

Faith and Reason Reconsidered

By Macon Boczek Ph.D.

A first question this title can provoke is, “do faith and reason require reconsideration?”

The answer of this Voegelin scholar is a resounding yes. Even at their best, the couplet faith and reason, as a frame of reference employed to explain human cognition of reality and its truth, has deformed into a question for “debate over their interrelationships and mutual priorities” that has “a long and troubled history”, one that merges into the divisive issues arising out of the nature/grace paradigm for existence in history.¹ Voegelin writes that this deformation has pushed “the one truth of reality, as it emerges from the Metaxy, . . . [into] danger of dissociating into the two verities of Faith and Reason”,² with each being considered an autonomous source of truth in opposition to the other. Because these symbols refer to the same reality of quest and appeal, the dichotomies of Faith and Reason, and as their offshoot, of Religion and Philosophy, Theology and Metaphysics, composing the conventional language we use to talk about reality in its fullness, cannot work as ultimate terms of reference to the reality they are suppose bring to meaning.³ And Ellis Sandoz writes frankly, “the rigid distinction, *of millennial standing*, (emphasis mine) between faith and reason must give way as experientially untenable.”⁴

These quotations intimate the why and wherefore for the reconsideration of faith and reason as a partnership in cognition. To elaborate somewhat, Voegelin has written often enough on problems arising for the human race that stem from a division of faith and reason into a dismembering reification of the one truth of existence. For example, the mistaken modern notions of “autonomous reason”⁵ and of a concurrent subjective and private faith have arisen from the disconnect between the two symbols. In turn this has led to a truncation of reason and

a loss of faith as a mass phenomenon in world societies.⁶ The former positions reason in the category of “ratinocation”, or simple logic, with its primary purpose being the instrumental manipulation of material reality as in the physical sciences. This new “doxic” reason, a *nosos* or disease of the psyche⁷, is an inadequate shell of reason in regard to the deeper, more profound truths of existence investigated by the human sciences. Truncated reason—a shallow, shadowy mode of conceptualization—reveals itself in the dogmatic assertions of truth, formal rather than scientifically analytic, characterizing the “dogmatists, sophists, nabala” as they pontificate---from left-wing Hegelians to neo-Thomists.⁸

As isolated and privatized, the latter, faith, is in turn viewed as an irrelevant concern of the fundamentalist and mindless simpletons of society by many in the scientific community.⁹ The notion of faith’s fatuity and unreliability has arisen in light of truncated reason’s weakening of “the culture of reason [which will always offer] the opportunity to draw the reality of divine order in doubt on principle”¹⁰ Thus, the loss of faith’s *ratio*, acerbated by the moderns’ need for certitude, shares equally with truncated reason in the eclipse of full reality as a possibility for human cognition. As a result human affairs are conducted in dis-association with the transcendent Ground of creation.. Autonomous “doxic” reason operates in a “fictitious existence insulated against reality,”¹¹ and without its faith, in ignorance of interiority. In this cycle of decline reason then is denied its defining character as the sensorium of the ground of existence. Finally, the loss of faith also can be implicated in producing the “anxiety” of the modern age.¹² In the end, humans with diminished capacities for both faith and reason, and will revert to an ir-reasoned voluntarism in judgments of truth, both practical and theoretic.¹³

Thus faith and reason, belonging together as a Vogelinian complex¹⁴, have fallen into

radically dissimilar acts of human knowing in opposition to each other in general common sense opinions.¹⁵ Arguments continue to irrupt over the adequacy of each to objective truth, and the credibility of each's methods and values. In addition there are attestations to absolute certitude by each camp. For example, in academia, Heidegger promoted a complete separation between faith and philosophy, and grounded his work on "*Dasein*" in a methodological atheism, because he asserted that believing hinders thinking.¹⁶ But at the same time Kant wanted faith "to be liberated to become more fully itself"; he held that thinking hinders believing, thus "anchored faith exclusively in practical reason, denying it access to reality as a whole."¹⁷ Faith and Reason are today in schism. Moreover, lack of confidence in faith *or* reason has been accompanied by an insane quest for "certain untruth"; demonstrated in the twentieth century by the advent of psuedo-scientific totalitarian systems as well as by the irrational faith systems of the modern age.¹⁸

There have been of late serious efforts to initiate in current times a reconsideration of faith and reason in light of these problems. For example, Benedict XVI's gave an excellent speech at Regensburg on this subject. In this lecture the new pope cites the need "for reason and faith to come together in a new way", to help restore "the profound sense of coherence in one universe of reason".¹⁹ However, the propensity remains to prioritize either faith and/or reason—usually faith in theological efforts to unify them. In the context of the natural/supernatural paradigm in which their present consideration occurs, faith becomes privileged as supernatural.²⁰ However, any re-take on this complex that pits faith against reason is not a reconsideration at all to this writer.

