

# The Thought of Bernard Lonergan for Educational Philosophy

by Ivan Gaetz ([ivan.gaetz@coloradocolleg.edu](mailto:ivan.gaetz@coloradocolleg.edu))

Library Director, Colorado College

## Introduction

Bernard Lonergan is considered by some to be one of the greatest Jesuit thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He is also thought to be in the top tier of Jesuit thinkers since their founding in 1540. Others have compared Lonergan to Saint Thomas Aquinas and to Immanuel Kant in terms of intellectual scope and profundity. George Whelan, S.J., professor of theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome offers a concise summary of his celebrated life and work.

Bernard Lonergan was a Canadian Jesuit who lived from 1904 to 1984. He was a philosopher and theologian and he is mostly known for two seminal works: *Insight* (1957) and *Method in Theology* (1972). He was both a student and a professor at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome and also taught in Montreal, Boston and Toronto. During the 1970s he was featured on the cover of *Time* magazine and he was “considered one of the finest philosophic thinkers of the twentieth Century,” and in a recently published book on Twentieth Century Catholic Thinkers by Fergus Kerr he makes the top ten list formulated by this author of the most important Catholic thinkers of the last century.<sup>1</sup>

As a theologian, Lonergan did not seek to adopt or adapt any particular philosophical system of thought for theological purposes—as did, for instance, Karl Rahner with Martin Heidegger or Pierre Teilhard de Chardin with Charles Darwin. Rather, he sought to develop a new mode of philosophy that would place theological inquiry on a sound, productive, collaborative methodological footing—mirroring in certain ways empirical method and its successes, but for theology. While Lonergan’s immediate focus was on theological method, he discovered a more general method that applies to scholarship within the humanities. Since you cannot put human beings in a petri dish, as it were, and study them scientifically, what are the general structures and processes of scientific empirical inquiry that relate to and inform inquiry in the humanities?

To answer this question, Lonergan set out to probe the basic nature of scientific inquiry and then, based on this, develop what came to be known as a “generalized empirical method.”

It is my understanding that Lonergan’s work in constructing a new mode of philosophy based on the nature and processes of human inquiry, along with its resulting general methodology, has particular relevance to the field of education. This essay will attempt to build the case for such an application—and, in doing so, find particular relevance to, and resonance with, Jesuit-based education.

First, however, I offer a caveat. This essay is not really for the seasoned Lonergan scholar who may be inclined to engage the intricacies of hermeneutics in deciphering precise meanings of words and phrases Lonergan uses, if and how they may have changed over his writing career, whether or not, for instance, there is a fifth level in the differentiations of consciousness, or whether talk of psychic conversion leads to other types of conversion. While these are engaging, animating and perhaps necessary clarifications or developments in Lonergan’s thought, many educators generally do not have the background, the time or the patience for this type of investigation and conversation. Educators tend to be pragmatists—there is a job to do, an important one at that, and the “tools” one uses in the classroom, in the seminar, online or on campus, need to be readily grasped and effectively wielded.

What I endeavor to do, then, is to present a basic, clear and relatively simple account of the ideas and system of thought for which Lonergan is known. These ideas and system, I believe, can undergird, refocus, and transform our work as educators. But in aiming at this, however, I do not suggest Lonergan’s work is simplistic. On the contrary, it is profound and radical, but I maintain that realizing some effect of Lonergan’s thought in how we understand and engage teaching and learning processes can be obtained rather quickly, even though mastering the “instrument” and gaining its full effect is a project demanding deep attention and commitment over a lifetime.

In a disparaging way, some may believe that “a little of Lonergan goes a long way.” (I am inclined to think that myself in terms of his Christology.) But on the positive side, however, in very good ways, a little of Lonergan *can* go a long way. One needs to grasp but a few key ideas,

a few principles, understand and then start to follow a few basic imperatives, for the effect to take hold and for Lonergan's thought to be life enriching and even transforming. So, let's begin this little journey.

### **Lonergan the Philosopher**

As a philosopher, Lonergan drew on a variety of philosophies, from the Greek and medieval classics to new thinking in philosophy of science and existentialism. In his book, *Insight*, Lonergan situated various philosophies and systems of thought within an integrated framework where their ideas contribute to an enlarging and comprehensive worldview. As a philosopher, he sought to create a radical mode of philosophical inquiry that brings together insight on the nature of human experience, the nature of understanding, the structure and operations of human discernment and judgment, and how existential crises and opportunities are met as individuals best make their way in the world. Aspects of his reconstruction of philosophy are presented by philosopher, Hugo Meynell in his book, *Redirecting Philosophy: Reflections on the Nature of Knowledge from Plato to Lonergan*.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to being a philosopher, Lonergan also was a noted theologian. Bringing together these two fields of study, and after prolonged and rigorous study of the classics, of mathematics, of philosophy and of patristic and medieval theology, he wrote a major treatise on human understanding called, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*.<sup>3</sup> Completed in 1953, but first published in 1957, this work established Lonergan as a major thinker of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

What emerges in the process of studying *Insight* is the conviction that epistemology, that is, the study of human inquiry and knowledge, still lies as the root of what are, and how we exist, as human beings. Lonergan soon became known for this epithet, "thoroughly understand what it is to understand, and not only will you understand the broad lines of all there is to be understood but also you will possess a fixed base, an invariant pattern, opening upon all further developments of understanding."<sup>4</sup> In *Insight* he explores and answers three basic questions: What does one do when one knows? Why is doing that called knowing? What does one know when that is done? Answers to these questions constitute Lonergan's cognitional theory, epistemology and metaphysics.

### **Lonergan the Theologian**

Following the publication of *Insight*, Lonergan began to focus more intently on methodology in general and on theological method in particular. His work in *Insight* showed that the human mind—understood more broadly in terms of human consciousness—has distinct levels and operations. These levels and operations most properly, and ultimately, work in a unified way as a person comes to experience the world, interpret and understand that world, comes to grasp what counts as knowledge (both probabilities and correct judgments), and then decides to act (or not act) in accordance to that knowledge. He came to see human consciousness as a patterned set of operations that produce increments of personal and collective knowing and doing. He showed that human consciousness basically, and optimally, unfolds methodologically.

How, then, does this relate to theology? Can the actual structure and operations of human consciousness, as Lonergan maps them out, direct one's mode of theological inquiry? To this he answered, "Yes," in his most widely influential book, *Method in Theology*, published in 1972.<sup>5</sup> Following some preliminary chapters on method, the human good, history, and related topics, he developed in this book a new way to "do" theology. His theological method unfolds in eight "functional specialties" that pertain to broad disciplines in theology—four conducted primarily by the academic and four conducted by the theologian committed to a particular religious tradition. These are: research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematics, and communications. Not only does his methodology endeavor to order and direct theological inquiry in a methodological manner, that is, as a "normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results," but also it provides a framework for more intentional interplay of inquiry and for theological collaboration.

