

RELIGIOUS STUDIES AND THEOLOGY

The Donald Mathers Memorial Lectures for 1976

Copyright © 1976 by Bernard Lonergan

Preface

- I. Religious Experience
- II. Religious Knowledge
- III. The Ongoing Genesis of Methods

The Donald Mathers Memorial Lectureship is a trust created by ~~his~~ friends after the death of the late Principal of Queen's Theological College, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.

---

P. S. With a pen or pencil "(C)" becomes "©" which is the necessary and sufficient sign and signature for copyright in international circles.



not identical but distinct. The theologies tend to be as many and diverse as the religious convictions they express and ~~are~~ represent. In contrast, religious studies envisage all religions and, so far from endeavoring to arbitrate between opposed religious convictions, commonly prefer to ~~are~~ describe and understand their rituals and symbols, their ~~origins~~ origins and distribution, their history and influence.

But many may ~~be~~ readily grant the distinction yet hesitate before ~~acknowledging~~ acknowledging complementarity. Indeed, I myself would agree with their hesitation if it arises from complementarity, not as an ideal for the future, but as an account of the common practise of the past. But precisely because my personal interest is method, I am inclined to discern in the practise of the past the beginnings of a new practise for the future.

In so far as religious studies have been shifting from detached description to understanding and even empathy, in so far as Friedrich Heiler has ventured to view the history of religions as a preparation for the cooperation of religions,<sup>2</sup> in so far as such cooperation has begun to be realized in ecumenical dialogue, in the clustering of diverse theological schools, in Christian ascetics frequenting Zen monasteries, in that measure there have emerged the signs of the times that invite a methodologist to explore the foundations for an interdisciplinary approach to religious studies and theology.

~~I have named the source of my topic. I have <sup>explained</sup> ~~examined~~ my methodological purpose. I must add what set things in motion and, most appropriately, I do so by an expression~~

Need I say that questions of method are practical. So my ~~the~~ purpose in these lectures is not to demonstrate what is necessary. It is not to forecast what is probable. It is solely to invite ~~x~~ you to share in the exploration of a proposal. For practical issues regard possible courses ~~to~~ action. They set forth objects of free choice. They have their pro's and con's. Only with time do they advance in clarity and precision. Only with a lag do they begin to gain acceptance. <sup>O</sup> Only when they are put in practise and the fruits of practise are found to be good, does acceptance spread and performance become common.

I have acknowledged my debt to Professor Charles Davis and explained my methodological purpose. It remains that I express my gratitude to those that set things in motion<sub>↓</sub>. My thanks then to the Committee for the Donald Mathers Memorial Lectureship for the warm invitation they exptended to me; to the Committee Chairman, Professor John D. Cook, for the many services he rendered me both before and, above all, during my stay in Kingston; to the audience that on <sup>three</sup> successive nights // braved first a blustery snowstorm and then the ensuing rain and slush to encourage me with their generous attention.

## First Lecture

### Religious Experience

Traditionally man was defined with abstract generality as the zoon logikon, the animal rationale, the rational animal. More concretely today he is regarded as the symbolic animal, whose knowledge is mediated by symbols, whose actions are informed by symbols, whose existence in its most characteristic features is constituted by ~~xxxx~~ a self-understanding and by commitments specified by symbols. On the ~~the~~ abstract view man was understood as nature. On the relatively recent view man is understood as historic: for the symbols that inform his being vary with the cultures into which he is born, and the cultures themselves change with the passage of time. They emerge, they develop, they flourish, they influence one another, they can go astray, vanish with their former carriers, only to reappear with fresh vitality and vigor grafted upon new hosts.

The symbolic animal in his endless manifestations is the object of human studies. In the multiplicity of human studies one department is religious studies. It is a ~~department~~ ~~and~~ singular department, for its symbols are human indeed, ~~but~~ <sup>since</sup> they express the spirit of man, yet at the same time <sup>commonly</sup> refer to ~~by~~ <sup>A</sup> they ~~purport to~~ <sup>refer to</sup> ~~xxxxxxx~~ what is beyond man, what is beyond anything in this world that man can observe and thereby come to study and to know.