In addition, as Neil Ormerod has written in his essay quote above, "Faith and Reason:

Perspectives from MacIntyre and Lonergan”, many modern efforts to restore the balance between faith and reason, including John Paul II’s *Fides et Ratio* with its “two wings” metaphor and its push for continuous conversations between philosophy and theology, are insufficient in the integration of these symbols. Also, John Paul II maintains the historical primacy afforded to metaphysics in philosophy with its subject/object hypostatizations.²¹ Ormerod points to Bernard Lonergan, S.J. and his focus on the interiority of the subject, and respect for the data of consciousness as the context for any reconsideration of merit on faith and reason.²² Interiority, specifically, within the In-Between reality as it exists in consciousness, is also the context for Voegelin’s own re-consideration of faith and reason in his Aquinas Lectures.²³

Thus a real break with present ideas of the inter-relationship of faith and reason must take place if the same millennial problems are not to re-occur in this project. Indeed, reconsideration as project could be looked upon as a *periagoge*, driven by a resistance to the deformation of the singular symbolism of a unified faith and reason, towards the light of renewed insight into their role in the “self-reflective discovery of the theomorphic nature” of humanity.²⁴ At the same time, any consideration cannot break completely away from faith and reason as a lasting paradigm, because as Voegelin has written, “the tension between faith and reason, their conspiracy and conflict in time, is a mystery,” and this too is of millennial standing. Thus, there are four guidelines I will use to bring a genuine creative re-consideration of faith and reason.

The first comes from Voegelin and he writes that the dis-unification of the complex symbol of faith and reason is partly attributable to language. First, much of conventional language to talk about faith and reason is becoming obsolete.²⁵ And secondly, the present language is buried under doctrinal deformations and the experiential roots of faith and reason

have become obscured. Hence, Voegelin provides the first guideline: the “old” language of experiential analysis must be our tool in a reconsideration.²⁶ I had thought of omitting the “and” in this couplet in attempt to bring faith and reason into view as a single, comprehensive process of the one act of knowing reality. Perhaps one could use the grammatical connectors, *from* faith, *by* or *through* reason. However, Voegelin also writes, “one cannot simply invent a new language against language we have.”²⁷ And so this first guideline simply means that a reconsideration must articulate a closer assimilation of faith and reason than we now have that is recognizable in common sense experiences of cognition. Hence, I come to a second guideline.

It has been provided by a question that Ellis Sandoz asks in The Voegelin Revolution, “whether faith has thereby become reason” in Voegelin.²⁸ The wording of the question does change the language in which the complex faith and reason is analyzed while maintaining the possibility of experiential analysis. It is a truly new linguistic approach for the consideration of faith and reason therefore. The possibilities for exaggeration and distortion won’t be eradicated by this or any finite wording or paradigms, but perhaps renewed understandings can be recovered nonetheless.

The third guideline also comes in a statement by Ellis Sandoz. It is to carefully prescind from the natural/supernatural paradigm. Ellis Sandoz has written that reason is not “*natural*”.²⁹ The very purpose of reason is to know God.³⁰ Reason, as light and wisdom, in its constitutive *sine qua non* make-up is a partnership of human and divine Nous.³¹ However, my view of this matter of reason’s identity and purpose, would emphasize another axiom as a complement to this third guideline. Because it is the defining mode of being human, reason constitutes the *nature* of human beings. Nature is not *natural* also!. When human beings do not know divine reality and/or

order themselves from the stance of participation in the fullness of reality, they miss the mark in even being human then. Faith and reason will be taken up in their “humanizing” functions then.

A fourth guideline is that an inquiry into faith and reason which highlights their mutuality and interaction should nonetheless preserve an inquiry into the individual purposes and specific definitions of each term in their renewed unity. My inquiry, into reason, given its theomorphic nature, can be articulated with a common sense question, “can human beings know full reality and its truth without God?”³² My inquiry into faith rephrases Sandoz’s question and asks, “what is it about faith that it becomes reason”?

In fact, there is a guiding interpretative principle for the project of reconsideration with all these guidelines in Voegelin’s essay, “The Beginning and the Beyond”. In this essay Voegelin presents an exposition of faith and reason in a unified act of knowing using St. Anselm as the exemplar. He analyzes how Anselm uses his faith and reason in The Proslogion, in terms of faith seeking its ratio.³³ This exposition is so comprehensive that we need look no further for the language or experiential analysis we require. Voegelin analyzes the structures in reason that permit reason itself to receive the vision of faith and to understand the ratio in its symbols. Thus the credibility of faith is also restored..

Nonetheless, a new exigency, post the Age of Un-Reason, is to revive the comprehensive meaning and full purposes of *reason* which have been eclipsed with the rise of Marxism, Freudianism, and positivism., etc. One can only achieve these goals through the hard work of anamnesis of consciousness; reason is both recovered and revived then through remembrance. In contrast, “forgetfulness of this divine origin of reason constitutes “death” to nature; such forgetfulness occasions the *scotosis* of truth in this modern/postmodern age of

“dogmatomachy”.³⁴ Thus, in the Monologion preceding his Prosologion, Anselm’s meditates on his reason in action and the appeal of reason is the focus.³⁵ Reason then also must be investigated, as Voegelin does in second part of this lecture, in all of its grandeur uncovered by the Greek the noetic quest”.³⁶ In fact the existential crisis of the modern times is not faith in search of its ratio; rather it is reason’s search for its fides to which it owes its origin and being as a response to the vision faith confers.