### **General Assessment of Lonergan's Thought**

In my estimation, Lonergan's vision was as grand as de Chardin's in terms of understanding the cosmos, and as existential as Rahner's in coming to terms with "being" in its human dimensions. It seems to me, however, that Lonergan was far more rigorous than de Chardin or Rahner, or many others for that matter, in addressing a larger scope of related fundamental questions and, in the process, he achieved more profound results. *Newsweek* explained in the 1970s, "Jesuit Philosopher Bernard Lonergan has set out to do for the twentieth century what even Aquinas

could not do for the thirteenth...*Insight* has become a philosophic classic comparable in scope to Hume's *Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.”<sup>6</sup>

John Macquarrie, a widely influential theologian in the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, offers his assessment as well. “[Lonergan’s] massive work, *Insight*, reminds one of Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* or Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Mind* because it works through the various levels of mental operation from the simplest to the most complex and leaves one with an extraordinarily impressive picture of the power and energy of the human intellect.”<sup>7</sup>

My point in referring to these brief assessments is that Lonergan was and remains an important thinker, and has something significant to contribute to the conversation on education.<sup>8</sup> If we take a little time to begin to come to terms with Lonergan, it could be worth the effort and help in surprising ways, perhaps, to understand and more deeply inform what we do in education – and more importantly, as Parker Palmer suggests, who we are as human-beings-as-educators.<sup>9</sup>

### **Lonergan’s Thought Applied to Key Themes in Educational Philosophy**

Lonergan was no stranger to the field of educational philosophy. Although this field of study was not his main focus by any means, like many great thinkers—Michael Oakeshott, Northrop Frye, and even Friedrich Nietzsche and Immanuel Kant, as examples—he was asked from time to time to address issues related education and educational philosophy. The most noted occasion for Lonergan was a series of lectures he delivered at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1959. *Insight* was already in a second edition, and Lonergan was making his mark nationally and internationally. He addressed educators over several days on matters related to Dewey’s and Piaget’s work on education, but also presented his own thought on ethics, art and history, among other topics. The lectures were tape recorded, transcribed and then published as Volume 10, *Topics in Education*, in the *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* in 1988.<sup>10</sup>

As the title suggests, the book consists of a set of topics addressed by Lonergan, and while philosophical in nature, he did not intend to present a “philosophy of education” where deep level, systematic and cohesive accounts of education unfolds. He ended his first of ten lectures with this proviso and invitation:

I am not a specialist in education, but I have suffered under educators for very many years, and I have been teaching for an equally long time .... [Y]ou can listen to me as I speak about philosophy and its relation to theology and to concrete living. But most of the concrete applications, the ironing out of the things, will have to be done by you who are in the fields of education and philosophy of education.<sup>11</sup>

The application of Lonergan's thought, then, in this essay consists of a start to "ironing out of things" that hopefully informs a philosophy of education. What we are after here is not a full blown account of the breadth and richness of Lonergan's thought – one can encounter this in the projected 25 volumes of his *Collected Works* – but rather a basic understanding of his key assertions, what could they mean for education generally and what they mean as a Jesuit model of education in particular.

"Educational philosophy" may be a term not familiar to many educators—especially to educators in higher education since many college and university professors have never taken a course or read much in educational studies or in educational philosophy. So what, then, are the broad contours of an educational philosophy? In simple terms, educational philosophy addresses the more profound matters related to teaching and learning and covers a wide range of topics from epistemology, ethics, and citizenship to personal formation and development, social concerns, and "new thinking" as this comes to bear on the theory and practice of education. Recent examples of new thinking explore various kinds of "intelligences," "knowledge ascriptions," and "human capabilities." Educational philosophy helps educators think deeply, critically, and creatively about the big issues related to human emotional, intellectual, existential and social life, and helps educators, and ultimately the persons being educated, relate these issues and resulting affirmations to one's basic values and commitments. While practitioners and administrators in the field of education wrestle with real problems in the classroom, in the seminar, the conference hall and the office, educational philosophy can help educators raise the eyes from the road immediately at foot to consider the longer view, the greater good, a better way, and the ultimate consequences. It is my contention that Lonergan, in the context of an educational philosophy, can help one do this.

With Lonergan, philosophical thinking and a construction of a philosophy depends fundamentally on an account of human consciousness. Without a clear and accurate grasp of what is going on in our own patterns and operations of consciousness, he claims, we are left simply to muddle through as best we can, living essentially in a world of extroversion (or what Lonergan calls “naïve realism”), struggling with confusing or wrong-headed ideas about culture and society, about human life and what it means to be human, and ultimately ideas about “reality.” On the basis of naïve realism and its common expressions in various forms of “pragmatism,” we can get by in education, sure enough, but it is very difficult to make substantive, fully satisfying progress in sorting through the complex and profound issues that face us today. In the end, as naïve realists, we may very likely end up being inadequate to meet deep challenges facing our culture, or, as the philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset, suggests, unable to “rise to the level of our times.” At best, understanding life’s big issues and relating them to the grand enterprise of education would be “hit and miss.”

### **Merely Muddling Through**

Education today seems to be a matter of “muddling through,” of chasing after this or that trend in popular culture and technology, of merely responding rather than taking the lead, and articulating matters of key concern and importance in education. Educators and administrators tend to be led by issues of the day as defined by others, such as “discipline,” “standards,” “back-to-basics,” “no child left behind,” “ethics,” “computer literacy,” “social media,” and so forth. These concerns may be important issues, but educators today tend not to be in the vanguard but rather defer to politicians, media personalities or various community groups. Others set the agenda. Moreover, administrators and leading educators seem to have no well-developed overarching framework with which to fully understand, assess, and decide on these issues in an integrative, comprehensive and fully satisfying way. Muddling through often stems from a lack of understanding of what counts as real knowledge and draws on ideology, on mere opinion or simple belief. Often the result, perhaps reflecting certain post-modern tendencies in higher education, is a denigration of questions of epistemology and what counts as “knowledge.” Issues tend to be “solved” in terms of authority and power, or what gets us through the day, and not larger understandings of what it means to be human, of what constitutes community, culture, the movement of history, or the human good.

