14-151, for a historical overview within the Catholic tradition of this central theological issue.

¹⁴For a representative sample of contemporary Christian reflection on the

the issues of Christian praxis.¹⁵

A small but significant group attempted to re-formulate the foundations for a Christian philosophy of history. Pre-dating Karl Jaspers, Dawson, in 1929, put forward the idea of the "axial shift" and developed a theory of historical stages.¹⁶ Arnold Toynbee's work is seminal, generating among other notions a series of ideal types for the analysis of civilizations.¹⁷ Pitirim Sorokin developed a theory of stages of history.¹⁸ The Dutch philosopher Herman Dooyeweerd advanced a normative theory of historical laws.¹⁹ Jacques Maritain, operating out of a neo-Thomist perspective, conceived a philosophy of history which attempted to explain its fundamental laws and vectors.²⁰

Generally neglected for its contribution to both the philosophy and the theology of history has been the work of Bernard Lonergan -- this despite the increasing influence of his theological methodology. Yet, if we survey Lonergan's works we discover his abiding interest in the question. Certainly, his consideration of history is important in the development of his theological methodology. Not only does "history" constitute one of the functional specialties but the question of historicity was a major issue in the formulation of his methodology.²¹ In "Insight Revisited" Lonergan noted the long struggle he had in integrating the developments of the new *Geisteswissenschaften* with the teachings of Catholic religion and Catholic theology.²² Beyond the problems of historical consciousness what

meaning of history see God, History, and Historians, pp. 28-190.

¹⁵The concerns of both liberation theologies and political theologies reflect this orientation. For an example of the treatment of praxis representative of European political theology see Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980). The output of liberation theologies has been considerable. Representative texts would include Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, and Jose Miguez Bonino, *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

¹⁶See Dawson, "Cycles of Civilization" and *Progress and Religion: An Historical Enquiry* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1929).

¹⁷See *A Study of History* abridgement of volumes I-X by D.C. Somerville, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1947 and 1957; reprint 1988). David Richardson, "The Philosophy of History and the Stability of Civilizations." *The Thomist* (1957), pp. 158-90 develops Toynbee's work in the context of a Catholic theology.

¹⁸See his *Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1952).

¹⁹See Herman Dooyeweerd, "History and Cultural Development," in *God, History, and Historians*, pp. 262-72.

²⁰See *On the Philosophy of History*, ed. Joseph W. Evans (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1959).

²¹On "history" as a functional specialty see *MT*, pp. 175-234.

²²See "Insight Revisited," in *SC*; Lonergan writes: "The new challenge came from the *Geisteswissenschaften*, from the problems of hermeneutics and critical history, from the need of integrating nineteenth-century achievement in this field with the teachings of Catholic religion and Catholic theology. It was a long struggle that can be documented from my Latin and English writing during this period and from the

interested Lonergan was the theology of history proper, which Robert Doran has recently called the "long-range point of view."²³

What he (Lonergan) most wanted to say, then, included preeminently a position on the role of human intelligence in history and society, and on the relation of intelligence to social and cultural progress and decline, especially in view of the distinct dangers confronting human society today.²⁴

A survey of primary materials reveals evidence of a significant influence by writers who dealt with the "long-range point of view." Lonergan read Toynbee's *A Study of History* in the early 1940s.²⁵ We find references to Toynbee in a number of his published works, in particular to his "ideal types."²⁶ With regard to Dawson we find the following in "Insight Revisited":

In the summer of 1930 I was assigned to teach at Loyola College, Montreal, and despite the variety of my duties was able to do some reading. Christopher Dawson's *The Age of the Gods* introduced me to the anthropological notion of culture and so began the correction of my hitherto normative or classicist notion.²⁷

We find evidence of Dawson's influence in Lonergan's lectures *Philosophy of Education*.²⁸ In the same lectures Lonergan cites Voegelin on the subject of general history.²⁹ Lonergan refers to Sorokin's division of types of civilization in his Halifax Lectures and his 1960 lecture "Philosophy of History."³⁰ The essay "Dimensions of Meaning" reveals the influence of

doctoral courses I conducted *De intellectu et methodo*, *De systemate et historia*, and eventually *De methodo theologiae*. The eventual outcome has been the book, *Method in Theology*" (p. 277).

