

Bernard Lonergan

As man's being is being-in-the-world, ~~and~~ his self-understanding has to be not only of himself but also of his world. So it was that the biblical writers not only employed but also reinterpreted a Babylonian cosmology. In similar vein Arabic philosophers remodelled Ptolemy's heavens, and in turn Aquinas reformulated their views on the ordered universe.¹ Today, with evolution naming the shape of things, Karl Rahner has written on "Christology within an Evolutionary View of the World."²

Wisely Rahner has not reviewed the whole evolutionary process. To specialists he has left the reach from subatomic particles to mankind.³ But the omission of that long series of discontinuities only makes the more prominent the greatest discontinuity of all. In traditional theology it is the transition from the natural to the supernatural. For Rahner it is even more arduous. For he is committed to the anthropological turn.⁴ On that view nature gives way to spirit; the supernatural at its root is divine self-communication in love; and the obediential potency of a formal ontology has to be translated into terms of consciousness.

I have used Rahner to state a problem: What in terms of human consciousness is the transition from the natural to the supernatural? With that problem alone am I here concerned. But as every reader knows, Rahner is not a man to deal with isolated problems. They come to him hydra-headed. The solution of any one both contributes to the solution of others and finds support in them. But what suits a set of volumes, is unsuited to a

Bernard Lonergan

single essay. So I cannot deal with the problem Rahner envisaged, nor from my slender base need I come at once to the solutions he conceived.

1. Vertical Finality

By 'finality' I would name not the end/^{itself}but relation to the end, and I would distinguish absolute finality, horizontal finality, and vertical finality.

Absolute finality is to God, to the end of ends. For every end is an instance of the good, and every instance of the good has its ground and goal in absolute goodness.⁵

Horizontal finality is to the proportionate end, the end that results from what a thing is, what follows from it, and what it may exact.

Vertical finality is to an end higher than the proportionate end. It supposes a hierarchy of entities and of ends. It supposes a subordination of the lower to the higher. Such subordination may be merely instrumental, or participative, or both, inasmuch as the lower merely serves the higher, or enters into its being and functioning, or under one aspect serves but under another participates.

The classicist view of the universe acknowledged hierarchy and the instrumental type of vertical finality. An evolutionary view adds the participative type: subatomic particles enter into the elements of the periodic table; chemical elements enter into chemical compounds; chemical compounds enter into cells; an ever more differentiated multiplicity of cells enter^s into the constitution of plant and animal life.

Still one does not reach the evolutionary view simply by acknowledging hierarchy and the instrumental and participative types

Bernard Lonergan

vertical finality. An evolutionary view is a view of the universe. It can be grasped only by attending to the cause of the universe. For it is only as an instrument operating beyond its own proportion that the lower, as long as it is lower, can bring about the emergence and participate in the constitution of the higher. And it is only the cause of the whole universe that can bring about the emergence of each higher species from preceding lower species.

So an evolutionary view leads us into the Thomist view that God applies each finite agent to its task and employs it as an instrument.⁶ Most emphatically, ^{God} / does so when from lower species he brings about both ~~the~~ higher ^{species} / and the environments they require.

2. Probability and Providence

A contemporary scientist thinks of evolution, not in terms of chance, but of probability. He thinks of schedules of probabilities of emergence and of consequent probabilities of survival. Such schedules regard both the probabilities of the coincidental clusters, of which a Scholastic might remark materiae dispositae advenit forma, and the probabilities of the environments needed by the new species. I do not mean that he plans the universe. I do not mean that he estimates the probabilities of the emergence of a new species of any complexity. I mean that his thinking is in terms of probabilities, that he regards as possible or impossible what he can estimate as probable or improbable, that if all ^{possible and coherent} / instances of such thinking were pieced together into a single view, there would result a hypothetical, multiply bifurcating series of conditioned probabilities, where later probabilities first emerge and then increase, as earlier probab-

Bernard Lonergan

ilities are realized. Such a seriation I have elsewhere named emergent probability,⁷ and here I would only note that large numbers and long intervals of time make high frequencies probable when probabilities are low and, further, that there is a De Moivre-Laplace limit theorem that makes some approximation to a probable frequency asymptotic to certainty.⁸

Now there is a perhaps surprising relationship between the notion of probability and the Thomist conception of God applying finite causes to their tasks and employing them as his instruments. For Aristotle had granted that determinism would be correct if every effect were the per se effect of a per se cause. But he saw that coincidence was a cause, that it was not a per se cause, that its effect was per accidens; and so he rejected determinism.⁹ With such indeterminism of terrestrial process Aquinas always agreed. In the De Veritate he even went so far as to conceive statistically the perseverance of the elect.¹⁰ But in the Contra Gentiles,¹¹ that ^{he saw} divine knowledge was exhaustive, that nothing could be per accidens from the viewpoint of the divine intention, that the divine intention grounded both the coincidences that prevented per se causes from acting and the sets of coincidences that constituted the situations in which they actually did act.¹¹

