



Our Anthropological Vision as Key to Understanding a Flourishing Life

Frances Baker

This is an unpublished conference paper for the 8th Annual Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues conference at Oriel College, Oxford University, Friday 3rd – Sunday 5th January 2020.

These papers are works in progress and should not be cited without author's prior permission.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT United Kingdom

T: +44 (0) 121 414 3602 F: +44 (0) 121 414 4875

E: jubileecentre@contacts.bham.ac.uk W: www.jubileecentre.ac.uk



In the context of our focus on “Virtues and Human Flourishing”, this paper claims that there is a question prior to any consideration of human flourishing, and that is ‘what is our understanding of the human person as we come to engage with the issue of virtues and human flourishing? What particular anthropological vision is providing the basis for such an exploration? This paper argues that it is necessary to articulate this anthropology, or understanding of the human person, before we can consider what is required for the human person to flourish. The assumption here is that human flourishing is directly linked to becoming who we understand ourselves to be. The paper proceeds on the basis that, while there may be a range of views as to who the human person is, that there is a link between that understanding and what is required for human flourishing will be accepted. This is not novel claim.

For Aristotle, the human person was someone who pursued happiness as the end or meaning of human living, and it was acquisition of the virtues that led to this happiness, this *telos*,¹ this happiness was an end in itself and the most desirable thing in the world.² This position then led to nuanced and varied discussions of what that involved and how it would be achieved.

Thomas Aquinas described ‘human flourishing’ or ‘happiness’ as a way of living that reflected who people understood themselves to be: in his case, people created by a loving God to live in the world in accord with what they understood to be the truth about human life and through death to return to life with God forever.³

The Australian philosopher, Peter Singer, has articulated very clearly his understanding of the human person and of what is required for a flourishing human life. He has then built upon that foundation a consistent and logical path to human flourishing in the light of that understanding. Among the elements of a flourishing human life for Singer is the ability to exercise one’s rational capacity. The inability to do this prevents full human flourishing and in fact excludes the human being from recognition as one to whom is accorded full human dignity.⁴

Lamoureux and Wadell ask ‘What makes for a good life? What would it mean to live in a way that is truly becoming of a human being? What do we need - and what do we need to become - in order to find happiness?’⁵ These questions are very familiar to all working in this area of human flourishing. It is frequently the case though, that we move to a consideration of what we need and what we ought to become without first of all unpacking in some detail the question as to who we are. A quick glance at contemporary society reveals significant diversity among us with regard to specific behaviours and ways of living more generally, that we believe to be good or right.

¹ Alisdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: a Study in Moral Theory* (London: Duckworth, 1982), 148-149.

² *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book1. 7: 5-8.

³ *Summa Theologiae*. Ia IIae, q6. Prol.; Stephen J Pope (Ed) *The Ethics of Aquinas* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002), 66-67.

⁴ Peter Singer, *Unsanctifying Human life: Essays on Ethics*, Helga Khuse (Ed) (Oxford : Blackwell Publishers, 2002).

⁵ Patricia Lamoureux and Paul J Wadell, *The Christian Moral Life: Faithful Disciples for a Global Society* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2010), 109.

It is the contention of this paper that an articulation of one's understanding of who we are as human persons, of our particular anthropological vision, is an essential consideration prior to any attempt to answer the questions about what we need and what we need to become to live in a way that brings to realisation who we are as human persons – to live in a way that enables us to find happiness, to live in a way that allows for human flourishing. Embedded in that view are some givens: that the human person is searching for happiness, and that happiness will result from a way of life that leads us to become the kind of person that reflects the truth, as recognised, about our human existence.

To address the theme of “Virtues and Human Flourishing”, this paper will first of all develop a particular anthropology. In the light of that anthropology it will consider briefly the conference question as to whether the theme is about the flourishing of individuals or the flourishing of communities, and then it will look at ways in which articulating a particular anthropology might shape the path to human flourishing. Finally the paper will sketch a dialogical methodology which may contribute to the formation and development of those within an educational context.

Articulating an anthropological vision

This paper acknowledges that for each of us, our understanding of the human person is shaped by several significant elements: These include our world view which is directly related to our particular understanding of the meaning and purpose of human living and in some instances is shaped to a degree by religious faith, critical reflection on human experience (in some traditions/disciplines referred to as the natural law), contemporary social sciences, and contemporary philosophical frameworks. Understanding this reality and being aware of its implications is highly significant and especially in a pluralist secular society such as the one in which I live in in Australia.

