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**Preface**

Twentieth century = new stage of meaning in which self-appropriation of interiority enables *control* of meaning.

Systematized by Lonergan; context for this has been discovery and exploration of the psychological depths.

Lonergan’s analysis of interiority allows one to generate categories for understanding psyche and depth psychology – especially the level of consciousness concerned with value: values are apprehended in feelings, and feelings are identifiable through symbols.

Doran seeks to develop a metascientific understanding of the psychotherapeutic phenomenon:

Lonergan and Ricoeur enable clarification of some aspects of Jung’s thought.

Attention to the psyche complements Lonergan’s method.

Fundamental resources can be expanded by integrating depth psychological analysis with Lonergan’s study of human knowledge/desires.

**Introduction**

Doran’s attempt is “to generate explanatory categories connecting psychotherapy with the self-appropriation of the existential subject and establishing this process as foundational for theology.”

Lonergan offers two mediations of immediacy by meaning [*MT*, 77]: objectification of (1) cognitional process and (2) psychic process.

Doran begins with Lonergan’s cognitional analysis: philosophy which begins from an infinite curiosity.

Being is always a task, a struggle with the flight from understanding, according to Lonergan. For Ricoeur, following Husserl, being is ‘laid out before consciousness.’

Doran’s question: Does Lonergan’s second mediation of immediacy by meaning (i.e., psychic) “opens upon an appropriation of the dynamics of the moral and religious consciousness which can sublate an intellectually self-appropriating consciousness?”

He seeks to contribute to the exploration of the fourth level of consciousness: the evolutionary, deliberating, deciding subject – to reinterpret depth psychology from the standpoint of a philosophy of self-appropriation (i.e., method).

Cognitional analysis illuminates the truth of depth psychology.

Depth psychology reveals the archetypal significance of cognitional analysis

“Lonergan engages one without mercy in the conflict immanent in human desire itself between the intention of being and the flight from understanding.”

Philosophy as an elaboration of the semantics of desire.

Second mediation of immediacy by meaning “will free psyche to be wisdom” (Orestes) – joining of psychic energy with intentionality.

Doran suggests a functional unity-in-difference of philosophy/psychology/depth-psychology in the movement of self-appropriation, the key to which is understanding self-appropriation of the semantics of human desire.

Doran’s personal quest for meaning has engaged Lonergan and Heidegger, whose divergent paths of thought were seen to be of comparable significance for authentic living, for genuine reflection on that living, and for theology. In reading both one is plunged into struggles of archetypal significance.

Lonergan (especially chapters 1-13 of *I*) engages the subject “in the archetypal struggle of the desire to understand with the flight from understanding.”

Athena (Anima – Sophia) as archetypal embodiment of the dynamism of psyche toward self-transcendence.

Heidegger’s meditations opened Doran upon the imaginal: time as the imaginally instituted horizon of interiority.

Ignatian *Exercises* opened possibility of placing psychotherapeutic phenomenon into the context of discernment of spirits.

The *coniunctio oppositorum* (of intentionality and psyche) is a matter of the fullness of appropriation, of the totality of the mediation of immediacy.

**Chapter I: Logic, Method and Psyche**

A CONTRAST: Hegel Lonergan

Logic Method

*Geist* Human subject

Method:

1. Phenomenological exhibition of the movement of human subjectivity.
2. Knowing of the essence of the schema of this movement in and for itself.
3. Self-recovery of human subjectivity, its concrete because self-appropriated recovery.

As Lonergan sought “greater concreteness on the side of the subject“ [*I*, xxv] with respect to intelligence, Doran seeks such concreteness “with respect… to the playground of our desires and fears which is the human imagination.”

He seeks to further explore the structure-in-process of human subjectivity by concentrating on the complex of imagination and disposition.

Self-conscious articulation of the existential human subject “calls for a sublation of psychic analysis into intentionality analysis.”

Analysis of the psychic dimensions of the existential subject provides clarification of the moral and religious consciousness capable of sublating an intellectually self-appropriating consciousness.

Religious core of this would be experience of the Crucified.

Contrasted with Hegel’s control of meaning in terms of system, Lonergan posits such control in terms of method: self-appropriating recovery of human interiority.

There is posited a second immediacy, entailing both (1) a methodical consciousness instructed through intentionality analysis, and (2) a post-critical symbolic consciousness, the self-articulated unfolding of which would be a transcendental aesthetic.

Self-appropriation of the existential subject in its fullness calls for psychic self-appropriation.

Method allows “an abiding at the level of the presence of the subject to himself.” (Fred Lawrence)

Movements of Western mind:

1. From mythos to logos;
2. From logos to methodos.

Hegel’s ambition for absolute system marks the end of the first movement; Kierkegaard’s recognition of the inevitable frustration of this ambition signaled the transition to the second movement.

Individual thinkers may recapitulate this ambition and frustration, entering the second movement, unless their frustration is equated with a despair over truth.

Pivotal presupposition of the second movement: authentic subjectivity is objectivity.

The second movement is grounded in functional unity-in-differentiation of philosophical, psychological, and theological mediations of immediacy.

Philosophy: Intentionality analysis

Psychology: Psychotherapy

Theology: Objectification of religious conversion

“Lonergan has opened up for us the fact that the foundations of reflective thought lie in the self-appropriation of the reflective thinker.”

THE SUBJECT AS CONTROL OF MEANING

The Call for a New Maieutic

The real world, in which we live out our lives, is the world mediated by meaning, and thus constituted by human acts of understanding, affirming/denying, and evaluating – a world not only known, but also made and transformed by the very acts – and that transforming extends to the subject him-/herself.

Human freedom/responsibility are greatest where meaning is constitutive.

Emergence of the existential subject when he finds out for himself that it is up to himself to decide what he is to make of himself.

Changes in meanings are at the root of all social/cultural changes; changes in control of meaning as the mark of great epochs him human history.

Greek movement into classical science: focused on the essential/necessary/universal.

Classical culture resulting from Greek breakthrough has broken down. The bewildering multiplicity/complexity of thought-forms and techniques replacing it indicates the need for a new control of meaning.

Contemporary interest is in the accidental as well as the essential, the contingent as well as the necessary, the particular as well as the universal.

Many thinkers have revealed our myriad potentialities, without direction in the realization of those potentialities. While many devote themselves to the understanding of meaning, I am on my own when it comes to judging.

Thus, the existential crisis “when we find out for ourselves that we have to decide for ourselves what we by our own choices and decisions are to make of ourselves.”

This crisis is rooted in “the immaturity of modern culture,” rooted in neglect of the subject.

The Cognitional Subject as Maieutic

“Modern culture’s knowledge of the knowing subject is restricted by philosophic issues that render him a neglected, truncated, and immanentist subject, and the remedy to this tragic state of affairs consists essentially in the affirmation of the correct positions on knowing, being, and objectivity, an affirmation rendered possibly only by a personal philosophic experience of conversion.”