It is the singularity of religious symbols that gives rise to the distinction between religious studies and theology. For religious studies leave to theology questions concerned

with what is believed to be more than man, what is not of this world. They confine their attention, as does the whole of modern science, to what is within this world, to the things man experiences, and even in ~~rare / experiences~~ <sup>exceptions</sup> to human experiencing itself. Nor is there any doubt, in my opinion, about the general soundness of this ~~human~~ restriction. For modern sciences are defined by their methods and their fields and, clearly enough, the same method cannot be employed both in <sup>S</sup>investigating what lies within <sup>human</sup> experience and in <sup>in</sup>vestigating what lies beyond it.

### The Ambiguity of Experience

It remains that the <sup>d</sup>istinction I have drawn raises further questions. Some of them are philosophic or theological. But the one that calls for immediate <sup>S</sup>attention has to do with the ambiguity of the word, experience. For that word commonly is used as a synonym for knowledge and, indeed, for thorough and especially for practical knowledge. So we speak of men of experience and thereby we mean men that have long been engaged in some trade or profession, some art or craft, and have come to possess a full and balanced knowledge of the in's and out's of their calling.

But there is another meaning at times given to the word, experience, and it is this meaning that <sup>concerns</sup> ~~concerns~~ us here. It occurs in certain analyses of the various components that together make up human knowing. It is employed to denote an infra-structure <sup>c</sup> within knowing, and its significance resides in a contrast <sup>A</sup> between this infra-structure and a supra-structure.

To take a first illustration,  
~~any scientist will distinguish sharply between his hypothesis and the data to which he appeals.~~ To the data the hypothesis <sup>is</sup> adds a supra-structure of context, problem, discovery, formulation. But the data, as appealed to, are not yet the infra-structure. For, as appealed to, the data are named. That naming supposes a scientific supra-structure <sup>both a</sup> of <sup>↓</sup> technical language and of the scientific knowledge needed to employ the technical language accurately. In turn, the technical language and the scientific knowledge presuppose an earlier ~~ordinary~~ <sup>the</sup> ordinary language and commonsense style of knowing that were ~~it~~ employed in learning the science in the first place. <sup>↓</sup>  
 Only when one goes behind ordinary language and commonsense knowing does one come to the infra-structure in its pure form. It is pure experience, the experience underpinning and distinct from every supra-structure. As outer experience it is sensation as distinct from perception. As inner experience it is consciousness as distinct not only from self-knowledge but also from any introspective process that goes from the data of consciousness and moves towards the acquisition of self-knowledge. <sup>3</sup>

No doubt, a distinction between consciousness and self-knowledge may seem paradoxical. <sup>↓</sup> But I think a brief excursion into cognitional theory will take one from the paradox to the simple fact. We all are conscious of our sensing and our feeling, our inquiring and our understanding, our deliberating and deciding. None of these activities occur <sup>s</sup> when ~~one is~~ <sup>one is</sup> ~~in a coma or in dreamless sleep.~~ In that basic sense they are conscious. Still they are not yet properly known.

They are just an infra-structure, a component within knowing that in large part remains merely potential. It is only when we heighten consciousness by adverting not only to ~~the~~ objects but also to activities, when we begin to sort out the activities, to assign them their distinctive names, to distinguish and to relate, only then that we begin to move from the mere infra-structure that is consciousness to the compound of infra-- and supra-structure that is man's knowledge of his own cognitional process.

