

2475AD0E050

Crowe, Questions for Fr. Lonergan on *Insight*

Possibly related to Crowe's preparing to read '*Insight: Preface to a Discussion*' for Lonergan at the 1958 Convention of the American Catholic Philosophical Association.

In his editorial notes to the paper '*Insight: Preface to a Discussion*' Frederick Crowe indicates that he had had some correspondence with Bernard Lonergan prior to the 1958 convention of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1958. Crowe had been asked to read the paper '*Insight: Preface to a Discussion*,' in Lonergan's stead. This correspondence 'dealt with questions I thought might be raised at the convention' (CWL 4: 285).

At least some of the correspondence to which Crowe refers and related materials have been found in the Crowe's papers and are reproduced in this item and several others that will follow.

The first document is a 4-page set of handwritten 'Questions for Fr. Lonergan on *Insight*.' Crowe is the author. In the Crowe Archive this item is CA122.2.2.4. The number assigned to it in placing it on the Lonergan archive website is due to its possible connection with '*Insight: Preface to a Discussion*,' 24750DTEL50.

Page numbers at the very beginning refer to one of Lonergan's typescripts, the one that is to be found on [www.bernardlonergan.com](http://www.bernardlonergan.com) at 34300DTE050. The page numbers quickly shift to those found in the earlier editions of *Insight*.

The document reads as follows.

[page 1]

### Questions for Fr Lonergan on *Insight*

omit: (1) If the *ideae rerum* are formally many in God, does my argument that the *sensus scientiae* is determined objective only by *the mind of the sacred writer*, fall? For it is objectively in the *noema* of God's thoughts.

### Corrections for *Insight*

cf. 43 ff. Points & lines cannot be imagined  
- imagined equal radii

45 explains – imagination endeavoring to run parallel to intelligent suppositions  
The image strains to approximate to the concept cf also 56-57

52  $2 + 1 + 1 = 3 + 1$   
Hence, from the table  $2 + 2 = 4$

[from the table, plus the postulate of ... of combination, nonne?] [RD: Crowe is referring to ‘the postulate about adding equals to equals’ found in the same section.]

Notes (from this point on the page numbers are those found pre-CWL editions of *Insight*)

Ch. 3: how does canon of selection differ from canon of parsimony

97 – are angelic insights always concrete (end of 6.5). [RD: FEC is referring to the following paragraph: ‘Secondly, our analysis prescind from all questions regarding the intellectual capacity of Laplace’s demon and other non-human beings. Clearly such issues have no bearing on the nature of empirical science or, indeed, of human understanding. Finally, this restriction seems contained in our definition of an orderly sequence; for a sequence is orderly if it can be mastered by an insight that can be expressed in general terms and, it would seem, only human insights can be so expressed.’]

103 – good summary of first 3 chapters

126 sqq. – why is there no mention of entropy, the running down of world process, in this outline?

169 – why has the velocity of light a place of privilege in space-time measurements?

175 – the statistical indeterminate until insight into particulars is added  
c.s. is indeterminate until insight into particulars is added  
why then the opposition on the ground that c.s. is incomplete?

180: in c.s. the set of insights varies in diff. cases

[in sc. the set of insights receives additions sine internal change??]

211: in c.s. the set of insights completed *differently* in each conc. sit.

321 – awareness opposed to content as common to variety

322 – awareness also varies – cf. 324

[Ultimately, ‘awareness’ is grasped, I suppose, in a new beginning, like a circle. You can’t prove it by any argument. Again, the common awareness of 322 & 326 is on the empirical level.]

486 – Disagrees with Spinoza’s *ordo idearum est ordo rerum*, on ground that it is deductivist. But asserts, 488, the deduction given [?] to met. elements.  
N.B. Comes to grips w this q on p. 499. Cf. 603.

516 Material intelligibility is understood – but (342) it includes the empirical residue.

535 Metaphysics a corollary to self-knowledge. (ref to summary of part 1 of book)

540 Revision of history due to (1) new data, (2) new investigators – scil. each age has to rewrite past in own terms.

697 Sol to p. of e. in some sense transcendent or supernatural  
But p. 725 – natural, rel. sup, or absol. sup  
Hence in 697 trans & sup must be disjoined: either t. or sup.

341 Kant’s categories flexible & mysterious, but 423 – rigidity of his a priori.

[page 2]

ISHU – review

521 similarity of BL’s met. & Ar. & Aq,  
‘Still, there is a basic novelty, for these results are obtained not by strokes of genius but by method.’