A disclaimer is in order at this point. One cannot solve a “millennial problem” in a paper. Faith and reason, Voegelin writes, have been problematical in part because these symbols arise in two different ethnic cultures of Israel and Hellas. As symbols they thus reflect two types of consciousness—noetic and pneumatic, and each in itself symbolizes the divine-human counter movements.³⁷ Also, their opposition speaks to the un-reconciled epistemological differences between Augustine and Aquinas,³⁸ one the natural/supernatural theorem in Catholic theology never adequately has brought to resolution. The latter theory, which navigates the mystery in which human freedom must be affirmed while acknowledging God acts in every human act,³⁹ has contributed to the perennial dilemmas on faith and reason listed above. For the sake of order in societies and full human “participation in the community of being”, these “millennial problems” cry out for attention as a matter for research in the human sciences. It is within such a comprehension effort that this paper takes a very small place, then.

One further clarification is needed. Voegelin often deals with human knowledge of the divine reality in language using the complex “revelation and reason.”⁴⁰ He does this because the pneumatic and noetic, as culturally derived differentiations of consciousness, do point to the same human/divine movement partnership in reality. When he begins his meditation on truth,

“The Beginning and the Beyond” with that perfect sentence: “Divine Reality is being revealed to man in two fundamental modes of experience: in the experience of divine creativity in the cosmos; and in the experience of divine ordering presence in the soul”,⁴¹ he is referring to *revelation* and its reception in the manner of the human receiver, through *reason*, hence revelation and reason. Thus there is a concrete fundamental dynamism always at work constituting each human psyche: of a divine revealing initiative entering into the soul from faith and a receptive human *knowing* response by reason. Faith does become reason in this paradigm.

Given all these guidelines, disclaimers and clarifications, I will attempt a three-part discussion to meet the exigencies they articulate. At first, there will be an explanation of both faith and reason as human responses in the unbroken, dynamic human/divine process of cognition, and then as “transfigured human responses”. Secondly, there will be an elucidation of the whence of both faith and reason. How does one get faith? What awakens reason in the human soul? A Voegelin term, the “triangle”, with its indices and an unified terminology that can never be broken without deforming reality, will be utilized to answer these questions.⁴² Thirdly, some illustrative rather than exhaustive examples will be provided to answer Sandoz’s question, “does faith become reason in Voegelin?” and mine: how does that work? In the conclusion of this paper I will briefly take up the commonsense question I asked, “can we know without God?”

Before taking up faith in its core definition of human response to the divine appeal, we should mention what Voegelin does not define as faith. Faith is not a discursive mode of knowing; in other words, as Bernard Lonergan quips, faith is not belief!⁴³ Voegelin stresses that “faith does not transmit tangible information” as in creedal articulations. “It does not render a

proposition to be verified or falsified . . . there is neither a subject nor an object of cognition” in faith.⁴⁴ In the positive vein, quoting Hebrews, 11: 1, Voegelin defines faith as “the *substance* of things hoped for, and the *proof* of things unseen”.⁴⁵ It is obvious from this succinct, plain definition that faith can not be categorized as natural or supernatural because faith and reason are inseparably in fusion in its very explication.

The *substance* is none other than *divine* reality entering into human reality, through the noetic differentiation: the parousia of the Beyond”,⁴⁶ and in the pneumatic one: the Word becoming flesh in Reason.⁴⁷ In the latter case we have an added step of the complete presence of divine reality proffered in faith. The Christ is the mystery of God in its fullness in all reality including the In-Between reality of Reason (*pan to pleroma*).⁴⁸ And the *proof* lies in an area of reality the modern ideologue chooses to “over look, or to ignore, or refuses to perceive”;⁴⁹ it is within a specific, time-bound event in which reality becomes luminous for its divine mystery of the divine/human movements and counter-movement *in reason*. The revelatory “vision” granted by faith spawns a dawning awareness of a divine/human structure within human cognition.

Faith, as it graces the human mind, brings a truth beyond its capacity, hence the Voegelin term, “uncertain truth”. Thus, Voegelin writes, it is a revelatory insight into the undeniable existence of divine, infinite reality implied in the experience of transcendence itself; “the fact of revelation is its content”,⁵⁰ Voegelin has written. While Voegelin insists that the response that is faith is not like sense perception in that faith is not an intentional response to an object “out there”, it can be compared to the response of sense perception of the physical world in that there is an immediacy to the experience of transcendence with faith.⁵¹ Faith implies an immediate relation to the Deity.⁵² Also Voegelin employs the word “apperception” to

characterize the knowing by faith.⁵³

To add a parenthetical aside, Bernard Lonergan also uses the immediacy of sense experience to describe faith, specifically the sense of sight. He refers to faith as a knowing by the “eye of religious love”. It is, he writes, this “eye that can discern God’s self disclosures”.⁵⁴ Thus, in Lonergan’s cognitive paradigm faith’s “inner word” allows access to the presence of the divine as data within consciousness available to reason in a way comparable to the physical data received via the senses from the material world. The imperative for both then is “Be Aware”, speaking out in urgency for attunement. Hence, like these responses of sense experiences, faith is the first step in the dynamism that is reason’s power to know God. It initiates an illuminating awareness vis-a-vis the world around and the human interior world within of the divine presence un-concealing itself and awaiting human notice there: i.e. to the parousia of Divine Reality⁵⁵ from the Beginning and the Beyond. In addition, faith affords an companion sentience of one’s own interior consciousness as the locale of divine movement and human apperception.