What I have illustrated from cognitional theory, also may be illustrated from psychiatry. There is Carl Rogers' client--centered therapy. It aims to provide the patient with an ambiance in which he feels at ease, permits his feelings to emerge, comes to distinguish them from other inner events, to compare different feelings with one another, to add recognition to their recurrence, to bestow names upon them, to manage gradually to encapsulate within a supra-structure of language and knowledge, of confidence and assurance, an infra-structure of feelings that by themselves had been an occasion for turmoil, disorientation, dismay, disorganization.

Again, but from a different viewpoint, a student of Carl Jung's has remarked that, for Jung, consciousness means reflective consciousness. Jung, he claims, refuses to name the contents of inner activities conscious unless the subject relates them explicitly and consciously to his own ego. <sup>4</sup>

In contrast to Jung, Karen Horney writes: "... there is no strict alternative between conscious and unconscious, but there are... several levels of consciousness. Not only is

~~that there are several levels of consciousness.~~ Not only is the repressed impulse still effective — one of the basic discoveries of Freud — but also in a deeper level of consciousness the individual knows about its presence...." After making this point, Karen Horney proceeded to pin it down with a technical term: she would use the word, register, when she meant that we know what is going on within us without our being aware of it.<sup>5</sup>

In similar vein Wilhelm Stekel wrote: "Our thinking is a polyphony. There are always several thoughts working simultaneously, one of which is the bearer of the leading voice. The other thoughts represent the medium and the low voices.... In this framework the whole material with which we deal in psychoanalysis is capable of becoming conscious. It is to be found predominantly in the lower voices. To quote Klages, the thing in question (the matter repressed) is not so much a thing that is not thought as one that is not recognized."<sup>6</sup>

We meet with a similar testimony when we turn from the clinical psychologists concerned with people who are unwell to the so-called 'third force' concerned with people who are conspicuously healthy.<sup>7</sup> The late Abraham Maslow, one time president of the American Psychological Association, set about investigating peak experiences. At first he supposed that such experiences occurred only rarely and then in exceptional individuals. But as his investigation advanced, he discovered that peak experiences really were common, that most people had them, but that few were aware of the fact. In other words, like other experiences, peak experiences pertain to the infra-structure.<sup>8</sup> It is one

thing to have a peak experience. It is something else again to advert to it, to compare it with other experiences, to note its singularity, to draw up a scale of higher and lower, to assign this type of experience to the topmost rank, and to label it a peak experience. All such adverting, comparing, evaluating, labeling pertain to a supra-structure. Without them one can very well have peak experiences but ~~without them one will~~ <sup>without them one will</sup> not be explicitly aware of ~~what was going on~~ what was going on.

So in another area we have a parallel to Wilhelm Stekel's polyphony and Karen Horney's many levels of consciousness. But in matters psychological what really cinches the issue is one's own personal experience. <sup>Of course,</sup> ~~that~~ you must not expect me to tell you what your own personal experience has been. All I can do is ~~not~~ suggest lines of inquiry. For instance, are you aware of having made free choices? What was going forward when the question of choosing arose? Was it merely that some people were urging you to this and others urging you to that? Was it ever that within you ~~there~~ there was a polyphony of higher and medium and lower voices, that they were not in harmony but discordant, that for your own inner peace you had to make up your mind and decide once and for all in favor of this or that alternative? Or again, to take a different example, that some may find more familiar, have you ever been to ~~attend~~ a lecture, followed it attentively for a while, and then discovered that your mind was wandering off on some other topic? Have you been reading a book and found yourself thinking of some quite different matter? ~~How~~ Or to become a bit theological, have you been to church and found yourself distracted in your prayer?

The Cultivation of Religious Experience

Because man is a symbolic animal, his development is only partly a matter of his <sup>genes.</sup> ~~genes.~~ All ~~genes.~~ its higher reaches depend upon his historical milieu with its techniques of socialization, acculturation, education. Where the kitten or puppy is born with built-in instincts and skills, the human infant is born with ~~all~~ helplessness that leaves room for an indefinite ~~pl~~ plasticity. Its capacities can be shaped along any of the lines that have been devised or may be devised by systems of symbols. Since such systems admit all but endless diversification and refinement, excellence in any walk of life is ever a matter of effort, training, education, encouragement, support.