The Neglected Subject: Classical fascination with the objectivity of truth neglected the process of its emergence in the subject; a notion of logical conclusions following necessarily from self-evident premises requires no concern with the subject; metaphysical account of human soul neglects the activities of the subject.

The Truncated Subject is unaware of his ignorance of himself and concludes that what he does not know does not exist (behaviorism, positivism, pragmatism, conceptualism). Such a subject is condemned to an anti-historical immobilism.

The Immanentist Subject does not know his knowing, does not know that his knowing involves an intentional self-transcendence, and thus may claim that his knowing is merely immanent (Kant).

Objectivity is correlated with picture-thinking: since the intentionality of questioning and the understanding of intelligible unity as possibly relevant to data cannot be ‘looked at;’ they are regarded is ‘merely subjective.’

Thus, Kant confines judgments to a merely phenomenal world, and insists that they are not knowledge of the real.

The self-appropriation of the exigencies of one’s own intelligence and reasonableness are available only to one who knows him-/herself better that does the neglected or truncated subject. The self-discovery needed for this appropriation is a matter of conversion, achieved through the “basic discipline” of cognitional analysis.

The Existential Subject as Maieutic

Intellectual self-appropriation, the self-knowledge of the subject in his/her intention of being as a knower, is the first and indispensable step in developing the new maieutic.

But while necessary, it is not a sufficient step, for beyond the knowing subject there is the existential subject.

Lonergan posits levels of consciousness in which higher *sublate* lower levels, i.e., retain them but transcend and complete them. E.g., deliberation/action sublated experience, understanding, and judgment.

Doran extends this to sublation of dreaming consciousness to experience, intelligence, judgment, and action.

The levels of consciousness are distinct, but functionally interdependent.  *Unity* is provided “by the unfolding of a single transcendental intending of plural, interchangeable objectives.”

The “notion of being” moves us toward ever duller knowledge of being.

“The notion of value” moves us toward ever fuller realization of the good. It is a transcendental principle of appraisal and criticism giving rise to instances of the good in the choices and actions of free and responsible subjects.

It is the existential subject who brings into being, maintains, and transforms the world mediated by meaning.

The self-appropriating subject is the only viable control of meaning in modern culture. Given Lonergan’s achievement, one must first go with him beyond the cognitional subject to the existential subject before raising the question of the contribution of depth psychology to the new maieutic.

Lonergan argues that contemporary doubt regarding the possibility of objective knowledge of God’s existence, omnipotence and goodness entails a skepticism about the value of God’s world.

THE EXISTENTIAL SUBJECT AS MORAL AND RELIGIOUS

Intellectual self-appropriation (*I*), and moral and religious conversion (*MT*) provide the criteria for the discrimination of pryshic process involved in the self-appropriation of the existential subject.

The Problem of Ethics in *Insight*

Development of a distinct notion of the good in *MT* highlighted real self-transcendence in the making of being and constitution of the world as distinct from cognitional self-transcendence in the knowing of being.

The criteria of moral authenticity shifts from an emphasis on the intelligent and reasonable (*I*) to an ascending scale of values certifying the extent of the subject’s self-transcendence. (*MT*)

In I, Lonergan argues that certain conditions must be met if the dynamic structure that is a human being’s essential freedom is to find an operational range within which exercise itself:

1. External constraint limits effective freedom;
2. One’s psychoneural state limits effective freedom;
3. Underdeveloped practical intelligence limits effective freedom; and
4. Effective freedom is dependent on a particular quality of antecedent willingness.

Effective freedom has to be won. The key point is to reach a willingness to persuade oneself and to subject oneself to the persuasion of others.

Moral impotence: The incompleteness of human intellectual and volitional development which is the radical root of the restriction of human effective freedom.

This is further complicated by individual, group, and general bias, which crete a social situation that progressively becomes a compound of the rational and the irrational – effective freedom is thus further restricted in that this situation constitutes the materials available for insight, reflection, and choice.

The tension between limitation and transcendence inherent is all development, becomes intensified to the point of desperation by the outer conditions and inner mentality prevalent in social decline.

The root of the problem lies in our inherent incapacity for sustained development. Its only solution can be a higher integration of human living even than that provided by a human person’s intelligence, reasonableness, and genuine willingness.

A capacity for sustained development must replace our incapacity without eliminating the tension inherent in all development.

Moral Conversion

With the emergence of a distinct notion of the good, feelings and their symbolic constitution became in some respect a coincidental manifold at the level of intelligence and reasonable consciousness, to be integrated into the dynamism of consciousness as intentionality toward real self-transcendence by *deliberation*.

Moral conversion is a shift of the criteria of one’s decision/choices from satisfaction to values. The difference between satisfaction and value is located in the measure of self-transcendence toward which our response carries us.

The criteria of self-transcendence enables construction of an ascending scale of values:

Religious

Personal

Cultural

Social

Vital

Moral growth entails the development of feelings, such that one’s spontaneous scale of preferences is modified.

Feelings, especially when deliberately reinforced, channel attention, shape one’s horizon, direct one’s life.

Feeling are the locus of one’s primordial apprehension of value. Such apprehension initiates the process of questions for deliberation which promote the conscious subject from rational to existential consciousness.

Sustained authenticity, i.e., sustained choice of what is truly good, demands that feelings be cultivated, strengthened, refined, criticized.

The emergence of personal responsibility emerges with the realization that one not only chooses between courses of action, but also thereby makes oneself an authentic or inauthentic person.

Judgments of value occur both within a context of developing knowledge/feeling/willingness and a context determined by neurotic need, bias, rationalization, *resentiment*.

Alienation = disregard of the intentional dynamism of one’s spirit.

Ideology = justification of such inauthenticity.

Psychotherapy is an appropriation of one’s feelings – enabling their refinement, reinforcement, or criticism – promoting the unity of feelings in one’s advance toward moral self-transcendence, at the summit of which, where God’s love consolidates one’s interiority, there is found an affectivity of a single piece.

Symbol as an image that evokes a feeling or is evoked by a feeling. Symbols fulfill a need for internal communication on the part of the existential subject.

Symbol is the vehicle for communication/collaboration between an organism/psyche and intentional consciousness.

Affective immediacy is imaginally constructed, and the aim of psychotherapy is the integration of this immediacy into the dynamism of conscious intentionality to self-transcendence. This facilitates the sublation of intellectual by moral conversion through the symbolically charged transformation of the feelings in which values are apprehended.

Thus, psychotherapy can strengthen moral conversion.

Religious Conversion

Authentic religion as the fruit of God’s love is the highest integration of human living. This involves a vertical self-transcendence beyond cognitional and moral self-transcendence.