Whether it is the reception which intuits the presence of divine mystery within creation or equally of the movement of divine presence within the soul, faith takes on the character of a response to a prior experience then. Cognition by faith is the human response to the spiritual event that is divine mystery revealing itself in its transcendence and/or its immanence. At the very same time faith becomes a transfigured response. At this point we come to the “whence” of faith and a first consideration of the Voegelin “triangle” to explain this assertion. Faith is a gift that endows the respondent with an ability to “know” beyond human’s capacity, that is to apperceive the divine reality in its moments of un-concealment and revelation . But this gift that transfigures the human response to such moments occurs within the larger “triangle” of the

religious act.

“Faith is knowledge born of religious love.”⁵⁶ So as in any Voegelin “triangle” there is an in-separability. The correlation to be maintained is between the call and response that structures religion as an actuating habit and a third moment: the divine answering response that informs the human response with the gift of faith. This transfigured faith is a “leap in being”. It is “the entering of the soul into divine reality through the entering of divine reality into the soul”,⁵⁷ that is, the human response is unreleased into the infinite in the divine transforming return response. This is an ontologically real event in time and space.

The triangle structure of religion that culminates in faith has been beautifully elucidated by Max Scheler, “love stirred within us” (call), “at first we thought it our love—love of God—our love of him.” (human response) “We came to know it for his love—love of God. His love for us.”⁵⁸ (divine transforming return response). Thus, where there is no religious act with its call and response, there is no faith. As Voegelin writes (in regard to the triangle of consciousness, immanence, and transcendence), “you get the three as a unit or you get nothing at all”.⁵⁹ The three are: religion as the over-arching, actuating habit, call and transfigured response as real events, and faith. And there is a name for this triangle; it is designated as prayer.

Three conclusions can be drawn from this experiential analysis of the “whence” of faith. First, the overall parameters of the triangle within which it is birthed are in the moral realm. Religion in its traditional sense of moral virtue⁶⁰ actuates the moral self-transcendence of the psyche in an unrestricted manner towards the ultimate Good. But that transcendence itself is a surrendering one, the fiat that recognizes, accepts, and gives humble deference to the truth of Goodness revealed when sought. One comes to the experiential basis for the other act that is

religion then—sacrifice. This fiat will evolve into the surrender of human knowing to that which is truly real—in its truth, beauty, goodness---first encountered in the vision of faith and then as we will detail by reason with its powers of understanding and judgment.

Hence the second point is that faith's definition is essentially designed by the moral foundations in which it arises, that is, by qualities informing the virtue of religion. You can see this in that Voegelin will sometimes employ the three, faith, hope and love,⁶¹ to reference the fullness of what he means by faith. Hence, faith's elucidation also includes a resolute, firm conviction sustained by obedience to reality. It is belief that is credible because it is encountered in one's own experience.⁶² Voegelin writes that faith connotes trust (*pistis*)⁶³, a willingness to base one's future decisions on the uncertain truth of the insights integral to the experience. Such trust can be further specified to include a loving and obedient surrender to reality which will spill over to ground reason in *its* essential makeup. Trust built on faith then becomes the foundation of reason's questing *eros* to acknowledge and explore the truth of reality so forcefully presented to one.

The third point is that faith, as transfigured response to the divine revelatory appeal, continues the "call". If we continue to engage in an empirical analysis, we will recognize that religious love stimulates the unrestricted *eros* towards ultimate Goodness. When this love encounters that Goodness, desire will begin in lieu of the imperfection and lack of the good recognized in the human condition, and we encounter the first, primordial divine call. In the religious triangle of the call, human response and divine transfiguring response that births faith, this primordial call is re-enforced and grows more urgent and demanding. This is because there is a fundamental "lack" to faith. It is "uncertain truth". Faith, Voegelin writes, "is an adventure

in the realm of existential uncertainty”. The call that faith brings is dynamic and never ending in the continuous human-divine counter movements opening the soul as it rises with the ever-present vision that is faith. Voegelin does call this opening of the soul, rationality, and so here too we have an affirmation that faith becomes reason.⁶⁴

Reason, in turn, is a response that is constituted in the soul actuated in the religious triangle.⁶⁵ At first reason as a response answers the primordial divine call writ in the human condition that is ignorance. Then latterly faith with its transcending uncertainty enhances the dynamic continuance of the primordial call of veiled reality—the known unknown; responding reason gets its noetic wings.⁶⁶ Thus Voegelin writes that the “quest of [Anselm’s] reason is the proper response to the intelligible movements of his fides. In regards to Anselm’s ascent he asserts, “[b]ehind the quest and behind the *fides* the quest is supposed to understand . . . [is] the living desire of the soul to move toward the divine light”, a desire ignited in the religious triangle that births faith. He continues:

The divine light lets the light of its perfection fall into the soul, the illumination of the soul arouses the awareness of man’s existence as a state of imperfection; and this awareness provokes the human movement in response to the divine appeal. . . . In order to express the experience of illumination [Anselm] quotes John 16:24: “Ask, and you will receive, that your joy may be full”.⁶⁷

There is then both divine movement and Anselm’s response by his questing reason; Voegelin names this dynamic movement in Anselm’s soul, “The Prayer”. To Voegelin, the philosopher’s quest can be defined at its core as a prayer: a faith seeking understanding. But in his analysis of the movement of the soul behind the quest, not only is faith a gift but so is reason. It is within the religious triangle of call, ascending response, divine return response, that we have the moment which occasions the irruption of rationality.

Here then we come to the question of the “whence” of reason. It should be noted that this is a question that is not often asked. Many may wonder how is it possible to acquire faith, but in the present era Voegelin is quite unique in pushing his own questioning to how does reason begin and take form. Much of modern philosophy and positivism rather takes reason as a “given” or as a human attribute for scientific thinking, but Voegelin the scientist asks the further question as to reason’s origin. He finds its source in the Greek noetic differentiation of consciousness, the result of revelation and hence his often repeated statement, “reason is constituted by revelation”. The answer is that whenever there is the unrestricted ascent to the Good in the form of Truth, human questioning, with its longing to be freed from the lack that is ignorance, is a prayer. This is why the philosopher’s quest is aptly named a “faith seeking understanding”.

The two-part religious act can be identified in the religious triangle that births reason and keeps it in existence. First comes the prayer, and the primordial divine response to this prayer is the leap in being that is this noetic differentiation of consciousness. Reason originates in the dawning awareness “of being caused by a Divine ground and being in search of the Divine Ground—that is reason. Period”.⁶⁸ Reason is the consciousness of search, the zetesis, of one who is in unrest driven by the state of ignorance. Thus Voegelin thinks of reason as a “clearing of existence” when it is illuminated with consciousness, an illumination carried by the human being but not as its subject.⁶⁹

Moreover, the second primary religious act, that of sacrifice, is present in the religious triangle birthing reason. Sacrifice comes in as the surrender to the Good that is Truth in the Beyond, thus goodness that is reality not humanly created or conceived in the form of its truth. Hence, Voegelin recalls the Platonic symbolism of the “golden cord” behind the noetic

discovery of reason; one can follow this cord or one can choose not to surrender to its revelation of the truth of reality.⁷⁰ Voegelin speaks about the latter choice as a destruction of reason in the “egophanic” revolt of human beings under the influence of *libido dominandi*.⁷¹ This is “unreason”.

The many definitions that Voegelin gives to reason can be incorporated into a general classification of reason technically defined as the transfigured response or the third movement in the triangle of “the prayer”. Employing transfiguring language, Voegelin defines reason as “the sensorium” of transcendence and the site of its luminous presence.⁷² The experience of divine reality, he writes, though solidly rooted in the body itself exists in the psyche located in the Metaxy, or in the tension toward the divine ground of being which is this sensorium. Reason thus is both the locale of divine/human encounter but also the site where “comprehensive reality becomes luminous to itself and engenders the language in which we speak of a reality that comprehends both an external world and the mystery of its Beginning and Beyond.”⁷³ Hence reason’s proportionality is not only to “the truth of divine reality [becoming] luminous but, at the same time, the truth of the external world”.⁷⁴

Reason as transfigured response is itself only known to exist through an insight and a discovery that is experienced as a transforming return gift of the divine reality encountered in the meditative ascent.⁷⁵ Why both insight and discovery? Both words are required to be adequate to reason as comprehensively defined. Reason is divine and human, composed of the gift of insight and the human work of discovery. It unfolds as transfigured divine-human movement and counter-movement coming to its own conscious luminosity. Voegelin describes the insight/discovery of the transfigured response beautifully in his sections on Anslem’s

Prosologion in his Aquinas Lectures. It is only within “the structure of appeal-response in the experience of divine reality” that Anselm is gifted with the discovery which is the transforming response to his quest/prayer, “by the creature to the Creator to grant a more perfect vision of his divinity”. The seeking faith of Anselm is met by the divine response of the insight to his reason, received as a discovery of what he previously had not known: “O Lord, you are not only that than which a greater cannot be thought, but you are also greater than what can be thought.”⁷⁶

Thus, if the response that is reason is defined in a genuinely global sense of how it comes into being and how it continues as a process within reality, its definition could be paraphrased as the “sensorium” of light or illumination (understanding with the gift of insights) and as the “site” of human cognitive discovery of these very same gifts. Such language seeks to explain how reason works when it is experientially analyzed as Voegelin has done. When speaking of reason as a “site” in a global context, what is meant is that reason is differentiated in the metaleptic reality of the human mind. Reason comes to its own cognitive illumination in consciousness as a participation and a partnership between the divine and human nous.⁷⁷ The condition of possibility for this global incubation of reason is the triangle, rightly designated by the actuating habit, religion—despite the problems in language this word carries—with its three-fold rise on the wings of faith—the dynamic movement in the soul of call, response, divine return transfiguring response.

