

## *Eldorede 5*

### **Loneragan's Ethics of Self-Transcendence: Education**

I must assume that there is a need, especially at this early stage of this final series, to remind my random readers that the series aims at plain doctrinal speaking on topics that happen to come my way on the road to my seventy fifth year. The topic named between the two colons in my title is the topic of the April 2007 meeting at Loyola Mary Mount University, Los Angeles<sup>1</sup> and it meshes conveniently with my concerns so far in this year: Jesuit education, Korean education, self-education, economic education, growth in education. Indeed, this is almost a listing of the content of the previous four Eldorede. What new twist am I attempting to add here, to the musing of the meeting, to the issues of ethics, of self-transcendence, of education?

Twist is deliberately singular, for there is a single underpinning pointing, a pointing suitable to the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of Lonergan's masterwork, *Insight*. The pointing is to Lonergan's own ethics of self-transcendence and self-education. But the pointing reaches towards us, individually and as a global community, posing challenges of self-education and global care.

Repeating myself, especially repeating myself compactly, does not belong to my strategy of plain speaking. This is all the more true if what was said previously was plain speaking, and this happens to be the case in my first pointing regarding the masterwork *Insight*. *Joistings* 22, "Reviewing Mathew's *Loneragan's Quest*, and Ours", is plain and straightforward in its pointing. In terms of the present topic, that *Joistings* deals with the ethics of Lonergan's quest, which carried him beyond *Insight* in a suffering search for a solution to the problem of Plato and of Marx, to change history for the better. In the sick solitude of Rome he identified Cosmopolis. In the years that followed he sadly failed, in the main, to identify it for others. Identification, very

---

<sup>1</sup>The 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual Fallon Memorial Lonergan Symposium, with topic "Lonergan's Ethics of Self-Transcendence".

evidently, is no mean task. I recall now a struggle I shared with Ken Melchin more than quarter of a century ago as he battled towards the end of his doctorate thesis on emergent probability and ethics. What was to be his positive conclusion? Neither of us came up with what is now quite evident to me: that emergent probability has pitched up an ethical refinement of progress.<sup>2</sup>

The upsurge is twofold, a twofoldness expressed in my claim that history is the mother and Lonergan the foster-father of the division of labour called functional specialization. Lonergan's slim formulation of the strategy is, for the most part, ahead of history's revelation of need and nature of a global collaboration. But there seems less and less doubt regarding a global ethics of collaboration that would be complexly structured: not then a feature of national leaders' compromises or international bankers' assessments, nor a directive from grass-root decisions, nor a voted suggestion, regularly ineffective, from such a body as the United Nations. What might that ethical structure be?

And what might my plain speaking about it be now?

A month's puzzling leads me back to a previously-used strategy of mine. Repeating, compact or otherwise, is avoided by the plain speaking of reference. My reference to *Joistings* 22 is plain enough. To it I might add a reference to the first chapter of *Method in Theology and Botany*, which was written in pretty plain language, pointing primarily to the upsurge of the need in history of a division of labour. And I should add further the paralleling of chapter 18 of insight, on ethics, by Cantower 18, where the third part takes a stand on the ethics of functional specialization as the norm of the future academy. The added emphasis here is a pointing to the actual ethics of Lonergan's struggle right through to February of 1965. Moreover, the addition of a

---

<sup>2</sup>Ken Melchin's doctorate work appeared as the book, *History Ethics and Emergent Probability*, University Press of America, 1984. We have discuss since then the weakness of the conclusion. The stronger conclusion, as I mention shortly in the text, is expressed in section 3 of **Cantower XVIII**.

focus on education is not really an addition at all: that bent was intrinsic to his ethics from his early years. His interest was in the education of humanity.

So perhaps I have said enough?

But is my saying effective? Effective in the manner that is required of *Praxis*, of a metaphysics that includes in its definition **implementation**, of a science of being that has unity and therefore beauty only if it is efficient?<sup>3</sup> Two years ago I address this same Los Angeles meeting on the topic “The Origins and Goals of Functional Specialization.”<sup>4</sup> Nothing much has changed. Is it a matter of leaving the pressure towards this solution to both Plato’s and Paul’s problems to history’s messing forward? A pity.

Leaving that topic for the moment, let me ramble back to the ethics of Lonergan’s search for self-transcendence as it appears in these first *Eldorede*. And perhaps this is a key to the present avoidance of that Platonic and Pauline solution to present ills: continuous drawing of attention to norms of future academic authenticity.<sup>5</sup> Such norms go beyond functional specialization to the self-transcendence that places one luminously with oneself, enlightenedly in an economy with others, called within to embrace the cosmos in a contemplation that is effective, that reaches towards the education of others and their economic well-being. So, in a plain sentence, I recall the drive of those previous *Eldoredes*, and in that recall I lift my own ethics towards further “Elder Speaking” efforts.