The understanding of the human person developed here uses a framework that draws on the work of two moral theologians in relation to moral decision-making. The first of these is Joseph Selling⁶, who himself builds on the contribution of the Belgian moral theologian, Louis Janssens. Selling highlights the central concern that the human person be ‘adequately considered’⁷ in the process of moral decision-making. It is my contention that this condition of ‘adequately considering the human person’ is essential also in any reflection on human flourishing.

The second theologian whose work contributes to the anthropological vision outlined in this paper is Sergio Bastianel.⁸ While Bastianel's interest is in moral response within the social context of our lives, it is my claim that his insistence on our essential interrelationality as human persons, is a critical aspect of any consideration of virtues and human flourishing. While this framework is set within a Christian context, for the most part it is rational or phenomenological in its methodology.

Selling identifies what he describes as eight “continuous dimensions”⁹ of the human person. These are that the human person is unique, a Subject, is always in relationship – with others, the material world, and the whole universe - is embodied, cultural and historical. In addition

⁶ Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

⁷ Joseph Selling, “The Human Person” in *Christian Ethics: An Introduction*, edited by Bernard Hoose (London: Cassell, 1998), 99. See footnote 6 on page 108 for a discussion of the ways in which both Janssens and others have developed Janssens' original framework.

⁸ Emeritus Prof. Pontifical Gregorian University.

⁹ Selling, “The Human Person,” 98.

to claiming these dimensions are continuous, Selling argues that they are without a hierarchy, and that the human person is a unity of these dimensions.¹⁰ The implication of this position is that a particular dimension cannot be claimed in isolation. In acknowledging or acting out of the perspective of one dimension the others must also be in view and acknowledged equally. The human person cannot claim the dimensions one at a time, and act in a way that acknowledges or recognises one of the dimensions only. Selling argues that all dimensions are present even if not recognised and that there must constantly be an awareness of all dimensions if the human person is to be “adequately considered.”¹¹ This paper will consider in some detail the following dimensions: that the human person is unique, is an acting Subject always in relationship, and is historical.

The first of these dimensions is Selling’s identification of the uniqueness of the human person. Reflection on our own human experience leads us to see that this is an element of our reality. Each of us is different, and even the very best of adolescent friends who do everything they can to be alike are still aware of the distinctions and differences between themselves and their best friends. Each human person is unique, different from the other and so, it could be thought, in some ways set apart from the other – separate from the other - In fact, Australian society goes so far as to designate us as individuals with our own rights and needs, and public discourse frequently reflects a sense of real separation or disconnectedness from the other, particularly at times of making choices about how to act or live in our society. The starting point for social policy is that each person is an autonomous individual.¹² In his framework Selling describes the human person as being unique rather than as being an individual.¹³ Discovering ourselves to be unique rather than discovering ourselves to be individuals would seem to be a more accurate description of our human experience. This view of the human person also sits very comfortably with the theological understanding of the Christian tradition that the human person is created in the image and likeness of God who is essentially triune, in relationship; for Christians, this faith element strengthens and shapes in particular ways their self-understanding. This is not negotiable. It is who they believe themselves to be. This is quite a contrast to the view gained when the emphasis is placed on the human person as an autonomous individual with rights and freedom.

This dimension of recognising the human person as being unique has two aspects. Firstly, it is not the same as claiming each person is an individual. The two descriptors have quite different connotations. To describe each person as an ‘individual’ is to indicate separateness, or being apart from or even disconnected from. It implies a capacity to exist and develop without relationship to or consideration of others or of other material things. On the other hand, to describe the human person as unique rather than as an individual is to allow for relationship. Secondly, it calls for a recognition of each person as unique, not just oneself. Understanding ourselves as unique, rather than as individuals with an ability to function in isolation from or apart from all else, is a necessary self-perception if we are to consider the second dimension of human reality identified by Selling, namely, that the human person exists always in relationship.

Selling argues that this relationality is threefold. First of all the human person exists in relationship to other people. For Selling this is evident in our familial relationships, in the reality

¹⁰ Selling, “The Human Person,” 99.

¹¹ Selling, “The Human Person,” 99.