THE QUESTION OF GOD

Lonergan distinguishes four forms of the question of God:

1. Questioning questions for intelligence: Can the universe be intelligible without an intelligible ground?
2. Questioning questions for reflection: Must there not be an unconditioned to account for the existence of beings whose being is conditioned?
3. Questioning questions for deliberation: Is the necessarily existing and intelligent ground of the universe also the primary instance of moral consciousness?
4. Questioning religious experience: With whom are we in love when we are in love unrestrictedly?

The question of God arises by questioning the pure question that the subject-as-subject is – cumulatively emerging as epistemological, philosophic, moral, and religious.

The basic question of God is that arising out of religious experience.

Religious Experience

Lonergan speaks of religious experience as “being in love in an unrestricted fashion,” which is the proper fulfillment of the capacity for self-transcendence revealed in our unrestricted questioning.

It is an experience of mystery that is conscious but not known, and is not the product of our knowledge and choice.

Existential consciousness is fulfilled such that one is ready to deliberate and judge and decide and act with the easy freedom of those that do all good because they are in love.

There is a two-fold expression of religious conversion:

One: It is manifested in changed attitudes (cf. Galatians 5.22f).

Two: An expression concerned with the base and focus of this experience itself, the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* itself.

Lonergan correlates variation in this expression with states of meaning: common sense, theory, interiority.

In the first stage of meaning, the functions of meaning are not recognized and differentiated. Thus, in stage one, religious expression results from projective associations/ identifications of religious experience with its outward occasion.

In the second stage, the cognitive function of meaning is differentiated, and a troubling split emerges between the common sense and theoretical mediations of the world by meaning. With theory, dogma, theology, and juridical structures entered Western religion. And the tension between common sense and theory is felt in religion.

In the third stage of meaning, consciousness is differentiated through the appropriation of human interiority. Religious experience is understood as correlated with a fourth realm of meaning: transcendence. And theology becomes the understanding of the diversity of religious utterance on the basis of the differentiation and interrelation of the realms of common sense, theory, interiority, and transcendence.

Religion as Higher Integration

Summary of the 31 point elaboration of the divine solution to the problem of evil given in chapter 20 of *Insight*.

The Existential Subject as Psychic

The psyche is a constituent feature of the deciding, deliberating, evaluative existential subject.

Symbolically certifiable feelings mediate between judgments of fact and judgments concerning what is good and worthwhile.

The fullness of the psyche’ apprehensions and responses is reached, not under the higher integration of human intelligence, but in the free and responsible decisions of the authentic existential subject.

The self-appropriation of intentional consciousness can be complemented by and include psychic self-appropriation, which is a further refinement of the self-knowledge of the existential subject.

Psychic self-appropriation satisfies a therapeutic exigence, awakened by crises of personal and political living reflected in psychoanalysis, Marxism, and existentialism.

Doran posits a psychic conversion which can critically ground one’s moral and religious living in an expanding concrete pattern of judgments of value and one’s sublation of an intellectually converted critical consciousness by moral and religious consciousness.

As the foundational reality of all theological endeavor is the subjectivity of the theologian, greater concreteness on the side of the subject opens new possibilities for theology.

Doran: “The foundations of theology lie in the objectification of cognitive, psychic, moral, and religious subjectivity in a patterned set of judgments of cognitional fact and value cumulatively heading toward the full position on the human subject.”

Our age marks the beginning of a qualitative mutation in the evolution of human consciousness: Lonergan understands this in terms of the third stage of meaning, Doran in terms of the relations between intentionality and the psyche.

Movement to third stage of meaning calls for a self-conscious return to mytho-poetic imagination through depth psychology.

Method itself, in the person of the self-appropriating subject, can participate in the depth-psychological effort as disengaging the symbolic constitutive structure-in-process of human experience.

An all-embracing dialectically informed discipline (“an evaluative cultural hermeneutic) would derive its data from everything that enters into human consciousness or life.

A methodically exigent consciousness can now engage in the differentiation and appropriation of the psychic base of human experience. The psychotherapeutic phenomenon would be sublated into method in a new constitution and control of meaning through a self-conscious and critically retrieved transcendental aesthetic.

Depth psychology leads beyond itself and achieves its fulfillment only in the existential subjectivity of self-transcending men and women love with the earth and with its origin and destiny.

Doran argues for a return from the mountaintop of cognitional analysis (John Dunne’s image) to the valley in which the existential subject decides for himself what he is to make of himself: appropriating, befriending, and to a certain extent transforming this dark power of nature so that it is not only creative of life but originative of value.

The task is that of articulating the integration of psychic energy into the thrust of conscious intentionality toward the love of God.

Psychic conversion: “The gaining of a critically and methodically mediated capacity attentively, intelligently, reasonably, and responsibly to disengage the symbolic constitution of the feelings in which values are apprehended and to live from that disengagement.”

With John Dunne, Doran posits the need for “passing over” to other cultures and religions, enabling return to one’s own culture/religion, but he also posits the need for criteria for evaluating these experiments with truth: these criteria are to be discovered in method as the mediation of transcendental infrastructure of human subjectivity.

The symbolic consciousness mediated by psychic self-appropriation will render possible the critical use of *poetic* categories in systematic theology – *explanatory* because generated by heeding the exigence for the appropriation of interiority.

Cultivation of the imaginal must be brought to figure in the self-appropriation of the existential subject.

James Hillman argues for identification of animus with spirit, anima with psyche. In these terms, Lonergan’s invitation has been to the discrimination and appropriation of animus/spirit. This is a good beginning to the appropriation of anima/psyche, which will aid the emergence of the authentic existential subject, whose outcome would be something of a *coniunctio oppositorum*.

“The discrimination of spirit must be complemented by the cultivation of soul and finally by the surrender of both spirit and soul in authentic religion.”

Gilbert Durand argues that Western civilization has resulted from a radical option not to remain feminine – an option for animus/spirit/logos rather than anima/psyche/mythos.

Lonergan has enabled appropriation of the very structure of this option. Today’s critical exigence seems to be a retrieval of the option not taken. Lonergan’s work, Doran argues, can enable such retrieval in a way that can be integrated with our archetypally masculine heritage.

The twofold appropriation of intentionality and psyche is what can enable the coming-to-pass of a fully awake naivete of the twice-born adult which Ricoeur calls a second, post-critical immediacy/naivete.

Doran extends “an invitation into the forest or desert after the ascent of the mountain but on the way back to the homeland of one’s own life.”

**Chapter II: Second Immediacy**

PRIMORDIAL IMMEDIACY AND SECOND IMMEDIACY

“Primordial immediacy” is the transcendental infrastructure of the subject-as-subject.