The more detailed rational powers of reflection, articulation in language and the ideas by which we formulate our knowledge,⁷⁸ thus judgment or “ratio” itself, which we indeed experience as integral to reason, occur within this global context of illumination and discovery. Voegelin writes that there is no reason to speak of when human cognition is cut off from its

ground,

All reasoning from a ground has its origin in the structure of the mind that has a ground and is conscious of a ground. Unless you were conscious of a ground and had problems of a ground, there would be no question of a ground, and you would have no logic and no scientific argument at all—there are no criteria [for them].⁷⁹

Voegelin's definitions of reason provide clues to answer the question, "does faith become reason"? We will attempt some summary of answers to this question in the following conclusion to this paper. Of course, we have already had the occasion to speak of faith becoming reason: i.e. faith, knowledge born of religious love, opens the soul and Voegelin defines the opening of the soul as rationality. Then too we had a discussion of faith as immediate apperception, the eye which could receive the vision of the divine self-disclosures, but in need of reason's material ratio if there were to be any understanding or judgments vis-a-vis the truth it carried.

It is possible in light of the previous discussion to tease out some characteristics of faith and reason to responsibly make the claim that faith becomes reason. First, faith carries the revelatory appeal of the divine ground, the call to which the human responds with the questing thirst that leads to the insight and discovery of reason as the site where this appeal is received. Secondly, faith carries the presence—the parousia or the Beyond or the of Word into the flesh of reason—to be pondered upon endlessly and brought to understanding and knowledge—imperfectly of course. When this presence is articulated in reflective consciousness, reason is coincidentally differentiated as a human faculty. Third, faith brings illumination to the human mind, the *epirryton* or inrush of divine light,⁸⁰ and consequently, reason's discursive processes are anchored in full reality through this light. And as a fourth and last example we could re-use the term, "noetic wings". Voegelin writes about the miracle of

reason's rise in which the transcendent pole of reality becomes "visible" through faith, which leads to the human discovery of oneself as the other pole in the tension the rise fosters, and of oneself as "noetic man".⁸¹

Finally, and to initiate the conclusion of this paper, Voegelin has spoken of the two different differentiations of consciousness. They reflect two divergent ethnic cultures with long histories. In light of this distinction one could possibly ask the question, does faith become reason or is reason the occasion of faith? That is, in the noetic differentiation of consciousness, how is reason served and shaped by faith? In the pneumatic differentiation, is there intelligibility integral to faith, where is faith's ratio? Both answers indicate the interaction and inter-relationship that is faith and reason in one dynamic action of knowing the one truth of reality. To answer the latter, reason brings new lights to faith. In the movements in reason as site of divine/human encounter we have "the process in which metaleptic consciousness acquires a new luminosity when reason articulates itself through reflection".⁸² Reason is not an independent source of knowledge of course but it enhances faith. In the former case, we have the profoundness of reality in the vision illuminated by faith given over to reason as a source of truth to be encountered and discerned. Faith's ratio becomes Plato's noetic wings and vice versa..

A second point to be taken up in this conclusion is the practical question asked above, "do human beings need God to know reality and its truth? The definition of reason as a divine/human power of cognition, the discussions about truncated reason composing "the whole of ideological thought as deformed and doctrinaire", plus the explanation of reason's coming to being through the actuating habit of religion all point to an affirmative answer to this question. Of course, this question is one whose answer is often pre-decided by the choices of the one

responding as in Plato's myth of the "golden cord". It will be a choice for or against the global religious context in which reason flourishes. In fact, we have pointed out that Voegelin believes humans choose reason or unreason based upon the specific answer made to this question.

Ellis Sandoz in his book, The Voegelin Revolution has some very interesting comments on "science as discovery"⁸³ as a sub category in Voegelin's noetic science. The experience of "insight and discovery" that was discussed in connection to Anselm's prayer and its fulfilment in reason are pertinent here. The Question hounding human existence that becomes the prayer in the religious actuation of reason is "a constant structure in the process of reality becoming luminous which is science as discovery".⁸⁴ The answer to Anselm's question was experienced as a divine return response informing his question in the very "prayer" of his search.

An analysis of Anselm's prayer and its fulfilment intimates the divine/human basis for noetic intuition. It is the religious genesis of reason with the possibilities of creative knowledge it affords, rather than some super intelligence of the genius or even a Lonergan release of tension in the search for insight⁸⁵ that opens up the human mind to insight and discovery. Scientists often speak of a surprise flash of understanding or of the simplicity of new truth revealed. Such experiences of insight and discovery can be pneumatically characterized as an experience of the very giving-ness that marks the mystery of creation, behind which is the intentionality of the Giver, the Creator, who commends himself in every gift of insight.⁸⁶ I do believe that specific research into "science as discovery", as a branch of Voegelin's noetic science, would be helpful in the task at hand: to answer the common sense question ask in this paper.