But the recall to my audience benefits from non-compact recall of the previous Elder Speakings, and the reason for those elder speakings. So I conclude, yes, conclude

---

<sup>3</sup>My oft-repeated reference here is to Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 160, line 16.

<sup>4</sup>Available on the usual website, [www.philipmcschane.ca](http://www.philipmcschane.ca), as *Quodlibet 17*.

<sup>5</sup>I would say that the main difficulty is the size of the discontinuity between normal science and scholarship at present ( I am thinking of Kuhn: see *Cantower 16*) and the distant goal of a global effective collaboration of the dimensions suggested in chapter 6 of my *Method in Theology and Botany*. For me, certainly, this has been an enormous effort of scientific fantasy over a period of forty years.

this short comment on the ethics and education of the educated by simply locating here the previous *Eldoredes*, with the strategic omission of some sections to be noted as we go along.

Is there not some benefit in taking the same “riverrun past Eve and Adam” twice?

What is it to repeat? Is it a repetition, or is one not elder, wiser, a stranger to the previous self with the so-much smaller inner word, world? But to answer this in some small way, one needs the riverrun to and past *Eldorede 4*.

### ***Eldorede 1: Re Forming Teachers of Themselves***

#### **1. Beginagain**

No doubt the odd title puzzles you, which is a good thing. Still I wish this final series to be as simple in expression as possible, even if it does have layers of remote meaning.

My first effort to begin this series was lengthy and self-defeating. So here I am chopping out my complexifications to let us begin with the gentle assumption that a minimal meaning of the title is enough for starters: I am, these months of December and January, 2007, venturing on a series titled *elderspeak* to be completed before I reach age 75. My first effort at simplicity is in section 1 here. Section 3 rambles round topics related to the title, but in a manner that still avoids complexifications.

The focus of the missing section 2 is on the core problem of teaching. It is the first of a series of four lectures given to teachers in Seoul, Korea. It has not the complexity that it would have were I to twist it, turn it, into the mood of the title I gave above. It is for you to add complexities to suit your growing needs as you read it on the website.

Can I maintain - do I maintain in that missing section 2? - the exclusion of complexity, in the “Eldorado” of my final effort which is a take-off from the unwritten “Paradiso” that Joyce might have added to his prior three books? “What the heavenly language was to have been for Joyce’s unwritten fourth book, we do not know, but

Joyce is reported to have said that it was going to be lucid, simple, and clear. Which is as it should have been for Paradise.”<sup>6</sup> Well, I leave it to you to muse over how I succeed, in that section 2, in keeping lucid and clear the topic, even the topic of simplicity. Then there follows section 3, included immediately here, which I keep brief “in spite of everything”.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. El Dorado<sup>8</sup>

“What the heavenly language was to have been for Joyce’s fourth book, we do not know, but Joyce is reported to have said that it was going to be lucid, simple and clear. Which is as it should have been for Paradise.”<sup>9</sup>

I repeat here Campbell’s comment that was my lead into section 1. That lead was beaten back into a single page. Here I have a similar problem: cutting out complexification.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps there is one favorite pointer I should retain, one that refers you back to the end of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. “We are discussing life and death and not

---

<sup>6</sup>Joseph Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Word. On the Art of James Joyce*, edited by Edmund L. Epstein, Harper Collins, 1993, 21.

<sup>7</sup>The conventional phrase has new strange meaning for me, even as I struggle with it this morning as a conclusion of this little introduction. What is that meaning, that spite, the spit-curl of meaning pressed against your temple of the sprite? Well, now, isn’t that the problem, the problem of the hole story?

<sup>8</sup>Obviously the basic reference here is to the mythic man or place of South America, the gilded one. Note, too that I leave the number of the section as it was in the original. Section 2 is a lengthy illustration of plain speaking: omitted here.

<sup>9</sup>Joseph Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Word. On the Art of James Joyce*, edited by Edmund L. Epstein, Harper Collins, 1993, 21.

<sup>10</sup>The first line of the cut-off notes gives you an idea, to be grinned about, of my original bent: “Joyce/ Boulanger/ Cezanne/ Cobbett/ George Elliot/ Proust/ Georg Sand/ Kate Chopin”. I would claim that such expansions would in fact help us towards concretizing the challenge, and I have used them previously. The effort above is to be brief, but it is not the brevity of the compendiousness of Lonergan that Hefling remarks on in his Preface to Volume 15 of the *Complete Works*. What, then is it? Do I manage to head you towards a compacted what above? And - the key issue - what might be meant by “head you towards a compacted what”? Let’s get back to our simple text, “in spite of everything”!

