

Loungers

QUESTIONS

2 August 1971

1. This morning it was demonstrated that in order to attempt a revision of the basic pattern of cognitional operations outlined, one would, in fact, have to repeat this very pattern.

But does this fact (that one would have to use this structure in an attempt to revise this structure) by itself prove that one could not achieve a revision; that the structure might be altered, so to speak, from within?

Or was the point of this argument simply to illustrate dramatically that any problem one tackles must necessarily be tackled according to this pattern of operations?

by

2. Could you please explain further what you mean by originating values?

a. How does the pure desire to know as developed in Insight relate to your recent stress on the good and value as being what is primarily intended in cognitional process and underlies it? Would it be correct to speak more fundamentally of the pure desire for value rather than ~~for~~ the pure desire to know?

3. You spoke of 4 transcendentals: the intelligible, the true, the real, and the good. Why do you distinguish between the true and the real as transcendentals and what is their intelligible differentiation?

a. Would you consider "The Beautiful" as a Transcendental?

If so, is it distinct from the other Transcendentals, or included in one of the others?

Further, if it is a Transcendental, how does it fit into a correlation with the 4 level knowing-structure?

4. Would you please explain the expressions "comprehensive in~~nk~~ connotation" and "unrestricted in denotation" as you use them in reference to transcendental method?

a. Why are Heidegger's Existentiells not elements of a transcendental method equally as well as the ones you have explained? Are they comprehensive in connotation, unrestricted in denotation, and invariant through cultural changes? Would not Heidegger affirm that they are?

Lonergan 2.

Questions from Monday and Tuesday, 2 and 3 August: 2 Aug. 1971

4. Would Fr. Lonergan expand a little on the criterion of the happy conscience and relate it to the various instances of reaching the unconditioned dealt with in the chapter in Insight on "Reflective Understanding"  
Is it similar to the judgment on the correctness of an insight which hinges on the absence of further relevant questions, but now with the further component of meeting satisfactorily the demands of our moral feelings?
5. Is Fr. Lonergan's present account of feeling as apprehending value related not only genetically but also dialectically to his comments on feelings in Ch.17 of Insight?
6. Since the good of order cannot be reduced to any particular good or goods, is it therefore possible to make a judgement about the good of order which is not logically reducible to a judgement about a particular good or goods?
7. You spoke of a symbol as an "image which evokes a feeling or is evoked by a feeling." Does not a symbol evoke a cluster of meanings - feeling laden meanings perhaps - but meaning as well as feelings, e.g. in the sacraments as forms of symbolic expression? Would you kindly comment on the connection between what you said about symbols and the field of sacramental theology?
8. The symbol as a "carrier of meaning" Do you think symbols (myths included) are only carriers of meaning, or are they somehow 'fountains' of meanings, as Ricoeur has it: *Le symbole donne à penser*. (i.e. do you get meaning through symbols, or do you find it in and from symbolic language? Not through an allegoric interpretation; but by a creative one!
9. Would Fr. Lonergan give some indication of how his account of feelings as apprehending values relates to earlier but apparently more explanatory context of the Chapter on development in Insight?
10. Would Fr. Lonergan ~~express~~ express his discussion of feelings in terms of metaphysical elements, please?
11. Does the notion of intersubjectivity refer to a peculiarly human social property, or can it extend to cover such questions as territoriality, dominance, hierarchy etc. in non-human animals? If not how are the phrases 'simple prolongations of pre-human attainment', 'more elementary processes', 'primordial basis' used in Insight Ch 8 p.212 to be cashed?

Questions from Mon. and Tues., 2 and 3 Aug:

*Lorenson*  
2 Aug 1971

3.

12. I would like to put--as a question-- a sort of common sense objection to the idea that there could be a transcendental method that holds good for every case of human knowing.

A person might object as follows: Bearing in mind the immense variety and sophistication of philosophical and psychological discussion of this topic (viz, knowledge), is it not much more likely that a person claiming to offer an account of such a "transcendental method" would be wrong in his claim (viz that it holds good for all knowing) than that he would be right.

Put directly to the text of your lecture, the question could run: If you are offering us an account of this method which is in principle revisable than any revision of it would necessarily be by means of the revised method. If, on the other hand, you are offering us an account which is only revisable by your method, then in fact what you are offering is not an account at all, but the method itself.

It is this latter position which would be open then to the implausibility objection offered by the common sense objector.

13. You mentioned this morning that the unity of the sciences cannot be grounded in the object because the object is changing. I have 2 difficulties about this:

a. Since there is an isomorphism between the subject and the object, will not the unity have to be similar on both sides? I recall your remark in Divinarum Personarum that paralleling experience, understanding, and judging in the subject are matter, form and existence in the object.

b. Is the object changing all that radically? Has it not got a central form? However you may prefer to deal with this later if you are speaking of the difference between classical and modern science.

14. In the light of this morning's lecture, would you care to elaborate on the question of beauty as a transcendental?