¹² A recent example of this has been the discourse around the debate and then the legislation relating to Voluntary Assisted Dying Act in Victoria, Australia, 2017.

¹³ Selling, “The Human Person,” 106.

that we are almost totally dependent for our existence on the social structures in which we live, and that “our human environment consists in an incredibly complex web of interconnecting systems”¹⁴ I suggest that reflection on our own human experience substantiates this claim. On one hand it is quite apparent that there is very little anyone of us can do that does not in some way impinge on another person. From another perspective, those who are experts in the social sciences and those of us who are educators know so well from both theoretical and practical perspectives that it is the capacity and the opportunity for relating effectively with others that allows for human growth and development in a whole variety of ways.

The second aspect of relationship identified by Selling is that of relationship with the material world. As we face the challenges of global climate change, the ravages of drought and fire in Australia, the deforestation and increasing desert areas in parts of Africa, frequent droughts in the Amazon Rainforest, and the melting ice in Greenland, the Arctic Circle and Antarctica,¹⁵ this reality is brought home to us so clearly. We are becoming more globally aware of our relationship with the environment in the broadest understanding of that term and more specifically demonstrate the beginnings of an awareness of both the impact we have on our physical world and of our dawning realisation of our responsibility for protecting our world. From the perspective of Christian faith is added the awareness that all of creation is gift and we are impelled to provide it with our most attentive stewardship. Pope Francis in his letter to all people of goodwill, *Laudato Si*,¹⁶ calls for ecological conversion, a concept that embraces all dimensions of human interrelationships: self, other persons, the physical world, cultures, the universe itself. To ‘adequately consider’ what it is to be human, one must take account of one’s relationship with the material world.

The third aspect of relationship in Selling’s framework is that of relationship with the whole of reality. While for Selling himself, this has theistic connotations and includes relationship with a personal God, he is keen to include in this aspect those relationships, increasingly recognised, with the cosmos, the spirit world of traditional religions, and what we might recognise as “the transcendent, that which is on a ‘higher’ plane than what we would normally refer to as human experience.”¹⁷

Acknowledgement of these dimensions identified by Selling leads one to an understanding of the human person which is quite in contrast to the view gained when the emphasis is placed on the human person as an autonomous individual with rights and freedoms. While not denying personal autonomy understood as our capacity to direct our lives through the exercise of our personal freedom, rather than being a rather ‘reckless autonomy’ lived out by one who considers himself or herself to be an individual, what is required is a ‘relational autonomy’ that takes account of the essential relationality of the each human person.

Even though Selling speaks of the “fundamentally social character”¹⁸ of the human person, these relationships might still be understood as external to the person and thus as realities one comes up against as it were more or less frequently. In the work of Sergio Bastianel, what emerges more clearly than perhaps Selling’s identification of the relational dimensions of the human person might lead one to see, is that interrelationality is to be understood as an essential or intrinsic dimension of the human person. Bastianel argues that rational reflection on our human experience,

¹⁴ Selling, “The Human Person,” 102.

¹⁵ Peter Hannam, “‘Cascade’ of climate tipping points looms”, *Melbourne Age*, 28 November, 2019, 11.

¹⁶ Francis, *Laudato Si*, Encyclical Letter (2017), n. 217.

¹⁷ Selling, “The Human Person,” 100.

¹⁸ Selling, “The Human Person,” 101.

by both individuals and social groups, leads to a realisation that we are essentially, in the philosophical sense, inter-relational. He argues that “the condition of every conscious human experience is precisely its being present in an intersubjective environment in which the individual human person is born”¹⁹ And moreover, he claims that the social context in which we find ourselves “is not just external to us, but it makes us, informing our way of understanding and acting”²⁰

For Bastianel, one’s inner self-understanding must include this essential interrelational dimension if the human person is to be “adequately considered”. From his perspective, the social dimension of human living is much more fundamental than simply an awareness of the political and communal structures of the society in which one finds oneself. In his view, it is an indispensable element of one’s self understanding and of the essence of what it is to be human. He claims that “[t]he mere fact of being with others becomes genuinely “moral” when one takes on the experience of being fellow humans as the meaning of one’s own life.”²¹ Bastianel speaks of the need for the responsible taking on of “our intersubjective life’ for our lives to be “human”.²²

This dimension of being human is the basis on which has been developed the principle of solidarity²³ and it highlights what *Gaudium et spes* describes as “a deep solidarity with the human race and its history.”²⁴ The importance of this awareness is highlighted when one takes into account what Bastianel describes as the “intimate connection between personal decisions and the structures of co-existence.”²⁵ This paper is contending that the recognition of this dimension of the essential interrelationality of the human person understood in all its dimensions is of major significance for any consideration of human flourishing.