This immediacy can be mediated by meaning: cognitional analysis / psychotherapy

Psychic self-appropriation facilitates the emergence of a capacity on the part of the existential subject to disengage the symbolic constitution of the feelings in which both values and satisfactions are apprehended, and from this disengagement to gauge the measure of self-transcendence operative in his/her affective orientation as Being-in-the-world.

The unity of the subject is a function of the transcendental infrastructure of human subjectivity (“primordial immediacy”).

Both knowing and feeling are sublated in the intention of value.

Second immediacy results from method’s objectification of primordial immediacy. It is the self-possession of the subject-as-subject achieved in the mediation of the transcendental infrastructure of human subjectivity in its intending of the intelligible, the true, the good – i.e., in the self-appropriation of the cognitional and existential subject.

“… the probably always asymptotic recovery of primordial immediacy by method.”

Doran’s notion of second immediacy accepts Ricoeur’s notion, but is more inclusive.

He suspects that what he terms “primordial immediacy” is what Heidegger termed “Dasein.”

Heidegger posits two equiprimordial ways of ‘being there:’ *Verstehen* and *Befindlichkeit*.

Primordial immediacy is mediated through intentionality analysis and through psychic analysis – resulting in a second immediacy, achieved in self-appropriation, through which the interlocking features of primordial immediacy are mediated to the subject in search of authenticity in his/her knowing, doing, and religion.

Psychotherapy will be one of the ways of appropriating the dispositional aspect of primordial immediacy. It can aid the emergence of the existential subject by mediating a capacity to disengage the symbolic/imaginal constitution of the feelings in which values are apprehended.

Thus, the psychic is a constitutive feature of the subject as existential, i.e., as moral and religious.

Dispositional Immediacy

Doran suggests that primordial immediacy can be differentiated into cognitional and dispositional aspects. Eugene Gendling writes of “the concretely present flow of feeling,” and comments, “within experiencing lie the mysteries of all that we are.”

Doran’s concern is with this ever-present flow of mood which accompanies every conscious act, to qualify these acts, give them style, render them aesthetically meaningful or grow, and even determine whether they take place or not.

Biases, e.g., are radically associated with the dynamics of the flow of mood.

This inner flow accompanies/qualifies/organizes not only our dealings with the outer data of sense, but our presence to the data of consciousness, our very constitution of ourselves as subjects.

The centrality of the flow of feeling in human life was recognized by such figures as Lao Tzu, Gotama, and Jesus, long before psychotherapy.

Psychological investigations need to be integrated into the spiritual quest for wholeness and truth which is the genuine finality of psychotherapeutic insight.

Doran argues that both psychotherapy and spiritual direction have to do with the appropriation of dispositional immediacy and advance to second immediacy.

Unless analysis is related to the insights of the various spiritual traditions, it proceeds blindly to the romantic agony, i.e., the capitulation of intentionality to the rhythms and processes of the psyche.

Essentially, dispositional immediacy is a matter of one’s *mood*: a peculiar quality of being, of being here and now, of being the person one is.

Advertence to possible difficulty in answering the question, “How do you find yourself?’, can lead to the awareness that one is, in one’s self-conscious being, out of touch with something rather important and, for all its seeming simplicity, very deep and mysterious.

The process of the mediation of dispositional immediacy by meaning in psychotherapy begins with this secret admission of confusion, of begin out of touch, of not knowing how one is, who one is.

Doran shares Ricoeur’s question: “Is there a way for us to return, not simply in spite of, but through the instruction of, the critique of naïve consciousness, to the fullness of speech simply heard and understood?”

Appropriation of dispositional immediacy. Doran suggests, stands the best chance of being successful if it is self-consciously attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible.

Mediation of primordial immediacy in its fullness involves:

* Appropriating oneself as a question for intelligibility and truth;
* Appropriating oneself as a question for value; and
* Appropriating the playground of one’s desires and fears which is one’s own imagination.

Second immediacy would be enjoyed by one who has labored to achieve a self-conscious integration of intentionality and psyche, or who has learned to live attentively, intelligently, reasonably, responsibly, lovingly, with their customary duality and tension.

**Chapter III: Symbols**

Dispositional immediacy is accessible to conscious intentionality by the latter’s focusing on the ever-present flow of mood, of feeling.

DISPOSITION AND SYMBOL

Lonergan defines symbol as “an image of a real or imaginary object that evokes a feeling or is evoked by a feeling” (*MT* 64).

Symbols provide one way of ascertaining both (a) individual uniqueness in dispositional responses to objects and (b) individual affective development or aberration and deviation.

The dispositional aspect of immediacy is imaginally constructed, symbolically constituted, but often this symbolic/imaginal constitution is not accessible to conscious intentionality in the same way as the disposition itself.

Psychoanalytic technique may be necessary to enable appropriation/objectification of dispositional immediacy when one is out of touch with that immediacy.

Such disengagement of symbols enables one’s self-understanding to appropriate reality, enabling intelligent/responsible guidance of the going-forward of one’s story.

Ricoeur writes of the “mytho-poetic core of imagination,” which gives rise to the Spartan elemental symbols that constitute the structure of *Befindlichkeit* for each individual.

Doran maintains that there is an individual core of spontaneous elemental imagination which is to be recovered by intelligent, reasonable, existential subjects in the interests of self-appropriation, and that this recovery is not achieved in a philosophical hermeneutic of cultural objectification (Ricoeur) but in an existential, evaluative, dialectical hermeneutic of one’s own more radical individual spontaneity.

This recovery moves psyche into the thrust of intentionality and provides one with the symbolic foundations for engaging in a hermeneutic of culture and religion.

THE TENSION OF THE SYMBOL

The Hermeneutic Conflict

Ricoeur’s is a vast philosophical undertaking concerned with delineating the essential structures, limits, and possibilities of human existence.

He is convinced that the ‘self’ can be retrieved through reflection on human objectification in knowledge, action, and culture.

‘Hermeneutic:’ human experience can be understood by understanding human expressions.

The meaning of these expressions is neither evident nor universal.

‘Symbol’ designates something other than what is said through what is said.

The task of interpretation is to reveal the richness and over-determination of symbols.

Two relationships between manifest and latent meaning:

1. Eliade: a process of assimilation by which the primary meaning moves us on to a latent, symbolized meaning (“intentional analogy”).

Eliade is drawn by symbols to a universe structured in a particular way and to god/gods relating in a certain way to the human world.

1. Freud: manifest meaning may also be a cunning distortion of latent meaning.

Freud understood dreams, works of art, cultural objectifications as the dissimulation of basic desire.

The opposition of these two relationships results in two styles of interpretation:

1. Hermeneutics of recovery: restoration of meaning addressed to me as a message;
2. Hermeneutics of suspicion: demystification, reduction of illusion.

The phenomenology of religion attempts to follow symbols forward – not through immediate belief, but through the recovery of implicit intentionality.