A “muddling” approach can actually get us “through,” but it comes with the price of simply “making do.” Without clear, overarching or methodological direction, far too often educators tend to hang onto their emotional and intellectual biases revealed in short-sightedness and even blindness concerning on the “big” questions of learning and life. Perhaps even the questions themselves are not really grasped. Far too often educators are unable to distinguish in a reasonable way the good and the bad, or gradations of the good and the bad, or are unable to offer arguments and analysis of what counts as one or the other. Educators would rather focus on classroom practice, on techniques, or on other practical, more immediate concerns. A further result of a retreat to largely biased-based positions appears as educators tend to become reactionary instead of constructive and developmental.

Not to be overly negative, though, on balance, the “hit and miss” approach can sometimes have its “hits.” Educators may get it right, may do the brilliant thing and make a positive difference. But is there a way to improve the hit balance sheet, a way to better ensure more hits and less misses?

I believe Lonergan’s philosophy and general methodology offer a better way. While Jesuit-based institutions of higher learning have done little to mine the riches of Lonergan’s thought for its set-up and delivery of education, I believe it is the mission of Jesuit higher education not only to strive more intentionally toward an integration and a wholeness in our knowing, doing, being, caring/loving, but, more importantly, to illumine the operations of knowing, to illumine the dynamism of human consciousness—which is our “spiritual” life. To be sure, there are various Jesuit “tools” to accomplish this, such as what is presented in the publication, *Teaching to the Mission: A Compendium of the Ignatian Mentoring Program*. However good, practical and insightful this document proves to be, it still is not a philosophy of education, per se. What underlies this fine work, rather, is the Jesuit “mission” (which has philosophical connections, of course), but this is not a full-fledged philosophy that probes the various dimensions of education at the deepest levels.<sup>12</sup>

Lonergan’s thought can provide a needed philosophy of education that counters and corrects a “muddling through” approach, one based on a thoroughgoing and convincing account of human



consciousness in its various parts and operations that direct one's knowing, doing, being and caring/loving. It is this type of illumined consciousness that largely constitutes our identity as persons. As Charles Taylor argues, such a sense of "inwardness" serves to create our "sense of self."<sup>13</sup> A Lonerganian approach to education, in my view, helps us realize our potential as knowers in building on our experience, but which goes beyond personal experience to map out how, in general terms, we become shapers of our world in all the good, better and best ways possible. This, for education, is the potential fruit of Lonergan's grand vision of philosophy.

### **Elements of a Lonerganian Philosophy of Education**

What are the elements of this philosophical vision and how do these elements operate in education? Very briefly, they consist of an account of human knowing and an interpolation of this account as a general methodology that can guide stages and processes relevant to teaching and learning. It is one objective of the Regis Ignatian Scholars program to explore the educational implications of this basic epistemology and methodology, one that is deeply rooted in the Jesuit-Catholic tradition. While this approach rises from the rich soil of a distinctive heritage, it must be emphasized that applications of this epistemology and methodology are not so restricted. Lonergan's insights and assertions can be applied to any area of human inquiry and learning where reason and openness are key values and aspirations.

A Lonergan-inspired vision of education focuses on the individual, but it does not espouse a pure subjectivism or an entrenched individualism. Its higher aim is the enhancement and development of communities, of societies and of civilization itself. The purpose of a Lonerganian educational philosophy is not self-enclosure, but self-transcendence. Its aim is true knowledge wherever it is found, and its *desire* is for what Lonergan calls a "finality" of human existence, that is, always striving toward the "higher viewpoint," to grasp in ever greater degrees deeper reality leading to an ultimate.

But how does one tap into this vision? How does one begin to draw on its potential and promise? Essentially, self-understanding and self-knowledge opens the door to this by exploring one's own "interiority" and coming to know oneself, the human subject, in a new way. The way Lonergan offers involves four basic "interior" operations of the human subject that unfold on

four distinct but related levels of consciousness. Three pertain to the question of knowing, and the fourth pertains to the question of action, the existential question, “What am I going to do about what I know?”

The four basic operations, when functioning fully and without impairment, yield knowledge and decisions that meet the existential demand for all human beings to be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible, and be caring/loving. Simply put, the four basic operations are experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding. Following a brief account of these operations, a few reflections on education are offered in order to suggest how these differentiated levels and operations can frame and begin to construct a philosophy of education.

One important clarification needs to be made, however. While Lonergan presents his discoveries and analyses of how human consciousness operates, the underlying motivation is an invitation to discover such operations of your own consciousness. The most important thing is not what Lonergan says about this or that aspect of human consciousness or what other thinkers assert about the world of human “interiority.” Rather, the crucially important matter concerns *you!* Thus, Lonergan’s work really unfolds as an invitation to self-discovery, to self-knowledge. But while this ultimately is about *you*, Lonergan does provide enormously helpful guidance and insight for this self-discovery.

This point was stressed by Lonergan’s chief advocate and colleague, Frederick E. Crowe, S.J., in a *Festschrift* published by *Continuum* in 1964. Crowe states in his introductory article, “The Exigent Mind,”

Lonergan’s position is that the way to understand him is to carry out for ourselves the performance of appropriating conscious activity. He has said as much in *Insight*, he has repeated in for years in his lectures, and his claim is ignored, sometimes as much by disciples as by opponents, both of whom turn more readily to the objective products of his thought than to their own operations. Those products command respect and deserve discussion (otherwise this collection of studies [in the *Festschrift*] would lose much of its purpose) but they just are not the main issue.<sup>14</sup>

By my observation, this point continues to be missed far too often in the expanding field of “Lonergan Studies,” the point being that all of this is not so much about Lonergan as it is about

you, about you, the educator. Again, in developing an educational philosophy that draws on Lonergan, then, the main issue becomes self-discovery and self-knowledge. Moreover, the beginning point does not consist of throwing out everything that we have so far gained in terms of self-knowledge, but unfolds as a rethinking, a reconsideration and perhaps even a transformation of self-knowledge that can take you, as an educator, and you as a thinker on educational philosophy, to greater heights and to deeper depths in personal and professional achievement.

### **Self-Rediscovery and the Elements of Educational Philosophy**

Simply put, Lonergan discovered that human consciousness – the interior self that constitutes one’s “spirituality”—consists of four basic operations: experiencing, understanding, judging (or discerning)<sup>15</sup>, and deciding. It is relatively easy to identify occasions where one has experienced, understood, judged, or decided. Take a few moments to reflect on how you have engaged these activities over the past day, within the past hour, or even within the past few moments. As you reflect on these events, you may be able to identify different focuses in your consciousness as being mainly about one of these four activities. In Lonergan’s analysis, these operations of consciousness are also called “intentionality” – what is predominantly occurring in your consciousness, what you are “really after,” in any particular occasion—to experience, to understand, to discern and judge, or to decide.