The next of Selling’s continuous dimensions to consider is that of the human person as a Subject. This of course reflects that very important move in Catholic moral theology of taking up the anthropological ‘turn to the subject’. Its relevance for this discussion is that it provides a recognition of the locus for the exercise of personal freedom and responsibility, and highlights the reflective capacity of the human person. In the context of human flourishing, adequately recognising this dimension of the person underlines both the role and responsibility of the ‘acting subject’ in moving towards the proper end of the human person. It is here that both the person (in the sense of the individual) and the interpersonal, (in the sense of ‘the other’) come together in the human flourishing of both the individual and the community/society. This is what Bastianel is pointing to when he states what was referred to above, that there is “an intimate connection between personal decisions and the structures of co-existence.”

The last of Selling’s “continuous dimensions” of the human person “adequately considered” to be considered in this discussion is the recognition of the historical dimension of the human person. In Italian this is a noun rather than an adjective and we have the word *storicità*, which conveys much more a quality of being human rather than simply a description of human

¹⁹ Sergio Bastianel, *Morality in Social Life*, trans. Liam Kelly, (Miami, FL: Convivium 2010), 27.

²⁰ Bastianel, *Morality and Social Life*, 27.

²¹ Bastianel, *Morality and Social Life*, 28.

²² Bastianel, *Morality and Social Life*, 28.

²³ While not concisely defined, *solidarity* is a virtue which is reflected in some concrete attitudes, and demands particular ways of living. John Paul II writes: “Solidarity helps us to see the “other”-whether a person, people or nation-not just as some kind of instrument, with a work capacity and physical strength to be exploited at low cost and then discarded when no longer useful, but as our “neighbour,” a “helper” (cf. Gen 2:18-20), to be made a sharer, on a par with ourselves” John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* Encyclical Letter (1987), n. 39

²⁴ Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et spes*, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (7 Dec. 1965), n. 1.

²⁵ Bastianel, *Morality and Social Life*, 31.

experience. This dimension of the human person endeavours to capture what we all know as a reality in our own human living – we develop, change, grow – not just physically but in our knowledge, our understanding and our perception of reality. I am not the same person I was yesterday before meeting so many of you and listening to the papers so far presented. All of the time I continue to be shaped and reshaped by the inter-relationality that is so fundamental to my human experience. This is a lifetime journey and becomes very significant for considerations of human flourishing and growth in virtue – or formation of character in the context of one’s particular self-understanding as a human person. And the recognition of this dimension of the human person is of particular importance in a formation or educational context and environment. Selling claims that “Each human person is also a ‘history’, deriving identity in the present, built upon a past and oriented toward a future.”²⁶

If the human person is understood to be unique but always in relationship with others, with the material world and with all of reality, and an acting subject whose identity in the present has a past and looks to a future, human flourishing pertains to a life’s journey which facilitates the personal growth and development of such a person.

Once this consideration of the human person is moved into a Christian framework, it is not so much that the understanding of the human person is changed from that outlined above, as that the faith belief of Christians makes this understanding an imperative rather than an option. If, as this paper is arguing, we can recognise the dimensions identified above as a reflection of our experience of being human, and the Christian believes that the human person is created by God in God’s image and likeness, there are two critical additions to our anthropology. The first is that the human dignity we associate with the human person actually has its origin in the belief that each person is in the image and likeness of God. For the Christian, that can never be changed, ignored or disregarded. It is a central tenet of Judeo-Christian tradition and acknowledging our essential interrelationality brings the Christian to a stance of awe before ‘the other’ recognised for who he or she is: one in the image and likeness of God. The second addition follows from the first: if all are created in the image and likeness of God, all are equal and all are called to share in and provide stewardship of the goods of the earth.

Conference Question

One of the questions we have been invited to consider in these days is that as to whether we are talking about ‘a flourishing school/university/community’ or about ‘educational institutions that produce flourishing people.’ I hope it would be clear by this stage that my answer is “yes”! This paper has put forward a particular anthropological understanding in which interrelationality, understood in the way described, is an essential dimension of the human person. It is not possible to hold that anthropology and be concerned with the human flourishing of people considered as individuals, any more than it is possible to hold such an anthropology and be concerned about the flourishing of the community without at the same time understanding this means the flourishing of each person who makes up that community.