Ricoeur understands this hermeneutic of retrieval as involving three existential decisions:

1. The object of phenomenological investigation is highlighted, not subjective or sociological motivations and determinants.
2. There is pervasive concern for the truth or fullness of symbols, in which we meet the fullness of language in the overdetermination of meaning.
3. Intended is a revelation of meaning.

The hermeneutic of suspicion can be understood in terms of these three decisions:

1. Concern is not with the objective expression, but with the underlying determinants of such expression.
2. Latent meaning is discovered by moving back to the realm of unsurpassable instinctual desire lying behind and determining the mendacious deliverances of consciousness.
3. Religion is regarded as the universal obsessional neurosis of humankind.

The Dialectic of the Symbol

Ricoeur attempts a dialectical resolution of the hermeneutical conflict.

In Ricoeur/Jung/Lonergan, the hermeneutic of suspicion (a radical doubt of immediate consciousness) aims at extending consciousness, which might clear the horizons for a more authentic hearing of the Word of Revelation.

If the conflict can be mediated, the hermeneutic of suspicion would remain, but would be taken up into the task of recovery.

Extreme iconoclasm would become a moment in the restoration of meaning.

Symbols/myths can be understood as exploratory pointers opening upon a world of meaning, and thus are instructive/nourishing for philosophical reflection.

But this reflection must be dialectical, involving a reflective critique of interpretations.

Ricoeur’s insistence that philosophical reflection must become in part a hermeneutic and dialectic of symbols parallels Doran’s insistence that intentionality analysis sublate psychic analysis.

The Archaeology of the Subject

Ricoeur understands Freudian discourse as being permeated by a twofold movement: a displacement of meaning away from consciousness toward unconscious process, and a recapturing of meaning in interpretation.

Our representations (and cultures) must be studied by an exegesis of hidden desires.

Life and desire, which alone are unsurpassable, tend to interfere with intentionality. Beyond epistemology, accordingly, philosophy must become a semantics of human desire.

Archeology and Teleology

Self-appropriation can become concrete only when an archeology of the subject is placed in dialectical tension with a teleology of the subject.

The process of appropriating the meaning of one’s existence is mediated through figures which give a goal to that process.

This involves a new decentering of meaning away from immediate consciousness.

Ricoeur finds three areas of Freudianism to reveal an implicit teleology:

1. The intersubjective nature of analysis contrasts with the solipsism of the topography of the psyche.
2. The notion of identification grounding genesis of the superego.
3. The question of sublimation as a displacement of energy.

The task of becoming ‘I,’ the finality of analysis, is in principle irreducible to archeology.

The Concrete Symbol

Symbols are the area of identity between progression and regression. There is, accordingly, a dialectic within the symbol itself which roots the dialectic of opposed hermeneutics.

Symbols are the concrete, though not immediate, moment of the dialectic.

“The ambiguity of symbolism is… the possibility of carrying and engendering opposed interpretations, each of which is self-consistent.” (Ricoeur)

Symbols carry two vectors:

1. Repetition of our childhood; and
2. Exploration of our adult life.

Thus, authentic symbols are regressive-progressive. True symbols conceal the aims of our instincts, and disclose the process of self-consciousness.

Riecoeur distinguishes various levels of the creativity of symbolism:

1. Sedimented symbols have nothing but a past (dreams);
2. Symbols functioning in ordinary human commerce; and
3. Prospective symbols serve as vehicles of new meaning.

A FURTHER RADICALIZATION

Lonergan’s critical realism leads Doran to radicalize Ricoeur’s thought.

1. Rather than move from understanding human expressions to understand human experience, Lonergan/Doran move from understanding human consciousness to understanding the cultural and religious objectification of human history.
2. Dreams can be evaluated far more positively than does Ricoeur.
3. Doran locates the ultimate dialectic of the symbol within the psyche, not between psyche and intentionality.
   1. This leads him to posit a therapeutic dialectic as a principal dimension in the achievement of self-transcending existential subjectivity.
   2. “There is the potential… that psyche may be brought to join in the dynamism of intentionality toward value… And there is the opposed possibility that psyche may drift in the direction of the loss of the existential subject as the potential for self-transcending authenticity, that the subject may come to drift in the direction of the now harsh and now seductive rhythms of psyche and nature and thus fail to achieve genuine humanity.”

The tendency to matter and the tendency to spirit are both to be consistently and permanently realized through a psychic reconciliation. This is what Doran means by the “therapeutic dialectic.”

Dreams undergo a story of development or aberration according as they are dealt with by the consciousness of the existential subject, and they take on a particular flavor from the existential subject whose dispositional immediacy they represent.

MYSTERY AND MYTH

Symbols are exploratory, rather than explanatory: “the symbol gives rise to thought…”

“Mystery” = relating to elementary symbol as an interpretation of oneself as an existential subject, of one’s background, potential future, and present status.

“Myth” = to reenact a symbol through immediate belief.

Symbols are intentions without fulfillment. Only the existential subject can resolve the dialectic: What am I to make of myself.

The concrete symbol is exploratory of the affective interiority of the subject, of the dispositional aspect of primordial immediacy. It is exploratory of his/her journey through time and, when produced spontaneously by the psyche of an individual, indicative of his/her present stance in time.

Spontaneously produced symbols open up for appropriation some element of the psychic constitution of their author, of the stance s/he is adopting or can adopt to the movement of intentionality forward self-transcendence.

INDIVIDUATION

Jung distinguishes the first from the second half of life.

In the first half, the outer directed ego is dominant: exterior, spatial, specific, human.

In the second half, one can cultivate the world of interiority, seeking new channels and new sources of self-expression and meaning.

Interior, temporal, generic, transcendent.

The inner law of the second half of life manifests itself in the movement to *individuation*.

In the difficult movement to the second half, the outer-directed ego must surrender its position as the supposed center of the personality to a deeper, more mysterious center, shich Jung terms the self.

The difficult possibility, achieved only asymptotically, is that of being attached to the numinous and at home in oneself, at rest and in creation motion, in the world and outside it at the same time.

The Self, as the sum of conscious and unconscious processes, is by definition beyond conceptual grasp.

Individuation is the psychic complement of the self-appropriation of intentionality; it is the appropriation of the dispositional aspect of immediacy.

It is a movement toward centering oneself in what can only be circumambulated, and it takes place through a process of relativizing naïve consciousness.

A movement from exterior/spatial/specific/human to interior/temporal/generic/ transcendent.

The process of individuation is aided symbolically.

Appropriated dispositional immediacy involves a knowledge of one’s own most spontaneous conditions and roots through an appropriation of the archetypal symbolic determinants or qualifications of one’s own inner order and meaning.

Archetypal function = the transpersonal source of imagining itself.