1. Neil Ormerod, "Faith and Reason: Perspectives from MacIntyre and Lonergan", Heythrop Journal (XLVI, 2005), p.11.
2. Eric Voegelin, "The Beginning and the Beyond", in What is History? And Other Unpublished Writings CW: 28 (Baton Rouge & London: LSU Press, 1990), p. 210.
3. Ibid., pp. 210, 211.
4. Ellis Sandoz, "Editor's Introduction", in Eric Voegelin, Published Essays: 1966 - 1985 CW 12 (Baton Rouge and London: LSU Press, 1990), p. xv.
5. Voegelin points to the seeds of this in Aquinas, "one can sense in the work of Thomas the possibility of the Science of Being sliding over, as it did in the modern centuries, into an autonomous source of truth." "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 210.
6. Voegelin details the descent of reason "in the philosophic sense [as] the undeformed knowledge and reality of human existence" to "an image of reason that served the purpose of eclipsing" reality and setting in its place, "second realities" as a mass phenomenon. See "The Eclipse of Reality" in CW 28, pp. 136, 157, 111 - 162.
7. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 202.
8. The cultural monument to the truncation of reason, that splits *dionia* from *neosis*, collapsing reason to the methodological operations of the physical sciences as in positivism is the "Enlightenment", in fact, "the age of Unreason". See Ellis Sandoz, The Voegelin Revolution 2nd edition (New Brunswick (USA) & London: Transaction Publishers, 2000), pp. 163, 269.
9. As an example: the current evolution vs. creation public debates as an ongoing spectacle
10. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 205.
11. Eric Voegelin, "Anxiety and Reason", p. 83.
12. Anxiety is a disease arising in the rejection of reason that affects man's humanity and destroys order in society. The Beginning and the Beyond, p. 202-203.
13. Benedict VI, "Faith and Reason and the University, Memories and Reflections, posted on the Evforum, (September 25, 2006), pp. 12 - 13.
14. "Under a 'complex' I understand the fact that this process of being moved and seeking, . . . should not be cut into pieces or fragmented as such, . . . of a process that exists between the two poles." To do so would be "hypostatizations of one pole in a tension [between poles]". Eric Voegelin, "The Meditative Origin of the Philosophical Knowledge of Order" in The Drama of

Humanity and Other Miscellaneous Papers, 1939 - 1985, edited with An Introduction by William Petropulos and Gilbert Weiss (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2004), p. 389.

15.As an example: in a recent “Non Sequitur” comic, one character is admonished, “”Kate . . . stop victimizing your sister with reason” for challenging her sister’s faith that she can avoid the laws of gravity by faith. (July 22, 2007 in numerous newspapers)

16.Laurence Paul Hemming, Heidegger’s Atheism: The Refusal of a Theological Voice (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp. 185 - 189.

17.Benedict XVI, p.13.

18.Voegelin’s motive was to resist, as much as one man can, the evil of the false truths so released and so destructive of humanity. Sandoz, “Introduction”, CW 12, pp.xvii, xix.

19.Benedict XVI, pp. 15, 10.

20.Voegelin writes, [in lieu of some of the diverse styles of truth dominating world societies, such as Islam or Christianity, societies—other than philosophy], “there arises such problems as those of a double truth of faith and reason or of subordination of philosophy to theology as it handmaiden.” “Reason and Anxiety”, CW 28, p. 92.

21.Ormerod, “Faith and Reason”, p. 14. See also Voegelin on “hypostatizing constructions” in the “Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 179 -80.

22.Ormerod, pp. 14 - 16.

23.This lecture is published in the essay, “The Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 173 -232.

24.“The Beginning and the Beyond”, p. 226.

25.Ibid., p. 210.

26.Ibid., p. 230.

27.“The Beyond and Its Parousia”, CW 33, p.414. However, Voegelin does experiment with a new language in attempt to revitalize this important complex. He uses the terms vision and noesis and investigates their interaction. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 227ff.

28.Sandoz does not answer this question but he does say that “neat distinctions between noetic and pneumatic experiences and symbolizations” is untenable in an exposition of reality to which we normally refer in the symbol, faith and reason. Voegelin Revolution, p. 179.

29.Ibid., p. . 265.

30. In a sense it is God knowing himself in human reason, hence a partnership. Man becomes aware of himself “as an active partner in the cognition of divine reality”; the language employed to know this reality erupts within and “is as much divine as it is human”. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 173, 180.

31. “Man is engaged in the search [of the Beyond as Ground of existence] with the divinest part of his soul, with the nous;” the search is articulated in noetic language; “and the ground that moves the search, when it is found, is the divine Nous”. “In Plato’s theology of history, the Nous reveals himself as the third god after Kronos and Zeus. Hence, *the noetic quest of the ground is more than a human effort* (emphasis mine) at cognition with merely human means.” “The Beginning and the Beyond”, p. 187.