How does our anthropological vision become a key to understanding human flourishing?

Our conference theme is “Virtues and Human Flourishing.” Much in the tradition, philosophical and theological, centres on the question of ‘human happiness.’ The central focus of this paper is to argue for the importance of articulating the anthropological vision which is providing the basis for a discussion of ‘human flourishing’ and or ‘human happiness’. This is so

²⁶ Selling, “The Human Person,” 103.

because any discussion of flourishing or happiness pertains directly to who the human person is understood to be.

For Thomas Aquinas, whose writing is central to much theological discussion of virtue, the meaning and purpose of human life, located essentially within a teleological framework, provides the setting for his discussion of virtue. A life of growth in virtue is, for Thomas, the path to the telos or end of human living or the attainment of human happiness – for Thomas, life forever with God. Growth in the virtues moves the person from where they are to the fullness of who they are intended to be. Thomas is drawing on a vision of who the human person is – his anthropology.

More recently Alisdair MacIntyre, in his work *After Virtue*, argues that we need to focus once more on virtue but from within a living tradition with a common vision and a common understanding of human living.²⁷ In the same regard, Jean Porter argues that “in its most proper sense, ‘goodness’ applies to the perfected being, to whatever is, insofar as it is what it ought to be.”²⁸ And again, Joseph Kotva claims that “the telos is always in front of us, always calling us forward to a fuller realisation of the human good.”²⁹

While these sources support the central claim of this paper, the gap is the actual articulation of the anthropology. Human flourishing is dependent on the anthropological vision that is informing the particular notion of human flourishing. Virtue ethicists such as James Keenan,³⁰ in considering approaches to the search for the good, identify the questions that need to be asked. These are “Who are we? Who ought we to become? and How ought we to get there?”³¹ These questions are directly connected to the self-understanding of each human person and bring us to the idea of the virtuous person, the one who is good at being human.³²

I have suggested elsewhere³³ that today, discourse about “virtue” is unfamiliar territory for many people; however if we accept that it is actually discourse about character, about the kinds of persons we are becoming, we have a more helpful path to our focus on “virtue and human flourishing.” Romanus Cessario argues that virtue tends towards the growth and development of the fullness of the human person as that is perceived.³⁴

James Keenan in arguing for the connection between our anthropological vision and the virtues, highlights the dynamic nature of this relationship.³⁵ In one of his responses to criticisms of virtue ethics, he acknowledges and emphasises the difficulties that arise when structurally, priority is given to certain virtues over others.³⁶ For human flourishing it needs to be the anthropological vision which drives the growth in particular virtues rather than some particular vision of society which may not ‘adequately consider the human person’.

²⁷ Alisdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 220-223.

²⁸ Jean Porter, *The Recovery of Virtue: The Relevance of Aquinas for Christian Ethics* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 37.

²⁹ Joseph J. Kotva, Jr., *The Christian Case for Virtue Ethics* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1996), 38.

³⁰ Daniel J. Harrington and James F. Keenan, *Jesus and Virtue Ethics: Building Bridges between New Testament Studies and Moral Theology*, (Lanham, Maryland/Chicago, Illinois: Sheed & Ward, 2002), 23.

³¹ Daniel J. Harrington and James F. Keenan, *Jesus and Virtue Ethics*, 23.

³² Patricia Lamoureux and Paul J Wadell, *The Christian Moral Life*, 109-110.

³³ Frances Baker, “Values, Virtues and Catholic Identity,” *Australasian Catholic Record*, Vol 96, No. 1 (January 2019): 10.

³⁴ Romanus Cessario, *The Moral Virtues and Theological Ethics*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 17.

³⁵ Daniel J. Harrington and James F. Keenan, *Jesus and Virtue Ethics*, 7-12.

³⁶ Daniel J. Harrington and James F. Keenan, *Jesus and Virtue Ethics*, 12.