When archeology and teleology are held in tension, one’s future (teleology) beckons one’s “having been” (archeology) into one’s present.

But the imaginal constitution of dispositional immediacy can become fractured so that this does not occur.

Genuine psychotherapy is the recovery of the primordial time-structure of *Befindlichkeit* through a release of the creative possibilities of the archetypal function which gives rise to primordial time.

The reconciliation of teleology (future) and archeology (having been) is a progressive emergence of the authentic, self-transcending existential subject.

The Crucified is the embodied symbol of reconciliation.

**Chapter IV: Sublations**

Doran specifies a sublation in addition to those specified by Lonergan: the attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible appropriation and regulation of one’s psychic spontaneity and irrationality.

THE IMAGINAL AS OPERATOR: A FIRST DETERMINATION

The imaginal elucidation of one’s disposition is released to consciousness in dreams. Second immediacy includes the capacity to objectify the imaginal structure of dispositional primordial immediacy through the interpretation of dreams.

Dream symbols are to be taken as a kind of text/story whose meaning can be delineated by interpretative understanding, reasonable judgment, and evaluative deliberation.

Doran uses the term “imaginal” to refer to what becomes known when one learns to relate disposition to elemental symbolization through the interpretation of the symbols spontaneously produced by the psyche in dreams and fantasies.

The symbols are operators effecting a sublation of neural and psychic process into the realm of recognition and interpretation; they are the most primordial signals of one’s orientation as existential subject in the world.

Dreams are the story of dispositional immediacy.

Interpretation of dreams is an appropriation of the dispositions which permeate one’s immediacy to the world mediated by meaning.

Eugene Gendlin has proposed techniques for reciprocally relating symbols to felt experiencing, and distinguished seven different kinds of functional relationships between feeling and symbols.

TWO CLARIFICATIONS

Doran replaces the Jungian term, the ‘unconscious,’ with the term, the ‘*undifferentiated*’ – and the Jungian expression, the ‘collective unconscious,’ with the expression, the ‘archetypal function.’

These changes are suggested to demystify the reifying associations too easily joined to the two Jungian terms – as it “the unconscious” were ‘an already down there now real’ to be known by looking.

Doran accepts the basic truth of what Jung meant by the collective unconscious, namely, that there are certain innate and inherited universal symbolic patterns determinative of much that is human.

Through negotiation of archetypal images, the existential subject is at the farthest possible remove from solipsism.

THE SYMBOLIC *A PRIORI*

The Conceptual *A Priori*

Kant insisted that scientific knowledge is knowledge of the universal and necessary, and that the object of knowledge is given only through the senses. And since pure sensation does not give universality and necessity, Kant posited *a priori* elements.

Lonergan’s criticism of Kant notes that knowledge of the universal and necessary represents the classical, not modern, notion of science. He also insists that the object of knowledge is not given only through the senses, but that the following phases of cognitional process contribute a partial object of their own to the constitution of the final and total object of knowledge.

For Lonergan, the *a priori* is the presence of the subject to him-/herself, consciousness, in its immanent orientation toward the universe of being to be known.

The basis a priori is not itself a category of any kind, but rather renders possible every determination of whatever is known, every category.

Questions are the operators, and the two kinds of questions (for understanding, for reflection) establish a structure for knowledge, so that it moves from experience through understanding to judgment.

In Lonergan’s account, there is an immediate relationship to reality as intended, in the intention of being, and to reality as attained in the judgment; and there is a mediate relation to reality in understanding and conceiving.

Lonergan posits an operational-heuristic *a priori*, as distinct from Kant’s content-objective *a priori*.

Doran seeks to elucidate the symbolic *a priori* that is continuous with the operational-heuristic *a priori* governing cognitional process.

The Psychic *A Priori*

Jung wrestles with the question of whether the archetypes are to be understood in terms of structure or content, without ever adequately resolving a certain confusion between two different notions of the symbolic *a priori*.

Doran highlights “the *ground theme*:” The emergence or failure of emergence of the authentic existential subject as free and responsible constitutive agent of the human world.

The basic operative-heuristic a priori of human consciousness as an intention of intelligibility/truth/value realized only in self-transcending cognitional and existential subjectivity determine the theme.

The promotion of truth into action consistent with truth occurs through questions for deliberation, and the premoral apprehension of the data for these questions occurs in feelings with structure imaginally/archetypally meaningful patterns of experience.

Archetypal images promote neural-psychic process, which permeates the various patterns of experience, to the status of a recognizable land intelligible narrative, which has to do with the ground theme.

Symbolic images enable interpretation of the otherwise mute patterns of experience, and when such interpretation is affirmed to be true, the images have aided the process of bringing the existential subject to genuine self-knowledge.

The image is an aid to an evaluative hermeneutic.

Dream interpretation, e.g., consists in attentive reception of the dream as exploratory of the dispositional aspect of immediacy in its temporal constitution.

The psychotherapeutic function is to conscript psyche into the single transcendental dynamism of human consciousness toward the authenticity of self-transcendence.

Common (universal?) features reflect the structure of the ground theme, which is the primordial struggle between (a) the dynamism to truth and value and (b) the flight from genuine humanity.

**Chapter V. Psyche and Intentionality**

THE THERAPEUTIC CONTEXT

Sublation of the imaginal by existential subjectivity is generally effected in a cooperative-intersubjective milieu, with the aid of a professional guide to lead one to the discovery and negation of the archetypal function.

Psychosis is a restoration to one’s roots in the rhythms and processes of nature, but in such a way that nothing remains but the roots, entangling one another and eventually choking each other’s avenue to differentiated consciousness.

The psychotherapeutic context must respect the archeological-teleological unity-in-tension of the concrete symbol.

Thus, the analytic process should further a gradually emerging pattern of inner order, a continuous process of integration, a sense-giving factor in the psyche – but it must do so in part by mercilessly destroying the mythic reenactment of symbols in terms of immediate belief.

Jung objects to the exclusiveness of Freudian reductionism (archeology), insisting on the complementary significance of teleology.

PSYCHIC ENERGY

Jung distinguishes between (a) a mechanistic, purely causal standpoint, and (b) an energic, final standpoint.

Jung posits groupings of psychic elements around feeling-toned contents (“complexes”), with each complex having a nucleus consisting of (1) an experientially and environmentally determined factor, and (2) an innate and dispositional factor in the individual.

A quantitative estimate of the psychic-energy in a complex can be indirectly obtained; symbolic dream images are a cipher to such an estimate.

Jung understands psychic energy as a specific part of a broader “life energy” (or “libido”), which functions under the principle of the conservation of energy – especially as considered under the rubric of the principle of equivalence.

For a given quantity of energy expended ‘somewhere,’ an equal quantity of energy will appear ‘elsewhere.’