What is true of the rest of human living, also is true of religious living. The sower, we read, went out to sow his seed, and some fell by the wayside, some among thorns, some on stony ground, but some on good soil where it brought forth fruit now thirty, now sixty, now a hundred fold. <sup>The seed, we are told, is</sup> ~~Now the seed is~~ for the word is the word, <sup>the tool of the symbolic animal.</sup> The ground is human consciousness in the polyphony of its many levels. But consciousness does not heed when absorbed in outer cares, or distracted by pleasures, or hardened in waywardness. And even when it is fruitful ~~is~~, its fruitfulness will vary with the cultivation it has received.

In time there emerge professional cultivators: ascetics and mystics, seers and prophets, priests and ministers. There is sought the transformation of consciousness that makes possible a human life that is a life of prayer. There is found the inspiration that speaks to the heart of a tribe or

clan, a nation or people. There is worked out a stable organization that diffuses the transformation of consciousness of the ascetic or mystic and that radiates the inspiration of the prophet or seer. There is fostered the piety of a people that fears God. Religion becomes an institution, a distinct and palpable reality. It is a region of human culture, an integral part of the social order, an explicitly acknowledged part in a tribal or national tradition.

Religious studies take us back behind the institutionalization of religion to a prior age. Mircea Eliade has discerned archaic techniques of ecstasy in the shamanism of the central Asian plateau. He has described man's being-in-the-world when religion had not yet become a thing apart but rather penetrated the whole of living. Then places and ways ~~had~~ formed an intelligible unity, not through road maps and street signs, but through their relations to a ~~the~~ sacred place that was their center. Then the intervals of time were marked off, not by calendars and clocks, but by ~~festivals-days~~ and daily rituals, <sup>and periodic festivals.</sup> Then the symbolic ordering that is the major constituent of human living was communicated, not through systems of public education, but through the traditional myths that told of the beginning of the world, of human destiny, of laudable deeds and abominable ways.

I have been contrasting major stages in the cultivation of religious experience. The sacralization of the universe and of the whole of human living in preliterate times. The emergence of religion as a distinct institution with its schools of ascetics, its prophetic traditions, its priesthoods.

The contemporary phase in which much institutional religion appears to be in decline, the universe has been desacralized, and human living secularized.

But it would be a mistake, I think, to concentrate on such differences to the neglect of what is more fundamental. For in the main such differences represent no more than the ~~the~~ ongoing process in which man's symbols become ever more differentiated and specialized. <sup>What</sup> ~~But what~~ is fundamental is human authenticity, and it is twofold. There is the minor authenticity of the human subject with respect to the tradition that nourishes him. There is the major authenticity that justifies or condemns the tradition itself. The former leads to a human judgment on subjects. The latter invites the judgment of history upon traditions. Let us dwell briefly on both these forms. <sup>9</sup>

As Kierkegaard asked whether he was really a Christian, so divers men can ask themselves whether or not they are genuine Catholics or Protestants, Moslems or Buddhists, Platonists or Aristotelians, Kantians or Hegelians, artists or scientists. They may answer that they are, and their answers may be correct. But it also can happen that they answer affirmatively and none the less are mistaken. In that case there will be a series of points in which what they are coincides with what the ideals of the tradition demand. But there also will be another series marked by a greater or less divergence. These points of divergence <sup>tend to be</sup> ~~are~~ overlooked. Whether from a selective inattention, or a failure to understand, or an undetected rationalization, the divergence exists. What I am is one thing, what a genuine <sup>Christian</sup> ~~Buddhist~~ is is another, and I am unaware of the difference.

My unawareness is unexpressed. Indeed, I have no language to express what ~~is~~ I really am, so I use the language of the tradition I unauthentically appropriate, and thereby I devalue, distort, water down, corrupt that language.