However, things can quickly become complicated as we reflect more deeply. If we are trying to understand something, for example, this does not occur in isolation. Experience relates to the effort to understand, as do previous discernments and judgments, and past actions. In fact, as you reflect on the various acts of your own consciousness, you may realize they tend to occur as single unified events that have many or all of the other elements of consciousness operating to greater or lesser degrees. Thus, the ability to make these differentiations within any single event may be a little more difficult—maybe really challenging, in fact. What parts of an event are regarded as “experiencing”; what aspects pertain to “understanding”; what parts of an event can be attributed to efforts at “discerning” and “judging”; and what precisely constitutes our “deciding”? While the four operations are easy to grasp intellectually, it’s more daunting to

actually make these differentiations in the moments and events that constitute our living in the real world.

This then leads to the question of applying this to educational philosophy. While we begin to make differentiations along these lines, I will offer ideas on how these different (but always interrelated) operations of consciousness factor into the activities and concerns in education. We will consider first, experiencing, second, understanding, followed by discerning/judging, and then deciding. Clearly, what follows is not a full-fledged educational philosophy, but rather a framework for developing one, and perhaps taking a first step toward a new philosophy of education.

### **Experiencing**

As conscious, sentient human beings we have experiences and, as such, experiences of all kinds come flooding into consciousness. It's not just sensory experience (hearing, seeing, and so forth) but experiences of images, feelings and thoughts—higher level experiences that tend to be more significant—what Dewey called “educationally valuable”). In fact, for Lonergan, the role of images and “imag-ination” are seen to play an enormously important role in what constitutes human experience. Another way to think about experiences is to regard them as “data.”

Lonergan regards all experiences as data—data of sense and data of consciousness that include our thoughts and feelings about sense data. On a purely experiential level, consciousness remains somewhat undeveloped, constantly receiving and creating all sorts of data coming to us, good or bad, significant or trivial, from the world external to ourselves and from the inner world of feelings and thoughts. But even on this level of “pure” experience, patterns begin to emerge and sorting processes begin. Some data capture our attention and other data escape our notice or are noticed by immediately disregarded. Experiences run the scale from the superficial and inconsequential to those deemed rich and meaningful. But what is the difference in these various types of experiences and how does one deal with such a wide range of experiences on the basic level of conscious awareness?

Besides positive experiences that enrich our lives, we all have negative experiences that can hold us back and cause us to withdraw from further experiences or otherwise impoverish our lives in

some small way, or perhaps in very significant ways. This is jumping ahead, though, since determining what are negative or positive experiences occur as a different level of operation in our consciousness. The point here, however, is that we have all kinds of experiences over which, initially, we have little control. As “experiencers,” and to become better experiencers, it is important to notice our experiences and to be attentive. Lonergan relates one’s noticing to what he calls a key imperative, “be attentive.”

Lonergan’s contribution to an account of experiences centers on a recognition of experiences as a basic level in the operations of human consciousness, but which includes not only sensory experiences with which we are all familiar, but also experiences of intelligence and understanding, of discernment and judgment, and experiences of deliberating and deciding. These “data of consciousness,” in addition to sensory data, become present to us in terms of how we “feel” about our thoughts and ideas, our judging and our deciding. Lonergan sums up what is meant by “experience” as an element or level in human consciousness.

By consciousness is meant an awareness immanent in cognitional acts. But such acts differ in kind, and so the awareness differs in kind with the acts. There is empirical consciousness characteristic of sensing, perceiving, imagining. As the content of these acts is merely presented or represented, so the awareness immanent in the acts is the mere givenness of the acts.”<sup>16</sup>

To explain further what is meant by “data of consciousness,” an important dimension of experiencing is attending to what Lonergan calls “desire.” A basic manifestation of desire appears as an experiential drive that propels our consciousness forward in its development. On the experiential level there is a pure desire to know. Lonergan states,

...[F]or the guiding orientation of the scientist [as a paradigmatic knower] is the orientation of inquiring intelligence, the orientation that of its nature is a pure, detached, disinterested desire simply to know. For there is an intellectual desire, an Eros of the mind....<sup>17</sup>

While desire, this “Eros of the mind,” is an experience, per se, its focus is on understanding and knowledge, and as such constitutes an element in our “data of consciousness.”

### **Experience Related to Education**

Traditionally, education was primarily, perhaps solely, about learning various subjects. How a subject related to you in your life or how you felt about it had little consequence. It was most important that you, as a student, were able to intellectually grasp what you needed to know about a subject and to pass a test. As educators began to reflect on this mode of education, it became clear that students learn better, learn more, and have a more enjoyable and rewarding learning experience when a subject taught had some relevance to their lives, when students could experience in some way, directly or indirectly, various dimensions of history, biology, or whatever was being taught and studied. Education that began to incorporate more experiential and experimental components came to be known as “progressive.”

Drawing on one of the earliest architects of experientially-based education, John Dewey explains the importance of having “quality experiences” that are “educationally worthwhile,” of valuing an “experiential continuum” based on habits that give rise to the formation of basic sensibilities and “emotional and intellectual attitudes,” that lead to physical, intellectual and moral growth.”<sup>18</sup> The great American pragmatist and philosopher of education, John Dewey, was brilliant in bringing to the fore the experience of students. Unfortunately, it is my contention that as a pragmatist, his philosophical commitments (biases) did not allow him to grasp very well the “transcendental drive” operative in human beings (the higher and ultimately the universal viewpoint) that energizes and upwardly directs the world of human experience toward a grasp of the question concerning the existence and nature of God. Moreover, while Dewey provides important insights into the role of experience in education, his system of thought does not offer clear and thorough analysis of the nature of human experience and its role in the larger unfolding of human consciousness, personal and social development that composes life of the educated individual. Lonergan’s system of thought, however, does provide this.

A better mode of education based on the importance of human experience unfolds as one that embraces and values a wide range of human experience, encourages learners to notice and to attend to their own experiences and to explore the richness of those experiences, and relates the experiential level of consciousness to the other basic levels.

---

## Ignatian Scholars, Regis University

### 1. Assigned Reading on “Experience”

Tad Dunne, “The Praxis of Noticing” in *Spiritual Mentoring*  
<http://users.wowway.com/~tdunne5273/SpMent.pdf>  
**Read pages 65-77.** (Permissions given for general use)

Kurt M. Denk, S.J. “Making Connections, Finding Meaning, Engaging the World:  
 Theory and Techniques for Ignatian Reflection on Service for and with Others.”