32. Divine/human partnership in human knowing lies at the core of Voegelin’s noetic science. Voegelin writes, “The reality of things . . . cannot be understood in terms of the world and its time” (hence at first the myth); “the universal presence of divine reality [is] the source of illumination in every man”. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 175, 183. This noetic question arises in the context of a consideration of faith and reason. I have phrased this question in a paraphrasing of the pneumatic question, a little more often asked in general conversations; for example, see: Glenn Tinder, “Can We Be Good without God? Atlantic Monthly (December, 1989), pp.

33. “He wants to discover the structure in human reason that permits the questing response of man to understand the *ratio* in the symbols of Faith”. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, p. 205.

34. Sandoz, Voegelin Revolution, p. 145. A quote from Jane Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion (repr. Ed., New York: Meridian Books, Inc, 1955), 573 -583, 559-60.

35. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, pp. 178, 196.

36. Ibid., pp 212 - 232.

37. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, p. 211.

38. Alasdair MacIntyre, Three Rival Forms of Moral Enquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy and Tradition (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), p. 131.

39. Bernard Lonergan, Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, Collected Works I (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2000), p. 306.

40. He writes about the issue of revelation constituting reason as an example. Eric Voegelin, Order and History IV: The Ecumenic Age (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1974), pp. 227 ff.

41. “The Beginning and the Beyond”, p. 173.

42. "The Drama of Humanity", p. 203.
43. Bernard Lonergan, Method in Theology (Minneapolis: The Seabury Press, 1979), p. 118 - 119.
44. "Anxiety and Reason", p. 69
45. Ibid.
46. The "Beyond" or Greek term *epikeina* is Plato's general term for divine reality. "The Beyond and Its Parousia", CW 33, p. 396.
47. This phrase expresses a very traditional Christian view of interiority, i.e. as articulated in the prologue to the gospel of John.
48. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 183.
49. Ibid., p. 202.
50. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 185.
51. Hence Voegelin tries the experiential language of "vision" to discuss faith in the complex, "The Beginning and the Beyond", pp. 227 - 232.
52. "The Drama of Humanity", CW 33, p. 198.
53. Sandoz, "Editor's Introduction", CW 12, p. xvii.
54. Bernard Lonergan, Method in Theology (Minneapolis, MI: The Seabury Press, 1979), pp. 115 -117.
55. Parousia is the general term for the presence of divine reality in all reality". See "The Beyond and Its Parousia", in CW 33, p. 396.
56. Method in Theology, p. 115.
57. Sandoz, The Voegelin Revolution, p. 124 -125.
58. Max Scheler, On the Eternal in Man, trans. by Bernard Noble (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 65.
59. Voegelin, "The Drama of Humanity", p. 206.
60. Religion considered as a moral virtue has a tradition extending back to the Stoics and St. Thomas Aquinas. See, Summa Theologiae, 2a2ae, 80.1.

61. "Conversations with Voegelin at the Thomas More Institute for Adult Education in Montreal", CW 33, p. 249.
62. Voegelin does maintain that "religious experiences" are empirically verifiable. See Sandoz, The Voegelin Revolution, p. 173. See the discussion on the conviction in divine reality achieved by Anselm's search, "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 194.
63. "Conversations with Voegelin", CW 33, p. 249.
64. "Further, we may characterize that which Bergson has called the open soul its rationality". Eric Voegelin, Anamnesis, translated and edited by Gerhart Niemeyer (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1978), p. 149.
65. Developing reason happens early in every human life; a sign of its unfolding parallels the early manifestations of the actuating habit of religion: i.e. the child's wonder at everything, the persistent "why" questions. Children live in a mythical universal and this is rudimentary religion.
66. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 213.
67. Ibid., p. 195.
68. "Conversations with Eric Voegelin", CW 33, p. 329.
69. "Anxiety and Reason", p. 89. Voegelin provides 10 related definitions of reason in this essay, pp. 88ff.
70. Ibid.
71. Sandoz, "Editor's Introduction", p. xvii. The "egophanic revolt" is a theme in Voegelin's writings—for example in the essay "Anxiety and Reason" quoted in this paper. See also "On Hegel: A Study in Sorcery", in CW 12, pp. 213 - 255.
72. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 184.
73. Ibid., pp. 184 - 185.
74. Ibid., p. 185.
75. "When in a revelatory process the hidden god . . . lets himself become manifest . . . the man who responds to the presence becomes conscious of his response as an act of participation in divine reality. He *discovers* (emphasis mine) something in his humanity that is the site and sensorium of divine presence." Eric Voegelin, Order and History IV: The Ecumenic Age (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1974), p. 8.
76. Ibid., p. 195.

77. "The Beginning and the Beyond", pp. 178ff.

78. See Voegelin on language and reflection, "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 188 - 191.

79. "The Drama of Humanity", p. 219.

80. "The Beginning and the Beyond", p. 229.

81. Ibid., pp. 215 - 217.

82. Ibid., p. 194.

83. Sandoz, The Voegelin Revolution, pp. 190 - 91.

84. Ibid.

85. "Responses at the Panel Discussion of 'The Beginning and the Beyond'", CW 33, p. 453.

86. Kenneth Schmitz, The Gift, Creation (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1982) pp. 44 - 59.