²³See Robert M. Doran, "Lonergan: An Appreciation," in *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Vernon Gregson (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), pp. 7-12.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁵See *Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Pierrot Lambert, Charlotte Tansey, and Cathleen Going. Thomas More Institute Papers, no. 82 (Montreal: Thomas More Institute of Adult Education, 1982), p. 88. Notes taken by Lonergan of the first six volumes of *A Study of History* are available at the Lonergan Research Institute Archives. These notes are catalogued as Item 1a of File 713. File 713 constitutes the source of the primary material considered in this thesis.

²⁶See *MT*, p. 228, and *NRHM*, p. 178.

²⁷"Insight Revisited," in *SC*, p. 264.

²⁸See *PE*, pp. 342-53.

²⁹See *PE*, p. 347. Lonergan's article "Theology and Praxis" in *TC* addresses some of his differences with Voegelin.

³⁰See *LPH*, p. 6. The Halifax Lectures were originally published as

Jaspers.³¹ But beyond these particular influences Lonergan made specific and quite extensive efforts to develop a theology of history. For Lonergan, a theory of history was needed to provide fundamental categories for directing Christian praxis in the contemporary situation.³² It is in this effort that Lonergan explores the dialectic of history.

Part of the reason for overlooking Lonergan's contribution to a theology of history has been that he published very little that refers explicitly to the question.³³ Lonergan himself has indicated, however, that there is a theology of history to be found in his works.³⁴ There is now indisputable evidence that early in his career Lonergan had a strong interest in the area and regarded it as important. We find the earliest indication of this interest in a letter written by Lonergan to Fr. Keane, his superior, dated January 22, 1935. In the letter he indicates that he has written a manuscript on the metaphysics of history. Lonergan writes: "I can put together a Thomistic metaphysic of history that will throw Hegel and Marx, despite the enormity of their influence on this very account, into the shade."³⁵ In another letter to Fr. Keane, written in 1938, we again find that Lonergan remains keenly interested in the subject. He writes:

As philosophy of history is as yet not recognized as the essential branch of philosophy that it is, I hardly expect to have it assigned me as my subject during the biennium. I wish to ask your approval for maintaining my interest in it, profiting by such opportunities as may crop up, and in general devoting to it such time as I prudently judged

Understanding and Being: An Introduction and Companion to "Insight", eds. Elizabeth A. and Mark D. Morelli (Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1980). See p. 273. Frederick E. Crowe revised and augmented this edition which recently appeared as volume 5 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990). See

p. 221.

³¹Lonergan refers to Jaspers' idea that "there is an axis on which the whole of human history turns" in "Dimensions of Meaning," CW4, p. 237. In "An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J.," in SC, p. 209, Lonergan indicates he had read Jaspers' *The Origin and Goal of History* which is the source of his view of the axial age. Lonergan comments on Jaspers in his "Lectures on Existentialism." Finally, in *Caring About Meaning*, p. 117, we find Lonergan had read Jaspers' "three books on philosophy."

³²It is clear, though, that Lonergan regarded his work in I as having a great practical relevance. See the preface I, pp. xiii-xv. See also Matthew Lamb, "Generalized Empirical Method and Praxis," *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Matthew Lamb (Milwaukee: The Marquette University Press, 1981), pp. 52-78.

³³A section called "The Dialectic of History" appears in the article in NRHM in TC, pp. 176-82. There is also an unpublished talk he gave in 1960 to the Thomas More Institute in Montreal on the philosophy of history. See PE.

³⁴See note 39 below.