What the theologian grasps by referring coincidences to the divine mind, the scientist comes to understand with less precision in terms of probability. For the classical laws of empirical science hold, not absolutely, but only on the proviso that other things are equal. It is by the play of coincidence that other things are equal or unequal. Still that play has a law of its own, the negative law that it cannot occur as if it were, not

Bernard Lonergan

a matter of coincidence, but a matter of law, not just per accidens, but per se. On this negative law there supervenes an inverse insight,¹² inasmuch as one grasps in it a positive intelligibility. This is named probability. It may be defined as an ideal relative frequency from which actual occurrences diverge only at random. It is a relative frequency: so often on so many occasions. It is an ideal relative frequency: it is not factual but normative. The norm governs the facts: from it the facts may diverge, but they may do so only at random. So when the dice diverge consistently from the norm, one concludes that they are loaded.

Compare law, probability, and plan. Events converge upon the results predicted by law. They diverge only at random from results predicted on the basis of probability. Again, the law prescind from the coincidental, for it holds only on the proviso that other things are equal. Probability takes the coincidental into account, but only in a general way, and then with approximate results only in the case of large numbers. But planning aims at taking the coincidental into account in each concrete situation. ~~But~~ ^{Still,} the only planning that can be efficacious is the planning of the universal cause, for it is only the universal cause that brings about the totality of coincidences and so brings about both the effects of proportionate causes and the effects of mere coincidence.¹³

3. The Supernatural

Contemporary English usage commonly associates the supernatural with the spooky. But the term has a far older meaning,¹⁴ to which we have already adverted in speaking of vertical finality. For in a hierarchy of beings, any higher order is beyond the

Bernard Lonergan

proportion of lower orders and so is relatively supernatural to them. And as the infinite absolutely transcends the finite, the divine order is absolutely beyond the proportion of any finite being and, in this sense, absolutely supernatural.

Our present problem is with the absolutely supernatural. It regards man's vertical finality with respect to God. It regards such vertical finality in the strictest sense, so that man not merely is subordinate to God but also somehow enters into the divine life and participates in it. So when Rahner writes on Christology within an evolutionary perspective, he very explicitly means that there is a threefold personal self-communication of divinity to humanity, when in Christ the Word becomes flesh, when through Christ men become temples of the Spirit and adoptive sons of the Father, when in a final consummation the blessed know the Father as they are known by him.

This threefold personal self-communication is the end, the ~~goal~~ goal. Of the end much has been written that need not be recalled here. Our concern is with not the end but finality to it, with that finality as evolutionary, with that evolutionary finality in relation to human consciousness.

Vertical finality is to its end not as within but as beyond its proper and proportionate reach. It regards ends that can be attained, that need not be attained, that may or may not be attained.

Vertical finality is multivalent. There need not be just one higher end beyond its proper proportion. ^{Indeed,} ~~indeed,~~ the lower in any hierarchic ^{order} a being is, the more, ^{numerous are the} ~~the~~ ends beyond its native scope.

Vertical finality is obscure. When it has been realized, it

Bernard Lonergan

can be known. When it is in process, it can be known in part. Where the process has not yet begun, there lies our question: Is the ulterior goal simply unknown? Is it somehow intimated? Is the intimation fleeting, or does it touch our deepest aspiration, or might it awaken such striving and groaning as would announce a new and higher birth?

Vertical finality to God himself is shrouded in mystery. For in this life we can know God, not as he is in himself, but only by deficient analogy. God himself remains mystery. Since potency is known by its act, and relation by its term, it follows that vertical finality to God himself can be known only in the measure that God is known, that it can be revealed only in the measure that God himself has been revealed, that it can be intimated perhaps but hardly in a manner that is unambiguous since vertical finality is multivalent and intimations are not apt to make clear which of many possibilities lies in store.

Vertical finality enters into evolutionary perspective inasmuch as the manner of its ~~unfolding~~ emergence, its unfolding, its development, its maturity, follows the analogy of general evolutionary process. By general evolutionary process, I would understand not some materialist or empiricist or positivist or idealist or rationalist world view but the process I have already indicated as in accord with emergent probability and under divine planning and action. By the analogy of that process I mean, not some basis of a priori prediction, but rather the source of ^{the} a posteriori interpretation of what in fact has come to pass. For here as elsewhere the decisive point is that unumquodque cognoscitur secundum quod est actu.