[http://www.loyola.edu/Justice/ignatian%20spirituality%20resources\\_LIVE\\_.html](http://www.loyola.edu/Justice/ignatian%20spirituality%20resources_LIVE_.html)  
**Click on the Link to “Template for Ignatian Reflection by Kurt Denk, S.J., and see  
 “Reflections on ‘Experience’”, pp. 5-8, and do the exercises.** (Permissions given for  
 classroom use)

### 2. Additional Resources on Experience and Education

Dewey, John. *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books, 1963. (First  
 published in 1938. A classic that helped spark the progressive movement in education  
 and “experienced-based” learning.)

Buchmann, Margret and John Schwille, “Education: the Overcoming of Experience”  
*American Journal of Education*, Vol. 92, no. 1 (November 1983): 30-51. (The authors  
 argue against the importance of “first-hand experience” in education. One needs to  
 consider contrary views.)

Andersen, Lee, David Boud and Ruth Cohen, “Experienced-based Learning” in  
*Understanding Adult Education and Training*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1999.  
 Pp. 225-239. (The authors strongly advocate the importance of experience in education  
 and learning, but allude to some philosophically-based concerns.)

## Understanding

When one begins to have experiences they soon begin readily to fall into patterns, and those patterns begin to repeat (as is what patterns tend to do). As one example of an experience that tends to repeat, when you buy a Honda CRV, you very likely will notice every other CRV you pass on the road. Patterns of your experience may broaden to where you notice rims and tires, racks and trailer hitches. These patterns can lead to further patterns of experiences. Why does this happen? What can change these types of patterns of experience?

In addition to repetitions, from a base in our experience we begin to wonder about things and begin to ask questions. Have you ever thought about what a marvelous experience it is to ask a question? Asking questions is one of the really exciting dimensions of being human. We are knowers, carers and lovers because we are question-askers. In so many ways, question-asking affirms our unique existence as conscious beings-in-the-world. When you ask a really good question, it makes you *feel* really good. One often experiences a particular exhilaration when this happens. As we begin to ask questions, a fuller dynamism of our consciousness begins to unfold.

Lonergan explains that different types of questions have different functions and they anticipate different results. Early on, one main goal in question-asking is to gain understanding. Gaining understanding has been a topic that has captured the attention of great philosophers over the centuries. One recalls Hume's *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding* and Kant's three great critiques (of Pure Reason, Practical Reason and of Judgment). Of course, we now know of Lonergan's work in this area, his chief philosophical work, *Insight. A Study of Human Understanding*.

Lonergan explains that understanding is achieved as we seek to make sense of experience, first hand (personal) experience and even second hand (historical) experience of a family, a community, a society. Understanding occurs as we piece things together and create order out of the confusion or disorder that our "pure" experiences tend to be. Understanding unfolds when the significance and possible meanings of things are grasped. Meaning is what happens when the patterns of experience are grasped or conceptualized in some way, when ideas about how the elements of our experience are put together and interrelated. Deeper meaning occurs when greater levels and more complexities of interrelations are discovered. Understanding is the occurrence of insight, of meaning, when we catch on intellectually to the way things are or could be in relation to other things. We have such acts of insight (acts of understanding) all the time. Some of them are very mundane and largely unnoticed, and some of them very dramatic, profound and life changing.



However, the really profound realization here is not that we have insights and understandings, but that there is a structure and process to them all. It is a matter of “insight into insight,” of grasping the dynamism at play in question-asking and answer-giving processes. As is sometimes said about Jesuit education, it is more about the questions than the answers. This is true, in a sense, for Lonergan, but his approach also involves a full appreciation and deep level grasp of the dynamism of the relation between the question and the answer.

For Lonergan, the phenomenon of understanding occurs as an intellectual “coming to life,” as it were. It can occur in a moment, in a flash of brilliance when one “sees the light,” when one “catches on.” Understanding can also occur in a painstaking process of study and struggle over weeks, months and even years leading to when an insight finally surfaces in one’s consciousness. However it occurs, in solving a crossword puzzle or in developing a unified field theory, an emotional experience—a sense of satisfaction or an overwhelming exhilaration—can result, but then further questions can surface, “Is this really true?”; “Can I be mistaken?”

Much could be said about this operation, this level, of human consciousness. (Again, Lonergan offers hundreds of pages on this in his book, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*.) However, let us consider its relation to education.

### **Understanding Related to Education**

An education that gives pride of place to insight and understanding – and all good education at some stage, in one way or another, does this – concerns itself largely with the intellectual development of the learner and the grasp of some familiarity with a field of knowledge and perhaps an acquisition of a skill set. Today, this is often referred to as “literacy.” This sort of education was championed in the middle part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as “traditional education” (in part as a reaction against “progressive education” that seemed intellectually weak), and in the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as “liberal” or “general” education. The “Great Books” programs, as an example of this, focus primarily on understanding the canon of Western thought. It also has been manifest in education that focuses on “training,” on gaining a proficiency in subject area, or achieving excellence in a field of study and being regarded as a “professional.”

But is this the whole story of the drama of human consciousness? “Insights are a dime a dozen,” Lonergan says.<sup>19</sup> Some insights are great and profound world-shaping illuminations. Others are mundane, used merely to get your clothes on in the morning or help put food on the table. Moreover, some insights seem so true and compelling while others seem odd or outlandish. In any case, further questions about insights arise (or should arise).

With further questions and an unfolding of understanding a new mode of consciousness emerges, and a new operation becomes engaged. The activities of your consciousness, as it were, are put into a different gear, and the drive forward moves to a different level.

Lonergan explains further the nature of understanding.

“By consciousness is meant an awareness immanent in cognitional acts. But such acts differ in kind, and so the awareness differs in kind with the act.... But there is an intelligent consciousness characteristic of inquiry, insight, and formulation. On this level cognitional process not merely strives for and reaches the intelligible, but in doing so it exhibits its intelligence; it operates intelligently. The awareness is present but it is the awareness of intelligence, of what strives to understand, of what is satisfied by understanding, of what formulates the understood, not as a schoolboy repeating by rote a definition, but as one that defines because he grasps why that definition hits things off.”<sup>20</sup>

Ignatian Scholars, Regis University

### 1. Assigned Readings on “Understanding”

Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., “Lonergan’s Structure of Cognition”: <http://lonergan.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Structure-of-Cognition1.pdf> Focus on parts (1) through (5). (Open Access)

Andrew Dwight, “Authentic Human Development and Vector Forces in Education: Drawing on the Thought of Bernard Lonergan, S.J. in Addressing Some Key Issues in Educational Philosophy,” *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (2012): <http://jesuithighereducation.org/index.php/jhe/article/view/8>. This is a complex article, but, based on this article, what insights or questions do you have about Lonergan’s notion of understanding? (Open Access)

### 2. Additional Resources on Understanding and Education

Kieran Egan, *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape our Understanding* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997).

