Self-knowledge includes certain obvious dimensions, but also less-obvious dimensions – the immanent and operative dynamics of one’s own consciousness.

Self-appropriation as Basic Method.

Invitation to self-appropriation.

Self-understanding as the basis for all understanding.

Lonergan’s approach to the whole is heuristic, not systematic.

Being drawn beyond

Desire for wholeness.

This is the most important dimension to be self-appropriated.

Bringing together of disparate specializations and kinds of understanding: integral heuristics.

Bringing together different kinds of knowing as well as different kinds of knowns

Overcoming the isolation of specializations, e.g., in universities.

Method of self appropriation leads to a verifiable metaphysics derived from structure of one’s knowing.

Evidence for verification in the “data of consciousness.” Self-appropriation as learning how to be attentive to the data of consciousness.

Groundwork also laid for a method of ethics.

Also provides the ground for approaching questions of transcendence and immanence.

Relation of self-appropriation to Husserl’s phenomenology and account of intentionality.

Scrutiny of activities and objects of consciousness.

Lonergan’s expanded account of the kinds of noetic activities.

Appropriating noetic activities as ground for a heuristic approach to the whole: being, the real, the intelligible, the beautiful, the good.

Structured noeses, Structured noemata

Resonance between dynamic character of human knowing, driven by inquiry, and the emergent character of the universe.

Emergent probability as the structure of natural world.

Self-Appropriation as Dialectical.
• Conflict as the key to dialectics.
• Self-criticism and calling one’s own values and assumptions into question.

[29:00]
• The Fundamental Duality that causes us to doubt that understanding correctly, that correct insight, is indeed knowing.
• What are the alternative “ideals” about what knowing is – alternatives to “understanding correctly”? What is it about understanding – insight – that makes it seem as though it does not have to do with knowing?
• Student responses and questions.
• Personal and “constructive” nature of arriving at understanding keeps us from regarding it as about what is objectively real.
• Assumption that knowing is direct, unmediated contact with what is “already out there now.”
• Student question about how data of consciousness are communicated in comparison or contrast to the way that sensible facts are communicated. Suspicion that data of consciousness are closed up inside of one’s consciousness.
• Challenge the assumption that data of sense and numerical quantification guarantee objectivity.
• In fact, scientists need to learn how to observe sensible data; so also, we need to learn how to attend to data of consciousness.

[39:45]
• Avoiding the dilemma between Naïve Realism and Idealism.
• The Startling Strangeness of Genuine Knowing.
• The profound, existential challenge of self-appropriation.

[43:10]
• Naïve Realism versus Critical Realism.
• Comparison of naïve realism, idealism, and Lonergan’s critical realism. Idealism as a halfway house to get to critical realism.

[45:45]
• Student questions about “Preface” and “Introduction”

• Question about clarifying naïve realism.
  –Hume, for example, critiqued naïve realism for assuming personal and substantial unity behind impressions.

• Question about difference between insight and self-appropriation.
  –Having an insight and realizing you had an insight are different moments.

[51:45]
• Question about the two kinds of knowing. Descartes’ dualism.
  –Discussion of animal knowing (extroverted and biological) versus human knowing (correct understanding).
• What Self-appropriation Is.
• *Insight* as a set of exercises in self-appropriation.
• The need to supplement the exercises of *Insight* with slowed-down and expanded exercises – e.g., books by Brian Cronin & Joseph Flanagan
• Exercises in self-appropriation as somehow related to Ignatian Spiritual Exercises.
• Witnessing the internal workings of one’s consciousness in a mode of guided stillness.
• Drive to understand always present.
• Appropriate = “make one’s own”; self-appropriation = “make oneself one’s own”

• Self-appropriation as a response to the Hegelian problem of shifting epistemic ideals.
• *Explicit* ideals of knowledge (compare Foucault’s *epistemes*) as successive and historically conditioned, always inadequate in explicitly thematizing our *implicit* drive to know.
• We are always already more than any explicit ideal because of the implicit ideal.
• Self-appropriation as a matter of making the implicit ideal fully one’s own.
• Self-appropriation as:
  1. becoming attentive to the activities and the implicit drive;
  2. endeavoring to understand what one has now become attentive to;
  3. critically assessing and judging one’s understanding of what one has become attentive to;
  4. deliberately committing oneself to cooperate with the implicit tendency/drive, and where it leads in acts consciousness and their contents

• Questions about self-appropriation?

• Student question about appetites and desires versus drive to inquiry.
  – Drive to inquiry has a specific character unlike other desires; self-appropriation helps keep other desires in check.

• Student question about people who decline to inquire or seek knowledge, and whether all people really desire to know.
  – Lonergan has not made a universal claim but an invitation. (The very real problem of deliberate ignorance is a problem for empirical anthropology).
  – Not just university-educated people live self-appropriated lives; “wise” people – or, better, “lovers of wisdom” (*philo-sophia*) – living ordinary lives as examples of implicit self-appropriation as well. People who performatively live out the implicit tendency/drive.