Mission and the Spirit
Bernard Lonergan

8

4. The Human Subject

In a celebrated passage Aristotle granted that his theoretic life was too high for man and that, if one lived it, one would do so not as a man but as having something divine present within one.¹⁵ Yet he went on to urge us to dismiss those that would have us think the thoughts of mortal ~~men~~ ^{men; and he would press us} ~~and~~ to strive to our utmost to make ourselves immortals and to live out what was finest in us. For that finest, though slight in bulk, still in power and value surpassed by far all else.¹⁶

There is here, I think, an acknowledgement of vertical finality in its multivalence and its obscurity. In its multivalence, for there is in man a finest; it surpasses all else in power and value; it is to be let go all the way. In its obscurity, for what is the divine in man, and what ^{would} be going all the way?

Yet if we shift from the context of the Aristotelian corpus to that of the Christian tradition, we can recognize in Aristotle's remarks a sign of things to come. So Christian humanists have spoken of a praeparatio evangelica and, more bluntly, St. Paul said to the Athenians: "What you worship but do not know -- this is what I now proclaim" (Acts 17, 23).

In the ^{Greek} patristic tradition theoria became the name of contemplative prayer. In the Middle Ages the writings of Aristotle provided materials for an argument that man naturally desired to know God by his essence.¹⁷ But for all its excellences the Aristotelian approach offered rather stony ground for the objectification of the life of the spirit. The priority accorded metaphysics gave it a dictatorial role, so that psychology had to think in terms of faculties that were not ^{conscious-} data of //

Bernard Lonergan

ness; worse, since the general terms of psychology envisaged not only human and animal but also plant life, the relation of object to operation was conceived, not precisely as intentionality, but vaguely as causality.¹⁸ Moreover, the priority of metaphysics at root was a priority of objects. It entailed a priority of intellect over will, conceived as rational appetite, and so a priority of theoretical over practical intellect.

Intentionality analysis yields a contrasting picture of the subject. One is brought to it by reflecting that a critical metaphysics presupposes a theory of objectivity, an epistemology. Epistemology has to distinguish between knowing, as illustrated by any cognitional operation, and adult human knowing, which is constituted by a set of cognitional operations satisfying a normative pattern. It follows that the single cognitional operation is neither a merely immanent psychological event nor yet a properly objective cognitional attainment. It has the intermediate status of an intentional act: as given, it refers to *x* some other; but the nature and validity of that reference remains to be determined. In a word, phenomenology brackets reality to study acts in their intentionality.

On this approach one begins from the given: intentional operations dynamically related in their self-assembling pattern. The dynamism in its broad lines rests on operators that promote activity from one level to the next. The operators are a priori. Their content is the questioning that anticipates the next level and so is not derived from the previous level. There are ~~the~~ questions for intelligence: with respect to data they ask why and what and what for and how and how often. There are ~~the~~ questions for reflection: with respect to the as yet undifferentiated

Bernard Lonergan

fictions, guesses, inventions, discoveries of understanding there are put the questions: Is that so? Are you sure? There are ~~the~~ questions for deliberation: they regard suggested courses of action and ~~about them~~ ask whether ^{these} ~~they~~ are feasible, worth while, truly or only apparently good.

Each lower level has a vertical finality for subsequent higher levels.¹⁹ It prepares for the higher and is sublated by it. We experience to have the materials for understanding; and understanding, so far from cramping experience, organizes it, enlarges its range, refines its content, and directs it to a higher goal.

We understand and formulate so as to be able to judge, but ~~judge~~ judgement

// only calls for fuller experience and better understanding, so as to clarify and extend and apply our distinctions between fact ~~and fiction, astronomy and astrology, chemistry and alchemy, history and legend, philosophy and myth.~~ We experience and understand and judge so as to be moral; ^{to be} moral practically, for our decisions affect things; ^{to be} moral interpersonally, for our decisions affect other persons; ^{to be} moral existentially, for by our decisions we constitute what ^{we} are ~~making ourselves~~ to be.

The vertical finality of this process is another name for self-transcendence. By ^{experience} ~~experience~~ we attend to the other; by understanding we construct our world; by judgement we discern its independence of ourselves; by deliberate and responsible freedom we move beyond merely self-regarding norms and make ourselves moral beings.

The disinterestedness of morality is fully compatible with the passionateness of ~~being~~ being. For that passionateness has a dimension of its own: it underpins, and accompanies, and

Bernard Lonergan

reaches beyond the subject as experientially, intelligently, rationally, morally conscious.