Let me return to the dimensions of the human person discussed earlier. As we develop the habit, through intentional practice, of a stance of awe on the basis of the dignity which is theirs before each person we ‘encounter’, this practice becomes a habit and gradually forms part of who we are and so comes into play unintentionally in new situations.³⁷ If I recognise that interrelationality is an essential dimension of who I am, then the practice of thinking about the implications for others, as well as for myself, of a proposed action is required. The path to human flourishing requires the identification of the practices, the habits, the qualities that I need to develop in order to become a person who acts in accord with that interrelational dimension of my humanity. It is a dimension that, within the Christian framework, reminds me that all the “others” are of equal dignity and the goods of the earth are ours to tend and to share. In what practices do I need to engage to enable me to develop habits that acknowledge the reality of this dimension of my humanity and bring it to its end?

We see this more easily today in our growing awareness of our relationship with the material world. Many of us are putting into place practices with regard to recycling, the use of plastic bags, composting, travel, etc. etc. We are finding that these practices are becoming more habitual and require less deliberation. We are becoming people who exhibit changing qualities with regard to our relationship to the material world. We are becoming people who more consistently live out who we are with regard to this dimension of our being. We may become people for whom these habits become so embedded in us that our character is so shaped by these habits that we have acquired the virtue of respect for our material world to such an extent that it is exhibited in our actions as a matter of course.

We do need to recognise our uniqueness in our living but this is held in tension with the other dimensions of being human. The ways in which we live an authentic expression of our humanity will develop and change at different stages of our lives. This is both why it is important to recognise the historicity of the human person and to understand its implications.

There is potential to be overwhelmed in the face of the enormous inequalities that exist in our world, and the massive failures to recognise and accept that all persons are equal and have a right to share in what is needed to live their humanity. This experience is contained to some extent when all those dimensions are held together. We are unique, and in relationship with others, the material world and all of reality; but each of us is also in a particular place at a particular time with particular resources and responsibilities. To be a human person is to be ‘historical’, ‘cultural’ and ‘embodied’ and, at the same time, an acting subject who can make choices about how to exercise personal freedom. It is in this place only that we can act, and it is in this place only that we can consider the practices in which we need to engage to become people who habitually begin to live and make choices that take account of all that will contribute to human flourishing.

Methodology.

At this point let me turn to the question of how dialogue about human flourishing might be introduced in an educational setting. The paper has argued for an adequate consideration of who the human person is in order to arrive at some understanding of what will contribute to human flourishing. We are aware that the virtuous person is one in whom particular qualities are so finely tuned that they are almost intuitively adapted to ever new situations enabling wise and prudent responses or actions.

Drawing on some work that is being undertaken in a number of dioceses in Australia within the area of Catholic education, this paper proposes a dialogical methodology to begin a journey in

³⁷ Patricia Lamoureux and Paul J Wadell, *The Christian Moral Life*, 117.

the context of educational facilities towards intentional practices that may become habits and so lead to virtue. The methodology is quite simple: A “text” which may be any one of a whole variety of formats -a formal document, a passage from the Gospels, a newspaper article, a picture, a YouTube clip – is presented and the students are invited to enter into dialogue with the “text. A series of questions are posed to the “text.”³⁸

- What is at the heart of this “text” with regard to the human person?
- What understanding of human life does this perspective reveal?
- What positions that I/we hold might this perspective challenge?
- What connects with my/our experience or thinking?
- What challenges my/our thinking about humanity?
- Where would I/we need “to move to” in my/our thinking?
- What would this require of me?
- What would this require of us?

Such an encounter with a “text” opens up the possibility of personal response, in attitude or action. It provides the opportunity for critical reflection on those virtue questions about Who I am?, Who ought I to be? and How do I get there?.

Conclusion

It is relatively easy to make lists of virtues or qualities of character one might try to grow into. Taking seriously our anthropological vision requires that we consider constantly and diligently what is needed of us that we might be enabled to live in accord with and bring to its finality that vision.

In conclusion let me recall the words of William Spohn:

“We make choices in the world that we notice, and what we notice is shaped by the metaphors and habits of the heart that we bring to experience....”³⁹

³⁸ Adapted from Kevin Lenehan and Rina Madden, University of Divinity, “Recontextualising Pedagogy for a Distinctively Catholic Education”. (Unpublished Position Paper for Catholic Education in Victoria, 2017) 1-8.

³⁹ William Spohn, “Spirituality and Ethics: Exploring Connections”, *Theological Studies*, 58 no 1 Mar 1997, 109-123. 115.