Such devaluation, distortion, corruption may occur only in scattered individuals, and then there occurs unauthenticity ~~only~~ in its minor form. But it may also occur on a more massive scale, and then the words are repeated but the meaning is gone. The chair is still the chair of Moses, but it is occupied by ~~the~~ scribes and Pharisees. The theology is still Scholastic, but the Scholasticism is decadent. The religious order still reads out the rules and studies the constitutions, but one may doubt ~~whether~~ whether the home fires are still burning. The sacred name of science is still invoked, but one can ask with Edmund Husserl whether any significant scientific ideal remains, whether it has not been replaced by the conventions of a clique. Then the unauthenticity of individuals generates the unauthenticity of traditions. Then if one takes the tradition as it currently exists for one's standard, one can do no more than authentically realize unauthenticity. Such is unauthenticity ~~in its major, well-intentioned, but massively~~ ~~corrupt form.~~ in its tragic form, for then the best of intentions combine with a hidden decay.

So it is that commonly men have to pay a double price for their personal attainment of authenticity. Not only have they to undo their own lapses from righteousness but more grievously ~~they~~ they have to discover what is wrong in the tradition they have inherited and they have to struggle against the massive undertow it sets up. Such resentment against the

human condition offers some explanation, perhaps, of the attraction exercised by Rousseau's picture of the noble savage or, again, of the ever recurrent hopes that an earthly paradise would be ushered in by the revolutionary obliteration of the human past. But really the problem is not tradition but unauthenticity in the formation and transmission of ~~the~~ tradition. The cure is not the undoing of tradition but the undoing of its unauthenticity.

The cure is not the undoing of tradition, for that is beyond our power. It is only through socialization, acculturation, education, that we come to know that there is such a thing as tradition, that it has its defects, its ~~&~~ dangers, its seductions, that there are evils to be remedied. To learn as much is already to be a product of the tradition, to share its biases, to be marked in a manner that we can change only in the light of what we have learnt and in the directions that such learning opens up. However much we may react, criticize, endeavor to <sup>bring about</sup> change, the change itself will always be just another stage of the tradition, at most a new era, but one whose motives and whose goals <sup>— for all their novelty —</sup> bear the imprint of their past. The issue is not tradition, for as long as men survive, there will be tradition, rich or impoverished, good and evil. The issue is the struggle of authenticity against unauthenticity, and that struggle is part and parcel of the human condition, of our being animals yet equipped to live not just by instinct but principally by the symbols by which we express our self-understanding and our commitments.

The Immanent Context of Religious Experience

In a public lecture at the University of Toronto in January, 1968, Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith began by remarking that much fruitful energy had been devoted to exploring man's many religious traditions and to reconstructing the history of the overt data on man's religious living. Both in detail and in wide compass the observable forms have been observed and the observations have been recorded. But Professor Smith went on to claim that a further, a more important, and a more difficult question must be raised. To live religiously is not merely to live in the presence of certain symbols but, he urged, it is to be involved with them or through them in a quite special way -- a way that may lead far beyond the symbols, that may demand the totality of a person's response, that may affect his relation not only to the symbols but to everything else, to himself, to his neighbor, to the stars.

Now just what is to be understood by man's relationship to the stars is a question for theology rather than religious studies. But we have been led rather naturally from a consideration of religious experience to the various ways in various cultures that men seek to promote religious experience and, no less naturally, we have been led // ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ from such group activity and its historical prolongations to the question of human authenticity. Now while authenticity is not a topic alien to any aspect of human living, still it does attain special prominence in religious texts and monuments. Feelings of guilt, a sense of one's uncleanness, denunciations of unfaithfulness, all express failures to be authentic. Rituals of repentance,



discernment of values, one's day-to-day decisions and deeds.