³⁵A letter to Fr. Keane dated January 22, 1935, and available from the Archives of the Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto, Canada, p. 5.

can be spared."³⁶

Part of the fruit of this early interest is evident in his essay "Finality, Love, Marriage," published in 1942.³⁷

The basic form for investigating the dialectic of history emerged quite early in his intellectual life prior to the start of his doctoral dissertation in 1938.³⁸ In "Insight Revisited" we find the following account: "It was about 1937-38 that I became interested in a theoretical analysis of history. I worked out an analysis on the model of a threefold approximation."³⁹ It is on the basis of this analysis that Lonergan developed his quite original understanding of the dialectic of history. Reference to the dialectic of history appears in articles and Latin works in the period between 1942 and 1972.⁴⁰ Of significance is the development of his hypothesis on the law of the cross, the strictly theological component of his theory, in his work *De Verbo Incarnato*.⁴¹ The dialectic of history constituted a significant component and organizing principle of his two seminal works *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* and *Method in Theology*.⁴² In an interview published in 1980 he said: "I have a general theory of history, implicit in *Insight* and in *Method*."⁴³ Lonergan continued to develop his thought in this area in the period following the publication of *Method in Theology* until his retirement for health reasons in 1983.⁴⁴ A number of these post-*Method* writings exhibit a keen interest on Lonergan's part to consider the issue of praxis.⁴⁵ It is worth noting that the title of the final course Lonergan taught

³⁶In a letter to his superior, Fr. Keane, written from Milltown Park, Dublin, August 10, 1938, and quoted by Frederick E. Crowe in "Notes on Lonergan's Dissertation," p. 5.

³⁷Theological Studies 4 (1942), 477-510. This essay is in CW4, pp. 17-52.

³⁸Lonergan's doctoral dissertation topic was approved on December 6, 1938. See Frederick E. Crowe, S.J., "A Note on Lonergan's Dissertation and Its Introductory Pages," MET 3 (October, 1986), 2-3.

³⁹SC, p. 271.

⁴⁰In particular see "Finality, Love, Marriage," in CW4, pp. 17-52; "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," *ibid.*, pp. 108-113; DRC; and "The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness," in SC, pp. 1-11.

⁴¹See "Transition from a Classicist World-View," in SC, p. 7; *De Verbo Incarnato, ad usum privatam* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1960), pp. 676-727; and *De Bono et Malo* unpublished supplement to or revision of part 5, "De redemptione," of *De Verbo Incarnato*, trans. Michael Shields, archive folder 657, Lonergan Research Institute Archives.

⁴²See the preface to I, pp. xiii-xv.

⁴³Bernard Lonergan, "Questions with Regard to Method: History and Economics," in *Dialogues in Celebration*, p. 305, ed. Cathleen M. Going, Thomas More Institute Papers, no. 80 (Montreal: Thomas More Institute of Adult Education, 1980).

⁴⁴Explicit reference by Lonergan to the term "the dialectic of history" can be found in NRHM. There are, however, other relevant texts among his post-*Method* writings. See, for example, "Healing and Creating in History," in TC, pp. 100-09.

⁴⁵Lonergan's explicit interest in praxis emerges quite strongly in TC. See, for example, his "Healing and Creating in History," "Theology and Praxis," and "Pope

was "Macroeconomics and the Dialectic of History."

Until recently we have been unable to study any primary materials related either to the emergence of this key analysis or to its initial form in 1937-38. After Lonergan's death in November of 1984 his personal papers were made available to the Lonergan Center at Regis College, Toronto.⁴⁶ Among these papers are a group of manuscripts dating, most probably, from the period 1933-1938, which are directly related to the development of a dialectical theory of history.⁴⁷ They are the earliest extant writings on the subject.

The existence of these early unpublished manuscripts and their importance for Lonergan scholarship has presented a unique opportunity to do primary research into material of great relevance for understanding Lonergan in this area. This present work will focus on these early manuscripts of Lonergan's on the subject of history. It is my intention in this work to conduct the basic research into these documents in particular as they relate to the origins of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history and to consider their significance in the development of Lonergan's thought in this area.

1.1 State of the Question

The subject matter of this study juxtaposes two areas of research in Lonergan studies: the interpretation of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history and the question of Lonergan's intellectual development in the 1930s.

On Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history, there have been significant interpretive efforts. There is Robert Doran's recently published *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, which considers the significance of the categories of the dialectic of history for theological positions.⁴⁸ The same author addresses the subject matter of this work in a series of recent articles.⁴⁹ An important consideration of the dialectic of history in the

John's Intention." For a discussion of the pastoral dimension of Lonergan's theology see Frederick E. Crowe, "Bernard Lonergan as Pastoral Theologian," *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), pp. 127-44.

⁴⁶Now the Lonergan Research Institute, 10 St. Mary Street, Toronto, Canada.

⁴⁷The relevant papers are temporarily catalogued in the Lonergan Archives as File 713.

⁴⁸*Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

⁴⁹"Education for Cosmopolis," MET 1 (October, 1983), 134-157; "From Psychic Conversion to the Dialectic of Community," LW 6, 85-107; "Theology's Situation: Questions for Eric Voegelin," in *The Beginning and the Beyond: Papers from the Gadamer and Voegelin Conferences, Supplementary Issue of LW 4* (1984), 69-91; "Suffering Servanthood and the Scale of Values," in LW 4 (1984), pp. 41-67; and "Theological Grounds for a World-Cultural Humanity," in *Creativity and Method*,

context of political theology occurs in Matthew Lamb's *History, Method, and Theology: A Dialectical Comparison of Wilhelm Dilthey's Critique of Historical Reason and Bernard Lonergan's Meta-Methodology*.⁵⁰ Lamb studies the question further in a series of essays published as *Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation*.⁵¹ The same question is the subject matter of a series of articles by Fred Lawrence.⁵² In particular we note Lawrence's exploration of the "longer cycle of decline" which is an important element in Lonergan's theology of history. Kenneth Melchin's work, *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan*, uses Lonergan's world view of emergent probability as an explanatory heuristic for understanding ethics and human history.⁵³ The dialectic of history is given substantial interpretive treatment as it relates to the explanatory context of emergent probability.⁵⁴ The subject of the dialectic of community, a component of Lonergan's theory, is given a developmental treatment in Thomas A. Dunne's thesis, *Lonergan on Social Process and Community*.⁵⁵ This work covers Lonergan's development on the question from his article "Finality, Love, and Marriage," published in 1942, up to 1975. The question of historical stages has been admirably treated by Thomas J. McPartland in "Meaning, Mystery and the Speculative Philosophy of History," in a paper given at the Lonergan Workshop at Boston College in 1986.⁵⁶ William Loewe, in two articles, has considered the strictly theological component of Lonergan's theory.⁵⁷ Finally, Frederick Crowe, in a recent article devoted to Lonergan's use of the transcendental deduction, considers as a possible example of Lonergan's use of the transcendental deduction the model of a threefold approximation for the analysis of history.⁵⁸ It is clear, then, that

pp. 105-122.

⁵⁰See pp. 422-55.

⁵¹*Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

⁵²"The Horizon of Political Theology," in *Trinification of the Word: A Festschrift in Honor of Frederick E. Crowe*, pp. 46-71, eds. T.A. Dunne and J.M. Laporte (Toronto: Regis College, 1978); "The Human Good and Christian Conversation," in *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, pp. 86-112, ed. Philip McShane (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1984); and "Political Theology and the Longer Cycle of Decline," LW 1, 223-55.

⁵³*History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1987).

⁵⁴See pp. 165-253.

⁵⁵*Lonergan on Social Process and Community*, Th.D. dissertation, Regis College, Toronto, 1975.

⁵⁶Available from the Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto.

⁵⁷"Lonergan and the Law of the Cross: A Universalist View of Salvation," *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977), 162-74, and "Toward a Responsible Soteriology," in *Creativity and Method*, pp. 213-27.

⁵⁸"The Transcendental Deduction: A Lonerganian Meaning and Use," in *MET* 2 (March, 1984), 21-39.

elements of the dialectic of history have been the focus of a significant amount of Lonergan scholarship.