Its underpinning is the quasi-operator that ushers into consciousness ~~/consciously/~~ not only the demands of unconscious vitality but also of vertical finality. Deficiency needs²⁰ it obtrudes. In the self-actualizing subject it shapes the images that release insight; it recalls evidence that is being overlooked; it embarrasses wakefulness, as it disturbs sleep with the spectre, the shock, the shame of one's misdeeds. As it channels into consciousness the feedback of our aberrations, so by manifesting its archetypes through symbols it presides over the genesis of the ego,²¹ and it guides the individuation process from the ego towards the self.²²

As it underpins, so too it accompanies the subject's conscious and intentional operations. There it is the mass and momentum of feeling that fleshes out and gives substance to what otherwise would be no more than "the pale cast of thought."

As it underpins and accompanies, so too it overarches human living by the topmost quasi-operator that ~~generates human solidarity~~ advances human intersubjectivity to human solidarity. ~~/solidarity/~~ To the philosophic individualist solidarity can be no more than the outcome of the exercise of physical or psychological or technological or economic or political power. But that is only because individualism and solidarity are opposites. For human solidarity is the proper and proportionate term of human vertical finality. Within each individual vertical finality heads for self-transcendence. In an aggregate of self-transcending individuals there is the significant coincidental manifold in which emerges a new creation that bears witness to its originality and power in the fidelity that makes families,

Bernard Lonergan

in the loyalty that makes peoples, in the faith that makes religions. Such solidarity in its various forms, I have said, is natural to man; for it is natural to man to love with the domestic love that unites parents and children, with the civil love that embraces his fellow man, with the all-embracing love that loves God above all.²³

It may be urged that, if ~~it~~ ^{such love} is natural, it ^{also} is strangely rare. But that raises a more complex issue and, before going on to it, let us note that intentionality analysis is a more compliant vehicle for reflection on ^{human subjectivity} ~~the subject~~ than the Aristotelian essence of the soul with its potencies, their determination by habits, their fulfilment in acts, and their causal relations to objects.

Questions of priority, too, not only are simplified but also are revealed to be reciprocal. The lower are prior as presupposed by the higher, as preparing materials for them, ~~as~~ as providing them with under-footing and, in that sense, foundations. But the higher have a priority of their own. They sublimate the lower, preserving them in their proper perfection and significance, but also using them, endowing them with a new and higher and fuller significance, and so promoting them to ends beyond their proper scope.

Further, when priorities are understood, their rigidities are apt to be overcome. One might accord metaphysical necessity to such adages as ignoti nulla cupido and nihil amatum nisi praecognitum. But while they assert the priority of ascent that has the lower presupposed by the higher, they overlook the priority of sublation that places orthopraxy above orthodoxy; and they hardly lay down a rule God must observe if he is to flood our

Bernard Lonergan

inmost hearts with his love through the Holy Spirit he has given us (Rom 5, 5).

5. Mission of the Son and Gift of the Spirit

The end of all creation has been conceived as the self-communication of divinity in love. Such has been the divine secret kept in silence for long ages but now disclosed (Rom 16, 25) in the sending of the Son, in the gift of the Spirit, in the hope of being united to the Father. But our question has been how to apprehend this economy of grace in an evolutionary perspective and, more precisely, how it enters into the consciousness of man.

First of all, it does so as awareness of a need for redemption. Human progress is a fact. There is a wheel that, as it turns, moves forward: situations give rise to insights; insights to new courses of action; new courses of action to changed situations; and changed situations to a recurrence of insight, new action, changed situation, and so on. But human progress itself is marred and ⁱdstorted by sin. There is the egoism of individuals, the securer egoism of groups, and the over-confident shortsightedness of omniscient common sense. The intelligence of progress is twisted into the objectification of irrational bias. To ~~the~~ simple-minded sins of greed there is added the higher organization of sophistry. One must attend to the facts. One must deal with them as they are and, as they are irrational, obviously reason is never going to work. The objective situation and its rationalization constrain people to do what they can. What they can, is ever less and less. So rationalization enters the inner citadel. There is opened a gap between the essential freedom all men have and the effective freedom they exercise.

Bernard Lonergan

Impotent in his situation and impotent in his soul, man seeks redemption, deliverance, salvation. It comes with the charity that dissolves the hostility and the divisions of past injustice and present hatred; with the hope that withstands psychological, economic, social, political determinisms; with the faith that liberates reason from the rationalizations that blinded it.²⁴

Secondly, it comes with the visible mission of the Son. In him is presented 1) the absolutely supernatural object 2) for us 3) to be redeemed. The first, for he is God; the second, for he is man; the third, for he dies to rise again. He is the sacrament of man's encounter with God, an encounter to be mediated to all men through the ongoing people of God, who put on Christ and live not to themselves but to God.