Being-in-love is most conspicuous in the home: in the love of husband and wife, <sup>of</sup> parents and children. Love gave rise to the marriage. Love gave rise to the offspring. Love keeps the family an ongoing, joyful affair. Nor is love unconnected with authenticity. A love that is not genuine is not ~~the true love~~ the 'true love' that provides the recurrent theme in our older novels and poems and songs. Again, if today the institution of marriage is assailed, still authenticity can be invoked both to bolster and to repel the attack: to bolster it on the ground that the traditional institution has become unauthentic; to repel it on the ground that the innovators are lacking <sup>the simpler</sup> in ~~authenticity~~ authenticity of an earlier time.

Besides love in the home there is love of country. Here too our thinking has taken on the complexity of modern life. One is <sup>jingoism any</sup> apt to brush aside as ~~jingoism~~ old-style allegiance to one's country right or wrong. But in the measure that one does so, not only is one questioning the authenticity of once unquestioned loyalties, but also there is commonly to be found not an abolition but only a displacement of loyalty. It is no longer one's country that is given a blank cheque but a better social order within the country or better relations with other countries abroad. In brief, the exigence of authenticity leads to a reformulation ~~but~~ but not an abolition of our allegiances where abuses have crept in or newer insights gained.



Whether such love pertains to religious conviction in other religious traditions, is a large and intricate question.<sup>10</sup> For the present we must pass it by, not only because of its diversity and complexity, but more fundamentally because ~~ix~~ to me it seems a mistaken method to seek generalization before one has tried to understand the particular. Accordingly, I propose to stick to the topic of this section, namely, the immanent context of religious experience, and so go on to ask in what manner God's love flooding our hearts is a human experience and just how it fits into human consciousness.

First, then, it is an experience, not in the broad sense that refers to the coming together and compounding of many conscious elements, but rather in the technical sense that refers to a single element and so constitutes not a structure but an infra-structure.

Secondly, consciousness is like a polyphony, or like a concerto that blends many themes in endless ways. So too religious experience within consciousness may be a leading voice or a middle one or a low one; it may be dominant and ever recurrent; it may be intermittently audible; it may be weak and low and ~~ix~~ barely ~~ix~~ noticeable. Again, religious experience may ~~ix~~ fit in perfect harmony with the rest of consciousness; it may be a recurrent dissonance that in time increases or fades away; it may vanish altogether or, at the opposite extreme, it may clash violently with the rest of experience to threaten disruption and breakdown. As the metaphor from music offers an enormous variety of suggestions, so too ~~the lives of men and women present the whole range of harmonious and dissonant combinations of conscious elements with their~~

the lives of men and women present every degree and shade in the intensity of religious experience, in the frequency of its recurrence, in the harmony or dissonance of its conjunction with the rest of consciousness.

Thirdly, as religious experience is ~~perceived~~ found <sup>when</sup> to vary ~~as~~ one compares one individual with another, so too it may be found to develop in the life-time of this or that individual. Hence there was long repeated the traditional distinction of three stages in the inner life. Beginners were said to be in the purgative way, for theirs was the initial task of reducing and, as far as possible, eliminating the conflict between their religious commitment and the other themes recurrent in their consciousness. Next came the illuminative way in which the significance and implications of religious commitment were ever more fully apprehended and understood. Finally, there was ~~spoken~~ <sup>potential</sup> listed a unitive way in which/conflicts were under control, the full significance of religious commitment was understood and accepted, and in mortal beings there could  $\frac{1}{2}$  be verified the harvest of the Spirit catalogued by Saint Paul: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, fidelity, gentleness, and self-control (Gal 5, 22).