Research on Lonergan's early development in general and on his development in the 1930s in particular has just begun. Until very recently, works that do consider Lonergan's development begin their investigation with his thesis written between 1938 and 1940.⁵⁹ A good example is David Tracy's well-known work *The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan*. Written in 1970, the work traces the development of Lonergan's thought from the Thomist world of theory to the modern context of intentionality. The work does contain a brief introduction to the neo-Thomist revival of the 1930s.⁶⁰ Although the work is useful in charting this fundamental development, its sources begin with Lonergan's thesis on *Gratia Operans*. Similarly, Michael O'Callaghan's *Unity in Theology: Lonergan's Foundation for Theology in Its New Context* does consider Lonergan's theological studies but includes only one paragraph on his studies in Europe in the thirties.⁶¹ The material for Patrick Byrne's excellent study "The Thomistic Sources of Lonergan's Dynamic World View" begins with Lonergan's thesis.⁶²

The chief secondary sources for Lonergan's earliest development have been Frederick Crowe and William Mathews. Frederick Crowe has done a number of important studies of aspects of Lonergan's development.⁶³ The results of Crowe's research into Lonergan's work in the 1930s can be found in a number of sources. Foremost has been his excellent review of Lonergan's development, "The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan's Intellectualism," published in 1964.⁶⁴ In this article he reveals crucial biographical data on Lonergan's studies in Europe from 1926 to 1940. "A Note on Lonergan's Dissertation and its Introductory Pages" is helpful in matters of detail,⁶⁵ as are Crowe's editorial notes for the *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. William Mathews has set out on the task of researching

⁵⁹*Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas of Aquin*, S.T.D. thesis, Gregorian University, Rome, 1940. Available from the Lonergan Research Institute. A substantial portion of the thesis was published in *Theological Studies* in 1941 under the title of "St. Thomas's Thought on Gratia Operans." These articles were collected in book form under the title *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. J.P. Burns, with an introduction by Frederick E. Crowe (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1971).

⁶⁰See *The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1970), pp. 22-30.

⁶¹See *Unity in Theology: Lonergan's Foundation for Theology in Its New Context* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1980), p. xxvii.

⁶²"The Thomistic Sources of Lonergan's Dynamic World View," *The Thomist* 46 (1982), 108-45.

⁶³See "An Exploration of Lonergan's New Notion of Value," in *Science et esprit* 29 (1977), 123-43; and "Lonergan's Search for Foundations: The Early Years, 1940-1959," in *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, pp. 113-39.

⁶⁴In *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan* (Chicago: Saint Xavier College, 1964), pp. 16-33.

⁶⁵In *MET* 3 (October, 1985), 1-8.

material for an intellectual biography. The first fruit of this work is an article "Lonergan's Quest," which deals primarily with Lonergan's development in the area of method.⁶⁶ Of more significance for research on Lonergan's early development is the unpublished "Lonergan's Apprenticeship," which discusses Lonergan's early years up to 1946.⁶⁷ This article represents the first work devoted explicitly to this subject. Recently, David Hammond published a study of Newman's influence on Lonergan that includes a consideration of materials prior to 1940.⁶⁸

Research on Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history has so far either concentrated on its particular aspects or has been the context for addressing other questions. Research into Lonergan's development prior to 1940 has only just begun. These circumstances suggest there is a need for a study of Lonergan's early writings on the question of history.

1.1 Method and Goal of the Study

I propose a modest venture for this work. In his article "The Task of Interpreting Lonergan" Frederick Crowe writes: "I am convinced ... that in the task of interpreting Lonergan far more attention must be paid to simple research."⁶⁹ This is the spirit which orientates the task at hand. The goal is to present the initial research into Lonergan's writings on history during the period of his studies at the Gregorian University in Rome, prior to the writing of his doctoral dissertation, as it relates to the development of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history. It is not my intention to offer an exhaustive or comprehensive analysis of these works. It is my intention to present an accurate account of the materials and to consider their relevance to the origin of the notion of the dialectic of history.