Psychic development, accordingly, involves the possibility of change in various systems of energy capable of theoretically unlimited unchangeability and modulation under the principle of equivalence.

Symbol is the key to Jung’s teleological point of view, in which causes are also means to an end. Causes, i.e., can be transformed into symbolic expression for the way that lies ahead.

The direction of psychic energy’s symbolic process is towards an equalization of difference (a unity of opposites).

The psychic energy of natural instincts can be converted into dynamic forms productive of work. Culture results from, and then further enables, such conversion.

Instinctual energy is channeled into an analogue (symbol) of its natural object.

Symbol makes possible the conversion of excess libido.

The transformation of energy from biological forms to critical forms is always an individual one and is always achieved by means of the symbol.

Jung proposes a psychology of creativity. His concern with an archeology of the subject is within a broader dialectical and operative-heuristic context concerned with the fulfillment of psychic infrastructure in its incorporation into the dynamics of intentionality.

INTENTIONALITY AND PSYCHE

By “inappropriate symbol-formations,” Doran means those formations which sponsor a re-enactment of the symbol through immediate belief or an acceptance of the symbol as explanatory, and which orient the subject immediately to the exterior/spatial/specific/human. The process of symbolic transformation would involve the turn to the interior/temporal/generic/transcendent.

Cognitional and existential self-appropriation is the first stage of the process being explored. Psychic self-appropriation, ending in the experience of the Crucified as symbol of the Self is a second stage. Then, beyond spirit and psyche, is the progressive discovery of the realm of transcendence.

“When method takes the step into the domain of the psyche, and when self-appropriation becomes appropriation first of intentionality and then of psyche, the foundations of theology consist of a patterned set of judgments, of cognitional fact and of value cumulatively heading toward the full position on the human subject.”

Dispositional immediacy (*Befindlichkeit*) is meaningful independently of any representative conceptual meaning.

Jung distinguishes four psychic functions (thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition), only one of which (‘superior function’) is usually successfully differentiated; one or two other functions may be partially differentiated, and one (‘inferior function’) around which one’s shadow is constellated, is inaccessible to conscious willing.

The totally undifferentiated ‘inferior’ function disturbs the ‘superior’ function.

Doran understands the task of psychotherapy to be that of ‘getting all functions going’ in a harmonious unity through the cumulative reconciliation of opposites.

PSYCHIC CONVERSION

Psychic conversion effects the conscious capacity for the sublation of the imaginal on the part of the existential subject.

Lonergan: Conversion is “a radical transformation on which follows, on all levels of living, an interlocked series of changes and developments.”

Psychic conversion is a beginning: the obscure understanding of the nourishing potential of the psyche to maintain the vitality of conscious living by a continuous influx of energy, by shifting the birthplace of meaning gradually but progressively to a deeper center which is simultaneously a totality, the Self.

Slowly a system of internal communication is established between intentionality and psyche.

-Slowly one leaves the habit of disengaging the archetypal significance of one’s feeling toned responses to situations, people, and objects.

Slowly one learns to distinguish symbols which further one’s orientation to truth and value from those which mire one in myth and ego-centered satisfactions.

Sources of conscious energy are provided that one never knew s/he had at her/his disposal, for the sake of conscious intentionality of truth and value.

THE PSYCHIC AND THE PSYCHOID

Jung posits three systems: Spirit / Psyche / Instinct

The psyche is a sphere of disposable energy based on, but relatively free from, specific instinctual compulsions and capable of either harmony or disharmony with the outer limits of instinct and spirit.

Psychic symbol is the foundation of unification of spirit and instinct, because of its archeological-teleological unity-in-tension.

Psychic conversion is the gaining of the capacity of intentional consciousness to integrate the flexible psychic system and even to effect a cumulative harmony with instinct and spirit.

Dissociation involves fragments of personality which have been broken off from the psychic totality.

Such dissociated complexes can be re-integrated.

**Chapter VI. Psyche and Theology**

FOUNDATIONAL REALITY: THE EARLY LONERGAN AND THE LATER LONERGAN

In *Insight*, Lonergan insists that the basis of any philosophy lies in its cognitional theory.

First, one will arrive at one’s cognitional theory by an analysis of the date of one’s own conscious knowing performance and by an appeal to the discovery and development of mind.

Secondly, one cannot articulate his/her cognitional theory without committing him-/herself in advance on certain basic philosophical questions.

The philosophical issues toward which one must take a stand concern: reality, the subject, and objectivity.

These basic commitments are either (a) positions open to development, or (b) counter-positions inviting reversal – depending on their agreement or discrepancy with the positions expressed in *Insight* concerning reality (chapter 12), the subject )chapter 11), and objectivity (chapter 13).

The basic position on the subject in *Insight* is the position on the knowing subject.

The later (post 1965) Lonergan relates intellectual conversion with religious and moral conversion. This developed notion of conversion is concomitant with the emergence of a distinct notion of the good.

The basic position on the subject is a compound position, consisting not only of judgments of cognitional fact, but also judgments of value.

The foundations of one’s metaphysics, ethics, and theology lie in objectification of religious/moral/intellectual conversion in this patterned set of judgments concerning the subject as cognitional and existential.

The foundational reality of theology is the subject who is self-transcending in his/her knowing, doing, and religion. Foundations as a functional specialty consists in an objectification of self-transcending subjectivity in its cognitional and existential dimensions.

The intentionality of human consciousness itself, the primordial infrastructure of human subjectivity, is a dynamism heading toward self-transcendence in knowing, morality, and religion. The subject whose conscious performance is in accord with this dynamism is foundational reality.

What is privileged is not some one pattern of experience, but a *self-transcendence* that can be attained in any of several patterns of experience.

Lonergan’s thought as a whole is a semantics of human desire, an elucidation of the drama of the emergence of the authentic subject.

PSYCHE AND FOUNDATIONAL REALITY

Doran identifies counter-positions on the subject that are incoherent with the emergence of the authentic existential subject.

An intellectualist bias can result in a counter-position, incoherent with the self-transcendence toward which the primordial infrastructure of human subjectivity as a whole is headed.

Emergence of a distinct notion of the good shifted the archetypal significance of Lonergan’s work as a whole.

Human authenticity is a matter of self-transcendence, which can be achieved in one’s knowing, in one’s free and responsible constitution of the human world, and in one’s religious living as a participation in the divine solution to the problem of evil. The struggle between the dynamism for self-transcendence and the flight from authenticity is the archetypal struggle which provides the ground theme unifying the various aspects of this achievement. The articulation of this struggle in an objectification of conversion constitutes a semantics of human desire.

A transcendental aesthetic would disengage the systematically intelligible pattern of psychic symbols (e.g., dreams) which indicate to the existential subject his/her present intention-of or flight-from truth and value.