Lastly, there are the somewhat intricate relationships between religious development and cognitive development in man. In its spontaneous unfolding ~~and~~ cognitive development may be characterized  $\frac{1}{2}$  as from below upwards: ~~it~~ it proceeds from the data of experience through the unifications and relational networks spun by understanding towards a process of verification <sup>that</sup> ~~then~~ ends with a verdict of acceptance or

rejection. Moreover, ~~there~~ there is a certain necessity to this order of development; without the unifications and relational networks spun by understanding there is nothing for a process of verification to test; and without the data of experience there is nothing for understanding to unify or relate. It remains, however, that these operations occur within a context and that this context is all the more complex and extensive the richer the culture and the more nuanced the social arrangements one has inherited. Nor is this context just some inert datum that attains influence only in the measure that it is noted, understood, verified, evaluated. Rather it exerts a major influence on the interest that motivates our attention, on the language that selects what we can name and study, on the prounderstanding that underpins our further advance, on the opinions that have to be revised before anything novel or new can be entertained or accepted.

So it is that besides development from below upwards there also is development, if not from above downwards, at least from within an encompassing, enveloping world-view

~~or horizon of blik that precedes and conditions, that pre-  
 judices us against or predisposes us  
 in favor of developments new is the time for all good men~~

or horizon or blik. Clearly enough this fact is particularly embarrassing in religious studies. For in the measure that the student is committed religiously, he can be expected to be predisposed in favor of religion. In the measure he is uncommitted, he can be ~~expected~~ feared to lack the resources needed for adequate interpretation. But:

~~any further consideration of this dilemma must await tomorrow's  
 lecture on religious knowledge.~~

The dilemma is real enough. What has to be observed is that it turns upon two quite distinct issues. In so far as doubt is cast on the authenticity of the person that has become religiously convinced and committed, I must ask you to await the outcome of tomorrow's consideration of the validity of religious knowledge. But in so far as you ask how religious commitment arises, perhaps you will find some beginnings towards an answer in the three topics we have considered this evening.

They were, first, the ambiguity of experience: it can be taken to mean the whole of knowledge; but it can also mean an element within a larger compound, an infra-structure that easily is unnoticed until it is rounded off in combination with a manifold of further elements.

Secondly, there was the cultivation of religious experience. We are self-completing animals: at birth we are alive and ~~perhaps~~ perhaps kicking; but we become normal human beings only by mastering vast systems of symbols and adapting our muscles, our nerves, our cerebral cortex, to respond to them accurately and precisely. The cultivation of religious experience is its entry into harmony with the rest of one's symbolic system, and as symbolic systems vary with the culture and the civilization, so too does the cultivation of religious experience.

Finally, we took our clue to the nature of religious commitment from the Hebraic and Christian tradition. We found it to be a type of love, distinct from the love of intimacy, distinct from loyalty to one's fellows, for it grounds both domestic and civil devotion by reconciling us, by committing us, to the ~~for~~ obscure purposes of our universe, to what Christians name the love of God in Christ Jesus.

Notes

- 1) Vol. 4, n. 3, pp. 203-236.
- 2) Friedrich Heiler, "The History of Religions as a Preparation for the Cooperation of Religions," in The History of Religions, Essays in Methodology, edited by M. Eliade and J. Kitagawa, Chicago 1959 and 1962, pp. 142-153.
- 3) For a fuller account, B. Lonergan, Collection, New York: Herder and Herder (now Seabury Press), and London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1957, pp. 221-239.
- 4) Raymond Hostie, Religion and the Psychology of Jung, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1957, p. 72.
- 5) Karen Horney, The Neurotic Personality of our Time, New York: W. W. Norton, 1937, p. 69.
- 6) Wilhelm Stekel, Compulsion and Doubt, New York: Grosset & Dunlop, 1962, p. 229.
- 7) On 'third force' see Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being, Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962, p. vi.
- 8) A. Maslow, Religions, Values and Peak Experiences, New York: Viking Press, 1970, pp. 22, 86, 88 ff.
- 9) The next two paragraphs repeat what I wrote in Collection (see above note 3) pp. 246 f.
- 10) I ventured to say something on this topic in A Second Collection, pp. 149 ff. (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, and Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975).