Howard Gardner, *Intelligence Reframes: Multiple Intelligences for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1999)

Israel Scheffler, *Conditions of Knowledge: An Introduction to Epistemology and Education* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965).

---

## **Judging**

As human consciousness develops in healthy ways, we begin to wonder if our insights or the insights of others are completely wacky, reasonably accurate, or solidly correct and true. As we wonder about insights and understandings, new questions arise in the inquiring mind that propels one's consciousness to a whole new level. On this level, reflections on being discerning, on assessing the evidence, surface that then lead to acts of making a judgment. And when a judgment occurs, Lonergan states, our understanding becomes "knowledge."

Human beings, however, are not perfect creatures and thus not perfect knowers. In fact, we are prone to blind spots, to barking up the wrong tree, so to speak, to seeing only what we want to see and ignoring all sorts of important factors. We can adjust or correct some of these shortcomings relatively easily and quickly but others we cannot correct without a great deal of honesty, effort and commitment.

Questions arise as to how we can make the required assessment, achieve the needed discernment and overcome the personal issues that may stand in our way. For Lonergan, addressing these new and deeper questions involves making good and better judgments.

In simplest terms, a good and true judgment about something rests upon knowing how well some particular understanding accounts for all the relevant data. Remember, there are data of sense and data of consciousness, and we account for these by concepts and by grasping possible meanings and obtaining understanding. Understanding, of course, can be correct or incorrect, or some gradation thereof. Lonergan explains how good judgments unfold.

On the level of judgment we raise the question as to how well concepts and suggested meanings we have answer all the questions that could be asked about some particular experience or set of

data. In the process of discerning and judging, we return to some possible explanation that we have settled upon, but then raise further questions about how well the explanation fits the data. In the process of judging, one moves toward a more solid and convincing answer as the questions become fewer and fewer. As the questions diminish, the understanding or explanation in question becomes more “secure,” and we approach a moment when we can make a sound judgment, “yes” or “no”, “maybe,” or perhaps to find that a judgment is still not ready to be made. The probability that a judgment is true can move closer and closer to certainty if one is truly open to unrestricted questioning. As this type of questioning proceeds, Lonergan believes at some point we can reach what he calls the grasping “virtually unconditioned.” That is to say, our answers and our assertions no longer have unanswered questions. All the relevant questions that can be posed have been posed and they have been answered in a satisfying way. We are at a place where a reasonable judgment can be made, and in a certain sense, we are compelled to do so. When this occurs, not only do we “understand” but we also “know.” If, however, all relevant questions are not asked and answered in a satisfying way, then we have something less than true knowledge. Our knowing is “in part” as St. Paul suggests, and our judgment is simply a matter of some degree of probability.

The result of making a sound judgment, Lonergan argues, is achieving true “objectivity.” This type of objectivity is not a matter merely of looking “out there” to see what’s “real” to oneself, but rather it is a matter of making a true judgment about our insights into the world or experience—the world of sense data and the world of data of consciousness. As we have seen, this can occur when the full and, as much as is possible unimpeded, operations of our own consciousness unfold. So, objectivity for Lonergan is not a matter of negating our subjectivity that may, as some believe, taint or skew objectivity. Rather, as Lonergan states, “objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity.”<sup>21</sup>

Lonergan takes this a step further in suggesting that when we truly know something, what we know is the “real world.” Authentic knowledge is not some illusion, not some set of interesting ideas, not some “reality” that we have created merely for ourselves, but it is the way things actually are. And we know this to be true because all the relevant questions, in an unrestricted way, have been answered so as to fully account for all the relevant data. When the questioning

has reached this level, we are compelled to affirm what is actually so, what is real. Lonergan calls this method of questioning and wrestling with the answers and finally settling on what actually in the case, “critical realism.”

In Lonergan’s words,

By consciousness is meant an awareness immanent in cognitional acts. But such acts differ in kind, and so the awareness differs in kind with the acts. . . . Finally, on the third level of reflection, grasp of the unconditioned, and judgment, there is rational consciousness. It is the emergence and the effective operation of a single law of utmost generality, the law of sufficient reason, where the sufficient reason is the unconditioned. It emerges as a demand for the unconditioned and a refusal to assent unreservedly on any lesser ground.<sup>22</sup>

### **Judging as an Issue in Education**

“Judgment” has been a longstanding issue in education. It surfaces especially in traditions in education where the chief goal is “wisdom.”<sup>23</sup> More recently, questions of judgment appear in new models of education focused explicitly on what is commonly called “critical thinking.”

While educators today have the mandate to teach critical thinking, one might be hard-pressed to find a well-developed philosophy of judgment associated with it. There are guides and manuals that are used in the classroom to promote critical thinking, but these focus on problem solving, on ways to look at situations, and how to think more clearly and effectively. The focus seems to be more on exercises and techniques than on a larger view of how consciousness operates and what it means to be an authentic, integrated and wise human being. Lonergan, however, offers this.

Critical thinking as it appears now in many curricula in various ways ought to be championed, but it seems to be lacking a fuller vision of what education ultimately should entail—self-understanding, self-knowledge and personal authenticity. A Jesuit-based model of education and educational philosophy, one that could do well in drawing explicitly on the work of Lonergan, provides opportunities and strategies for learners to become good, better, sound, trustworthy discerners and judges. It also promotes and develops teachers and learners in deepening self-knowledge and effectively caring for others and the world, as we see in the next level of deciding.

---

---

Ignatian Scholars, Regis University

1. Assigned Readings on “Discerning”/“Judging”

Tad Dunne, “Critical Thinking and Bias:

<http://users.wowway.com/~tdunne5273/Critical%20Thinking.pdf>

2. Additional Resources on Judgment and Education

John Chaffee, *Thinking Critically*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991)

Patricia King and Karen Kitchener, *Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and Promoting Intellectual Growth and Critical Thinking in Adolescents and Adults* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994)

Bruce R. Reichenbach, *Introduction to Critical Thinking* (Boston: McGraw Hill Higher Education, 2001)

---

## **Deciding**

In Lonergan’s system of thought, once we become good knowers (that is to say, “good judges”—since knowledge culminates in an act of judgment), we also begin to catch on to what knowing really is, and we begin to apply those operations of consciousness to all aspects of life. As such, then, the next distinctive stage of human conscious development emerges – that of making choices, of deciding, of engaging in wise living. It is what Aristotle calls “phronesis” (practical wisdom) or what Alasdair MacIntyre champions as “virtue ethics.”<sup>24</sup>

Basically, our consciousness takes on yet another mode of operating when we are confronted with the question of what to do about our knowledge. The answer could be to do nothing, but that is an answer nonetheless, or perhaps one decides that some course of action is the “right” or the “best” one to follow. The answer also could be to wait, to hold off on acting, for any number of reasons.