The discussion will proceed within the methodological context of Lonergan's functional specialties -- functional specialization being the eightfold division of theological tasks which Lonergan developed in *Method in Theology*. Because of the degree of differentiation functional specialization allows, it is the most helpful context for determining and directing the particular object of this study. In particular Lonergan distinguishes between mediated and mediating phases in the division of the functional specialties.⁷⁰ The mediating phase includes the functional specialties of "research," "interpretation," "history," and "dialectic." The mediating phase assimilates tradition to determine what has been said

⁶⁶In *Milltown Studies* 17 (Spring, 1986), 3-34.

⁶⁷To appear in LW 9.

⁶⁸David M. Hammond, "The Influence of Newman's Doctrine of Assent on the Thought of Bernard Lonergan: A Genetic Study," *MET* 7:2 (1989), 95-115.

⁶⁹"The Task of Interpreting Lonergan," in *Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*, S.J., eds. Timothy P. Fallon and Philip Boo Riley (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987), p. 6.

⁷⁰See *MT*, pp. 133-34.

about Christian faith. The mediated phase includes the functional specialties "foundations," "doctrines," "systematics," and "communications." The function of these specialties is to meet the challenge of the contemporary situation enlightened by the mediating of the tradition in the first phase.

This particular work will bear features of both the functional specialties "research" and "interpretation." The functional specialty "research" is preparatory to other tasks: "Research makes available the data relevant to theological investigation."⁷¹ It is not specifically concerned with the critique of the position taken by the author of the documents studied but assumes the more modest task of assembling the data, determining the date of authorship, and judging the authenticity of the manuscripts. It leaves to the functional specialty "interpretation," for example, the task of determining what is meant by the author and to the functional specialty "history" the task of relating the documents to their particular historical context. The question of the position taken by the author is properly an assignment for the functional specialty of "dialectic." In matters relevant to "research" I present a hypothesis regarding the order and dating of the relevant manuscripts. Specifically there is an assessment of the probable order of composition and a position regarding the division of the manuscripts based on an evaluation of the development of Lonergan's thought in the manuscripts.

Although the task of "research" constitutes a primary object of this work it is not the exclusive one. For one thing, the exposition of the text inevitably raises questions of interpretation. Furthermore, I am particularly concerned as a fundamental task to consider how these manuscripts relate to Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history. Thus, the understanding of the texts as they pertain to this particular question will be an important component orientating the research. Therefore, it is necessary to indicate what Lonergan means by dialectic of history. This is the task of the functional specialty of "interpretation": "While research makes available what was written, interpretation understands what was meant."⁷² To this end I offer an interpretation of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history and its early development. On the basis of this interpretation I shall also be able to comment on the significance of Lonergan's work in these manuscripts for his later development.

To focus our effort on "research" and "interpretation" does not suspend the operation of the other functional specialties. In fact, the advantage of functional specialization is that, by adequately differentiating tasks, it grants to each specialty the ability to operate free of the totalitarian ambitions of other specialties, yet, because there is a dynamic unity, results from one specialty can enrich developments in others.⁷³ Accordingly, the

⁷¹*MT*, p. 127.

⁷²*Ibid.*

⁷³On the need for division within functional specialization see *MT*, pp. 136-38. On

efforts here take advantage of the developments in the specialty "history" relevant to the material. This is especially the case in attempting to situate Lonergan's work. As well, "dialectic" is relevant in considering either the basis on which Lonergan's view contrasts with the other views or the viewpoint of our interpretation in relation to those with which it might conflict. Thus, in the course of this study we will note, where relevant, the manner in which Lonergan's view contrasts with other positions on history, for example, those of Hegel and Marx. Although this does not constitute a major focus, such contrasts shed light on Lonergan's understanding of the dialectic of history. Furthermore, the results of this study themselves are subject to the examination of "dialectic." Other functional specialties have a bearing on the work insofar as the material developed here contributes to the mediated phase of theology.

I have approached the organization of this book in the following manner. First, I introduce the general interpretive context by setting out the basic elements of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history. Next, I consider the question of the dating and ordering of the manuscripts. The bulk of the book is an exposition of the unpublished materials under study. Finally, the relevant developments in these manuscripts which resulted in the emergence of the basic structure of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history are presented.