Ultimately, the problem of evil can only be met in the surrender of psyche and intentionality to the gift of God’s love.

The symbol of this surrender, the embodiment of the Self at the far reaches of the psyche, is the Crucified.

The orientation of intentionality toward self-transcendence in knowing, doing, and religious includes an exigence for psychic self-appropriation.

Psychic conversion aids the discrimination of one’s stance regarding the good. The story of one’s own personal engagement in the drama of the existential subject is enabled to be told by psychic conversion.

Thus, psychic conversion enables the existential subject to narrate the primal, archetypal drama of his/her own struggle against the flight from authenticity. This drama as the ground theme of human history and of personal life, the story of one’s salvation or of one’s loss.

Only within the context of a thoroughgoing intentionality analysis can depth psychology discover its own inner meaning and finality.

Intellectual conversion, when sublated by existential subjectivity, is a step in the displacement of the origin and home of meaning away from naïve consciousness; it s a contribution to the movement of subjectivity toward the deeper center, the Self.

The existential crisis threatening civilization with destruction is rooted in the isolation/separation/ alienation of logos from the rhythms and processes of nature, from psyche, from the original darkness which both nourished it and threatened to smother it.

We need to achieve a differentiated reconciliation with psychic darkness.

Self-appropriating logos can utilize its own newly discovered resources in the intelligent hermeneutic, reasonable affirmation, and responsible transformation of those imaginal roots out of which these very powers of intelligent grasping, reasonable affirmation, and responsible constitutive subjectivity have violently wrested their birthright.

DIALECTIC AND FOUNDATIONS

Perspectives and Horizons

“A horizon is constituted of basic convictions about man and the world.”

Differences in horizon originate in an explicit or implicit cognitional theory, ethical stance, religious outlook. They can be overcome only by the radical transformation effected in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions.

Dialectic brings these radical conflicts into the light and objectifies the differences in subjectivity that account for them.

Dialectic

Horizons are dialectically opposed when what in one is fundamentally intelligible/true/good, in another is unintelligible/false/evil.

Horizontal: movement within a horizon

Freedom genetic

Vertical: movement from one horizon to another

Dialectic

A conversion is a dialectical exercise of vertical freedom.

Conversion = an about-face in terms of self-transcendence.

Breakdown = an about-face in the direction of inauthenticity

Dialectic (as a functional specialty) has a twofold task:

1. *Evaluative*: of achievement in terms of good/progress (and evil/decline);
2. *Horizon-encounter*: Meeting the persons one is studying in history and interpretation, appreciating the values they represent, criticizing their defects, and letting oneself be challenged radically in the process, thus putting one’s own self-understanding and horizon to the test.

Two precepts govern the process of dialectic:

1. Those statements compatible with intellectual, moral, and religious conversion are to be furthered and developed;
2. Those statements incompatible with intellectual, moral, and religious conversion are to be reversed.

Conversion “is finding out for oneself and in oneself what it is to be intelligent, to be reasonable, to be responsible, to love.”

FOUNDATIONAL REALITY AND THE FUNCTIONAL SPECIALTIES

In the second, mediated phase of theology, the theologian articulates his/her own positions, joins them systematically, relates them to the sciences/theology/history, and participates in the collaboration through which what one judges to be true is communicated to different members of different classes in different cultures.

Foundational reality is a deliberate decision in favor of total surrender to the demands of the human spirit. Foundations consist in an objectification of this deliberate decision about one’s basic horizon.

The ongoing process of theology will be guided by the imminent and operative norms of intentional consciousness; the sole and ever precarious guarantee of this process is the conversions.

Lonergan understands foundations, not as a set of propositions, but as a change in the human reality that a theologian is.

FOUNDATIONAL LREALITY AND PLURALISM

Lonergan distinguishes six differentiations of consciousness: common sense, theory, interiority, scholarship, art, and transcendence.

A pluralism of theologies will result from distinct differentiations.

Interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness will replace theoretically differentiated consciousness as the new source of basic clarification for theology.

Interiorly differentiated consciousness will provide *general categories*.

Religious differentiated consciousness will provide *special categories*.

In Foundations, the theologian has the task of working out both general and special categories on the basis of the conversions.

FOUNDATIONS AND CATEGORIES

The base for general theological categories is transcendental method, that of special theological categories is God’s gift of his love.

Both sets of categories will be transcultural to the extent that they refer to the inner core of this twofold base.

What is truly transcultural is the infrastructure, not its objectification.

Lonergan specifies five sets of special theological categories:

1. Derived from studies of religious interiority (historical, phenomenological, psychological, sociological);
2. Derived by moving from the subject to the community;
3. Derived by moving from our loving to the loving source of our love;
4. Dealing with authentic/inauthentic Christianity; and
5. Dealing with progress and decline.

PSYCHE AND FOUNDATIONS

Foundations has a two-fold task:

1. Articulating the horizon within which theological categories can be understood; and
2. Deriving the categories which are appropriate to such a horizon.

Abstractly apprehended cognitional activity must be placed in the concrete and sublating context of human feeling and or moral deliberation/evaluation/decision.

The mediation of dispositional immediacy be meaning is essential in this task.

Doran argues that the radical crisis of our age is not cognitional, but existential: the crisis of the self as objectified becoming approximate to the self as conscious. It is the exigence for a mediation of the transcendental infrastructure of the subject as subject that would issue in a second immediacy.

Some form of psychic self-appropriation is necessary if the concrete sublation of appropriated cognitional activity within the context of human feeling and moral decision is to take place.

An articulation of psychic conversion is a constituent feature of the patterned set of judgments of cognitional fact and of value cumulatively heading toward the full position on the human subject that constitutes the renewed foundations of theology.

Doran argues that all theological categories have an archetypal significance.

General theological categories are derived from the transcendental base giving rise to the emergence of the authentic cognitional and existential subject.

This is the ground theme of the dialectic between intentionality and psyche.

The cultural context is a compound of stories reflecting the ground theme of the emergence of existential subjectivity.

The Christian religion is the fruit of a collaboration between human persons and God in working out the solution to the radical problem of this emergence.

At the farthest reaches of the psyche there stands the image of the Crucified, symbolizing the surrender to the Father in which alone the finality of the psyche as a constituent feature of human subjectivity is achieved.

Psychic self-appropriation grounds the possibility of theological categories/doctrines/positions/systems which are legitimately symbolic or poetic or aesthetic.

Ray Hart: “a systematic symbolic.”

Psychic self-appropriation can aid recovery of “a poetic engagement of the truth about man and God.”

Psychic conversion facilitates the sublation of one’s commitment to truth into a commitment to all value, and the sublation of both into a state of surrender leaving a unified affectivity.

Post-critical religious consciousness is habitually focused in its immediacy on interiority, time, the generic, and the divine.