When we move to the level of deciding, we actually begin to make our way in the world, we become participants more fully in the life of the family, the group, a society, a culture. On this

level, the moral and ethical dimensions of human life are considered – questions of how to treat others, how better to conduct oneself in the world and how best to live one’s life in accord with the history and values of your own existence. On the level of deciding, optimally, one actually seeks to do “good” and advance the “common good.”

Lonergan eloquently explains human development in terms of this level of consciousness.

In fact, the emergence of the fourth level of deliberation, evaluation, choice is a slow process that occurs between the ages of three and six. Then the child’s earlier affective symbiosis with the mother is complemented by relations with the father who recognizes in the child a potential person, tells him or her what he or she may and may not do, sets before him or her a model of human conduct, and promises to good behavior the later rewards of the self-determining adult. So the child gradually enters the world mediated by meaning and regulated by values and, by the age of seven, is thought to have attained the use of reason. Still this is only the beginning of human authenticity. One has to have passed well beyond the turmoil of puberty before becoming fully responsible in the eyes of the law. One has to have found out for oneself that one has to decide for oneself what one is to make of oneself; one has to have proved oneself equal to that moment of existential decision; and one has to have kept on proving it in all subsequent decisions, if one is to be an authentic human person.<sup>25</sup>

It is on this level that existential philosophy takes its cue and tends to privilege the act of deciding over all else. Notably, existentialists Friedrich Nietzsche and Jean Paul Sartre praise the heroic act of deciding in face of the ultimate meaninglessness of life and the abyss towards which all human existence is drawn. Lonergan, however, as a different sort of existentialist, stresses the importance of meaning and reasonableness that lead to an existence deemed “authentic,” one that desires and is driven toward “transcendence” and the Transcendent.

### **Deciding Related to Education**

More than valuing equally *all* decision-making and championing “courage” in making decisions, as may be the case with some existentialist philosophers, a Jesuit model of education clearly prizes a concern for the reasonable, the “good,” and the “right” decisions. For example, a distinctly Jesuit-based education concerns peace and justice, leadership, moral development and service to the community. Persons are called upon to “make the good world better” through making decision on what counts as the good and the right, and actually to help bring them about. Thus, service learning remains a fundamental value in Jesuit education.

As a Jesuit philosopher, Lonergan stressed the importance of the decisional mode of human consciousness as a distinct operation that unfolds in terms of a highly differentiated but integrated set of cognitional operations that establish what counts as knowledge, and what counts as knowledge of the good. Lonergan uniquely sets forth a basic account of the structure and operations of human consciousness with its key differentiations that can help bring this about.

Do we find in educational theory and philosophy expressions on this decisional level of human consciousness? More often than not the concern and focus in education is with meaning, understanding and interpretation, and developing reasoning and critical skills. However, in “constructivism,” one of the more popular recent trends in educational theory based largely on the thought and analysis of Jean Piaget, the questions of decision-making comes to the fore in terms of both epistemology and social construction: we construct our own meaning and understanding, and we construct the “products” to be understood.<sup>26</sup> To be sure, this movement in education, complex and multi-dimensional, builds on the notion that individuals create for themselves their world of understanding and being. For Lonergan, this concern focuses on what he sets for as the level of deciding.

---

### Ignatian Scholars, Regis University

#### 1. Assigned Readings on “Deciding”

Terry J. Tekippe and Louis Roy, “Lonergan and the Fourth Level of Intentionality”

American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly, vol. 70 (1996): 225-42. Especially sections III “The Fourth Level”, VI “The Decision” and VII “Conclusion.”

<http://lonergan.concordia.ca/dialectics/tt.htm>

#### 2. Additional Resources on Decision-making in Education

Catherine T. Fosnot, ed., *Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, and Practice*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 2005).

D. C. Phillips, ed., *Constructivism in Education: Opinions and Second Opinions on Controversial Issues* (Chicago: The University Press of Chicago, 2000).

---



## Critique and Summary

It is a mistake to suggest that the various levels and operations Lonergan elucidated are new to educational philosophy. The opposite, in fact, is the case. Important themes and concerns in educational philosophy relate to one or combinations of the four levels he has identified. What's new in Lonergan, I maintain, is his thoroughgoing account of the differentiations of *all* the key elements of consciousness, and thus, the key elements of education and educational philosophy, in one grand system of thought, and has explained throughout his writings not only the differentiations but also the interrelations and the integration of these elements. Lonergan believed that these four basic patterns of operations of experiencing, understanding, discerning and deciding are fundamental to everything human beings know and do—whether we acknowledge, understand or affirm them or not. When we don't acknowledge them, we operate with “undifferentiated consciousness” and when we do acknowledge and understand them, we operate with “differentiated consciousness.”

These operations unfold in response to various sets of questions related to each of these four levels. In fact, it is the role and function of “the question” that can bring to light these differentiations and spark the operations of these different levels of consciousness. Together, the operations of consciousness propel us to new heights of discovery and learning, to a more deeply grounded authenticity, where we in ever greater degrees acknowledge who we are as conscious, knowing and caring human beings, and as we operate explicitly in terms of that acknowledgment. We become authentic knowers and doers as we unrestrictedly ask questions concerning being attentive, intelligent, reasonable and responsible. Moreover, Lonergan has provided some broad lines of what human existence appears as, individually and collectively, when these levels and operations become increasingly realized—as persons, as communities, as societies become committed to being attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible and loving. Although it is beyond the scope of this essay to delve into these possibilities, one could begin to reflect on what the results may be for one's own life and the life of a community.

For the field of education, it is my conviction that these differentiated and integrated operations can place education on a new and exciting pathway. It can place education on a solid methodological footing that helps teachers and students achieve the most in their formal studies,

and in life-long learning, and helps educators realize greater integration of the far too often isolated and imperialistic sets of disciplines. Ultimately, this Lonerganian approach to life and education can help bring persons and communities to greater realizations of the common good and to ever greater expressions of authentic existence, to new dimensions of self-knowledge, to a deeper knowledge of the world in which we live, and to wrestle with the questions of ultimate meaning and reality.