523 BL’s met. traditional, but ‘pulled neatly and effectively out of the compromising orbit of Aristotle’s physics’  
possibility of ‘an invasion of the new territory of explanatory genera and species and of processes of development’

524 BL’s objective – to test his method, not to articulate a metaphysics

But proof of possibility is fact. Hence his ... with met.

?? of prop. being – k. of th. as rel. to us

k. of th. as rel. to one another: science that explains  
met. that anticipates the  
general struc. of p. b. as  
explained

526 demand for meth. in met. arose in medieval universities  
is basic preoccupation of subsequent philosophies

527 ‘once reason is acknowledged to be distinct from faith, there is issued an invitation to reason to grow in consciousness of its native power, to claim its proper field of inquiry, ..., to determine its own methods ... Such was the underlying significance of the discovery of Ar. by the medieval age of faith. Such too was the open significance of Renaissance humanism, Renaissance philosophy, and Renaissance science.’

528 But Desc ‘innocent of the notion that sc. could be pursued with a similar independence of philosophy ... Clearly the dist between reason and faith had to be followed by a dist. between science and philosophy.’

## CH. 17

530: ‘Hegel has obliged (subseq. philosophers) not only to account for their own views but also to explain the existence of contrary convictions and opinions.’

Hence our appeal not only to isomorphism of cognitional activity and pb  
(which accounts for our work)

but also to polymorphism of human consc (which refers to contrary views)

572 evolution of philosophic expression from Gks, Plato, Ar, Schol, Kant, to Hegel.

590 Re interp: ‘in the measure that the universal viewpoint is reached, radical surprises are excluded; ... in the measure that eventually there was closed the gap that once existed between original meaning and available resources of expression, it is possible to begin from the later, more adequate expression and remount to the origin of the ideas in the initial, transforming stresses and strains in linguistic usage.’ [from Aq. to ?]

595 a method of ethics that parallels the m. of m.’

[page 3]

ISHU – a review

618 ‘As met. is a corollary to the struct. of knowing, so ethics is a cor. to the str. of knowing and doing.

639: On critical survey to set aside qq. that cannot (now) be answered, and limiting attention to those which can be answered.

640: But this critical issue can be tackled only piecemeal. For poss of kn is proved only by fact of kn.

‘it is only in the grand strategy that guides the seriation of the facts that the answer to the critical issue appears.’

[on Xt’s answer, see p. 556.] [Note diff. of B, C, D etc. while A remains.] [Cf. 739.]

680-81 Positions develop: primarily by dist. sense from und.

and und from judg.

secondarily by dist. pos. from counter-pos.

(breakdown of scholas. and methodological efforts of modern phil. set problems of secondary dev and advance of math and empir science provides the precise information needed to effect it.)

680-86 good pts scattered thru these pages

685 crit. meth. vs meth of met and meth of emp sc

[Besides the general sc of ?, there are the existentialia of the ??? conditions of preaching]

714 scientists more easily avoid error in explanation than men of c.s. in ? which relates things to them (for personal interests intervene in latter. But if ?? don’t intervene, v.g. scientists may be ???)

[Besides appl of ISHU to theolog, note that ISHU incomplete, doesn't raise all the qq.]

721-22 collab. in sol. to p. of e. – in preaching good news  
in transmitting to later generations  
in recasting expression to equiv expr for  
other places and times  
in expr. sol. in terms of univ. viewpoint  
in formulating manner in which sol relevant  
in successive sit.

723 sol. to p. of e. must capture man's sensitivity and intersubjectivity

726 How faith is starting pt for an ever fuller und of its meaning, implications,  
and applications

727 imperfect faith can endanger the general collab in its hurry to show forth its  
social and cultural fruits

732 the epilogue is devoted to q. whether bk 'has any contributions to offer to the  
higher collab ...'

739 Devel of ? to be such that same doct. apprehended w same *meaning* (Vat. c.)

743, 744, 748 (bis): personal appropriation of rational self-consciousness

746: 'Grace is not a substitute for nature, and theology is not a substitute for  
empirical human science.'

[page 4]

251 For verif. of sens. existents (excluding ?? etc.) cf. acc of kitten & painted  
milk.

308 c.s. has principles – 1 native intelligence and reasonableness  
and inherent structures of cognitional process  
2 'Moreover, all understanding has its universal aspect,  
for similars are similarly understood.'

But science exploits this universal aspect in a professional manner

c.s. exploits the intelligibility by adding further intelligibilities till one comes to grips with concrete situations.

by definition, c.s. deals with the particular.