Thirdly, besides the visible mission of the Son, there is the invisible mission of the Spirit; besides fides ex auditu, there is fides ex infusione.²⁵ The former mounts up the successive levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, deliberating. The latter descends from the gift of God's love through religious conversion to moral, and through religious and moral to intellectual conversion.²⁶

These three are cumulative. Revulsion from the objective ~~king~~ reign of sin and from the subject's own moral impotence heightens vertical finality. Without the visible mission of the Word, the gift of the Spirit is a being-in-love without its proper object; it is an orientation to mystery. Without the invisible mission of the Spirit, the Word enters his own realm, but his own receive him not. Towards the conjunction of all three, divine providence operates in more ways than we know. It lets evil take ~~its~~ its course, ^{has} circumstances shift, dispositions change, encounters occur, hearts be touched. In this process, man is an instrument, not

Bernard Lonergan

~~In this advance man~~
~~touching hearts. / In all this, he is an instrumental agent, not~~
 in the sense that he is a mere thing, but from the fact that as yet he has not attained the hermeneutic that can read the signs of the time of his visitation. Yet even when he has been made an adoptive son of God and a temple of the Spirit, he will experience ~~the~~ grace yet not know it. Like outer experience, inner experience is not human knowing but only a component within human knowing. So Abraham Maslow has found that most people have 'peak' experiences and most do not know that they have them.²⁷ So I have no doubt that most people have many insights, but most do not advert to the fact. So Rahner brings people to an awareness of their experience of grace by inviting them to a retrospective look at their lives.²⁸

There remains, of course, the question of the 'supernatural existential,'^s but that involves too many further issues for it to be considered here.

NOTES

- 1) See Robert Linhardt, Die Sozialprinzipien des hl. Thomas von Aquin, #10. Die Universumidee, Freiburg: Herder, 1932. Pp. 67 - 80.
- 2) Theological Investigations 5, 157 - 192.
- 3) Ibid., p. 160.
- 4) Peter Eicher, Die anthropologische Wende, Karl Rahners philosophischer Weg vom Wesen des Menschen zur personalen Existenz, Freiburg/Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1970.
- 5) Aquinas, Sum. theol. I, q. 44, a. 4 ad 3m.
- 6) B. Lonergan, Grace and Freedom, Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, edited by J. Patout Burns, London and New York, 1971. Chapter 4.

Bernard Lonergan

- 7) B. Lonergan, Insight, London and New York 1957, pp. 121 ff., 259 ff.
- 8) William Feller, An Introduction to Probability and its Applications, London and New York 1950, I, ~~II~~ #7.2, p. 133.
- 9) B. Lonergan, Grace and Freedom, p. 77.
- 10) De Ver., q. 6, a 3.
- 11) Grace and Freedom, pp. 77-79.
- 12) Insight, pp. 19 ff., 54 ff.
- 13) C. Gent., III, 94; Sum. theol., I, q. 22, a. 2 ad lm.
- 14) Grace and Freedom, pp. 13-19.
- 15) Eth. Nic., X, 7, 1177b 26.
- 16) Ibid., 1177b 32.
- 17) B. Lonergan, Collection, London and New York 1967, pp. 84 ff.
- 18) Aquinas, In II de Anima, lect. 6 #305 (Marietti).
- 19) The notion of vertical finality was worked out and applied in a paper on "Finality, Love, and Marriage"; see Collection, pp. 16 - 53.
- 20) Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being, Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1962, chapter 3.
- 21) Erich Neumann, The Origins and History of Consciousness, Princeton: Bollingen Paperback, 1970.
- 22) Gerhard Adler, The Living Symbol, A Case Study in the Process of Individuation, Bollingen series 63, New York: Pantheon, 1961.
Opinions on the notion of The Self edited by C. E. Moustakas, New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- 23) According to Aquinas man in the state of natura integra naturally loves God above all: Sum. theol., I-II, q. 109, a. 3 c. and ad lm.
- 24) Insight, chapters 7, 18, 20.

214-92

619-33

681-703

718-770

Bernard Lonergan

25) Sum. theol., II-II, q. 6, a. 1.

26) B. Lonergan, Method in Theology, London and New York 1972.
Pp. 122, 243.

27) A. Maslow, Religions, Values and Peak-experiences, New York:
The Viking Press, 1964, 1970. Pp. 22 f.

~~28) Theological Investigations, "Reflections on the Experience
of Grace,"~~

28) "Reflections on the Experience of Grace," Theological In-
vestigations, 3, 86 - 90.