In lauding this approach to education, however, there should be a word or two of caution. These take the form of a few questions that for me remain still unresolved. Does Lonergan rely too heavily on the scientific paradigm for understanding completely what counts as knowing, and thus what is revealed of the structure and operations of human consciousness? Are there other types of knowing that are legitimate but which reveal variant structures and processes of consciousness? I am reminded of the work of Temple Grandin on the autistic brain and that thinking and “knowing” consist primarily of pictures rather than words and concepts, and occur as single instances of knowledge rather than a cumulative process of experiencing, understanding and judging endemic to empirical method.<sup>27</sup> Is Lonergan’s account general enough to accommodate the more outlying versions of human knowing? Does research demonstrate the effectiveness and value of mapping a broad approach to education based on the structure and operations of human consciousness? Does it follow that, simply because our consciousness operates in an invariant pattern, education should (or optimally) follow this pattern? Could the argument be made that education occurs not as an operation of a single consciousness but rather as an interplay of various “consciousnesses” – the student and the teacher, at minimum, and as such, does this intersubjectivity also engage the same general structure and operations – or are there different, equally fundamental, elements that come into play?

At any rate, as is Lonergan’s invitation, further questions arise. Answers to none of these questions may perhaps not prove to be detrimental or devastating to a Lonerganian philosophy of education, or they may prove to be additional support for this approach. But these, and probably a host of other questions, still need to be asked, probed and answered satisfactorily. At the end of the day, however, it is probably safe to affirm that in whatever ways education can enhance, deepen, enrich and enliven one’s experiencing, one’s understanding, the breadth of one’s

discernments and judging, and the clarity and wisdom of one's deciding, that education, then, is on a right track. Education would do well, practically and philosophically, to appropriate in more intentional ways these differentiated yet interrelated operations.

## **Appendix: An Illustration**

A model from the legal world illustrates quite well the elements of human consciousness, their differentiations, and reveals their norms of operation, and how the levels interoperate. But first, an initial question leaps to mind: Why is it that we find within the field of Law a clear illustration of the levels and operations of the human mind? I will leave this question for you to ponder.

This illustration also helps one grasp these differentiations and interrelations in one's own consciousness. (I am indebted to Frederick Crowe, S.J., for introducing this analogy to me.)

The model comes from the American justice system, a system from the commonsense world that addresses the need for a full account of experience, understanding, truth (judgment), responsibility and reasonable consequences.

**Experiencing** -- What happened to those involved in the crime?

- from the perspective of the prosecution
- from the perspective of the defense

**Understanding** -- How can these experiences be understood?

Really, this is where the lawyers from both sides step up to present their arguments, cross-examination occurs of the witnesses of the direct experience, or of what expert witnesses offer by way of understanding the case.

**Judging** -- What is really the case? Whose interpretation of events is better, is best, is ultimately correct?

**Deciding** -- What is to be done about the judgment? Is the accused acquitted? Sentenced? And if sentenced, what is the appropriate sentence?

These four levels have corresponding imperatives that Lonergan identifies:

**Be attentive**

**Be intelligent**

**Be reasonable**

**Be responsible**

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Gerard Whelan, S.J., “The Continuing Significance of Bernard Lonergan” *Thinking Faith* [http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/20080923\\_1.htm](http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/20080923_1.htm) (*Thinking Faith* is the online journal of the British Jesuits.)

<sup>2</sup> Hugo Meynell, *Redirecting Philosophy: Reflections on the Nature of Knowledge from Plato to Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*.<sup>3</sup> *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, Volume 3* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Herder and Herder, 1972)

<sup>6</sup> While it is not especially scholarly to refer to book cover blurbs, this one appears on the cover of the 1978 edition of *Insight* as a reference to the *Newsweek* article where this quote first appeared.

<sup>7</sup> John Macquarrie, *Twentieth Century Religious Thought* (London: SCM Press, 1988), pp. 379-80.

<sup>8</sup> For an excellent, authoritative overview of Lonergan’s work, see Tad Dunne’s entry in the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/lonergan/#H5>.

<sup>9</sup> Parker Palmer is widely known for his epithet concerning teachers, “we teach who we are.”

<sup>10</sup> Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Topics in Education. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, Volume 10*. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert Doran, eds. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

<sup>11</sup> *Topics in Education*, p. 24.

<sup>12</sup> Center for Mission and Identity, Xavier University, *Teaching to the Mission: A Compendium of the Ignatian Mentoring Program* (Cincinnati, OH: Xavier University, 2010). The book offers insight and methods in integrating ideals of the Jesuit mission across the departments and disciplines of Xavier University.

<sup>13</sup> Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: the Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989). Taylor regards a sense of “inwardness,” the realm of ideas and self-understanding as a key dimension of identity. Lonergan calls this realm, “interiority.”

<sup>14</sup> Frederick E. Crowe, “The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan’s Intellectualism” in *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S.J.*, Frederick E. Crowe, ed. (Chicago: Saint Xavier College/Continuum, 1964): 27.

---

<sup>15</sup> I tend to prefer the term “discerning” since “judging” tends to carry negative connotations, such as being “judgmental” or “negative” about things. Discerning seems to be more neutral. However, in philosophical language, the term “judgment” occurs as a commonly used category for study and analysis.

<sup>16</sup> Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978), p. 322.

<sup>17</sup> Lonergan, *Insight* (1978), p. 74.

<sup>18</sup> John Dewey, “Criteria of Experience” in *Experience and Education* (New York: Collier Books, 1963), pp. 33-38.

<sup>19</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, p. 13.

<sup>20</sup> Lonergan, *Insight* (1978), p. 322.

<sup>21</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, p. 292

<sup>22</sup> Lonergan, *Insight* (1978), p. 322.

<sup>23</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (New York: Free Press, 1967), and Malcolm D. Evans, *Whitehead and Philosophy of Education: The Seamless Coat of Learning* (Atlanta, GA: Editions Rodopi B. V., 1998).

<sup>24</sup> Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virture: A Study in Moral Theory*, 3<sup>rd</sup>. ed. (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2007).

<sup>25</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, p. 121.

<sup>26</sup> Kenneth R. Howe and Jason Berv, “Constructing Constructivism, Epistemology and Pedagogy,” and Eric Bredo, “Reconsidering Social Constructivism: The Relevance of George Herbert Mead’s Interactionism,” in *Constructivism in Education: Opinions and Second Opinions on Controversial Issues*, D. C. Phillips, ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 19-40 and 127-157.

<sup>27</sup> Temple Grandin and Richard Panek, *The Autistic Brain: Thinking Across the Spectrum* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013).