These tasks are set out in six chapters. In the first chapter, "Foundations," Lonergan's efforts are situated in its historical context and an account of those features of Lonergan's thought foundational to his notion of the dialectic of history is presented. In chapter 2, "The Dialectic of History," an account of Lonergan's conception of the dialectic of history is assembled from his published work. This chapter serves as an introduction to Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history and provides the general context for the interpretation of the texts. The dating and order of the relevant documents of the study of Lonergan's early writings on history is problematic. Chapter 3, "The Order and Dating of the Materials," considers this difficulty. After indicating the relevant sources and their probable date of composition, I consider the hypothesis that, on the basis of Lonergan's developing conception of the dialectic of history, the material under consideration can be fruitfully divided into two distinct groups, consisting of an earlier set, batch A, and a later set, batch B. Chapter 4, "The Documents of Batch A," presents, in the probable order of their composition, an exposition of the four earliest documents. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate the contents of the relevant documents and present a preliminary interpretation of the material under study. In chapter 5, "The Documents of Batch B," the four later documents are considered. As in chapter 4, this involves an exposition and interpretation of the contents. Because of the great similarity in content, three of the four documents will be considered together under the title "The Analytic Conception of History."

its dynamic unity see *MT*, pp. 138-45.

A fourth transitional document will be considered separately. In chapter 6, "The Development of the Notion of the Dialectic of History: 1933-1938," the developments in the manuscript will be related to the interpretive context developed in chapters 1 and 2. The Epilogue includes some brief comments on the significance of these documents in the development of Lonergan's thought.

This work aspires to contribute to the basic research into a primary source for Lonergan studies. The exposition of the proposed materials will make available to the community of scholar's important materials for understanding a crucial period in Lonergan's development. This opens up possibilities for further research into Lonergan's development on a whole range of questions. Furthermore, it should provide material for further work in other functional specialties such as foundations, history, or dialectic. I hope this will assist scholars in the accurate accounting of Lonergan's fundamental positions. The work also aspires to contribute to an understanding of Lonergan's notion of the dialectic of history. The subject matter of the dialectic of history is, I believe, germane to the question of the historical mission of the Church and to many of the questions raised by political or liberation theologies.⁷⁴ Although the proposal is modest in scope I believe it has something to contribute to the pressing concerns expressed by these theological movements. The details of the development of the thought of a seminal thinker of the stature of Lonergan are intrinsically important, but on the particular subject matter of the dialectic of history Lonergan has an important contribution to make to the public debate which I hope this work can help to articulate.

⁷⁴On the relevance of Lonergan's work to liberation theologies see, for instance, Matthew Lamb, *History, Method, and Theology*; Frederick Lawrence, "The Human Good and Christian Conversation," in *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, pp. 86-112; and Frederick Crowe, "Bernard Lonergan and Liberation Theology," in *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, pp. 116-26.

Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies. Volume 1, Issue 1, Spring 1983. Ronald McKinney. Pages 60-67. DOI: 10.5840/method1983114. A Critique of "Lonergan's Notion of Dialectic". << Previous Article. >> Next Article. ¶ 1. This outline history covers the main events in the historical development of the English language: the history of its phonetic structure and spelling, the evolution of its grammatical system, the growth of its vocabulary, and also the changing historical conditions of English-speaking communities relevant to language history. A language can be considered from different angles. In studying Modern English (Mod E) we regard the language as fixed in time and describe each linguistic level "phonetics, grammar or lexis" synchronically, taking no account of the origin of present-day features. References to any of Lonergan's writings that have appeared in the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan must cite that edition, but may also cite older editions. Below you will find Tables of Contents for each of the published METHOD journals. Online editions of back issues can be found here. Volume 1 Volume 2 Volume 3 Volume 4 Volume 5 Volume 6 Volume 7 Volume 8 Volume 9 Volume 10 Volume 11. Volume 12 Volume 13 Volume 14 Volume 15 Volume 16 Volume 17 Volume 18 Volume 19 Volume 20 Volume 21 Volume 22. New Series N.S. Volume 1 N.S. Volume 2 N.S. Volume 3. Volume One. 1.1 " March 1983. 1 " Christ