in the abstract, either. We are discussing my life and my death. And I cannot conceive of any other tone. Now is not the time for verbal thought-play. Nothing would be worse than a detailed scholarly analysis of erudition, interpretation, complication. Now is the time for simplicity. Now is the time for, dare I say it, kindness".<sup>11</sup>

But most of all perhaps it is a matter of your kindness in listening to an elder telling the tale of the tribe, of ontogenetic and phylogenetic meaning-growth. But more on that in *Eldorede* 4. I think now of the elder lady in the African firelight telling the tale of the tribe: the listening group have no illusions of taking it in. They will listen again, perhaps tomorrow night, freshly.<sup>12</sup>

I am not going to muse over Joyce's final life-run, reverierun. I have my own view, obviously, of my own simplicity here, and of a needed cultural simplicity that is to be internal to the speaking, the very words, of the third stage of meaning. I am writing in doctrinal simplicity, about a simplicity of know-how talk, methodological doctrine incarnated, yet there must be a hodic way in which my writing is a little comprehensible now in an ex-plain<sup>13</sup> way from me to you. When master-classes were given by the likes of Nadia Boulanger or Pavorotti the talk is know-how talk.<sup>14</sup> It

<sup>11</sup>I quote from Emma Thompson's lines near the end of the film *Wit*. She wrote the screenplay for the film (2001) with Mike Nicholls, the director, from a play by Margaret Edson.

<sup>12</sup>But I think, too, of the elder ladies of 2040 and beyond, adding images from another film, *Dreamgirls*. Surely there are voices out there now, who, like Jennifer Hudson, came seventh in some academic competition merely because they did not belong in the present truncated academy but who have a lonely foundational sense generative of a dream team? Cantowers 4 and 5 deal with aspects of feminism. See also the Website **Archives**, no. 3: "Foundations of Ethics, Feminism and Business Ethics" A context for a future integral feminism is Alessandra Drage, *Thinking Woman*, Axial Publishing, 2005.

<sup>13</sup>The meaning of ex-plain<sup>ed</sup>, ex-plain<sup>ed</sup>, is a topic of the conclusion of chapter three of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. The solution to the problem of popularization that it points to there is meshed with the present topic of how-language. See also the notes that follow here.

<sup>14</sup>I was struggling vaguely with this problem when, at 65, I titled *A Brief History of Tongue* chapter 2 "How Language: Works?" and wrote the final section there, "2.5 Works?" which began with words that make so much more sense to me now at 75. "There is a sense in

“**appears** to me” - in these last twelve hours, with Fermat freshness - that human speaking is to become, in most of its realms<sup>15</sup>, know-how talk with little reverence for fool stops.<sup>16</sup>

M'amour, m'amour  
 what do I love and  
 where are you?  
 That I lost my center  
 fighting the world.  
 The dreams clash  
 and are shattered -  
 and that I tried to make a paradiso  
 terrestre.”<sup>17</sup>

---

which, in this final section of our second chapter, we are in fantasyland.” It seems to me that I am reaching for some Fermat-like theorem about human talk which certainly cannot be expressed briefly at the end of a first *Eldorede*. Lurking here, perhaps, not too obviously, is a thesis about those four books of Joyce, and in particular about that episode of *Ulysses*, “Oxen of the Sun”, that has intrigued me for more than three decades. From musings on it comes the title of the four volumes of Cantowers: *Roun Doll*, *Home James*.

<sup>15</sup>This complex topic calls for a large book. It relates to the problem of popularization raised e.g. in chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. Chapter four there raises, in notes, the problem of different presentations in mathematics: e.g. the presentations of Weierstrass contrasted with Riemann. Aesthetic presentation has an integrality that requires the subject to be present to integrally - so, if it involves intrinsically time then it needs repeat presentation. Weierstrassian presentation can be relevant here, indeed necessary, with aesthetic tonalities. Think of Wiley's three-lecture presentation of his discovery of the answer to Fermat's Last Theorem.

<sup>16</sup>I would recall here the shift intimated by Lonergan in note 34 of page 88 of *Method in Theology*: “At a higher level of linguistic development, the possibility of insight is achieved by linguistic feed-back, by expressing the subjective experience in words and as subjective”. The shift I write of with equal brevity here is to sublimate this shift into a luminous hodic genuineness.

<sup>17</sup>I am quoting from Ezra Pound's last Canto, *Canto CXVII*. My last Cantower was to have been *Cantower CXVII*, for December 2011. That series stopped at Cantower 41 after 400,000 words, 600,000 words short of the full project. But I suspect that there is to be more than 600,000 words in the pointing that turned away towards the hopeland of collaboration.

## *Eldorede 2*    **Core Economics for High Schools and for Lonergan Followers**

### **1. A First Context**

I continue with my shot at plain speaking, and my aim is to stir some interest, especially among teachers of economics, but also among interested Lonergan people, in breaking from the abomination that is standard in first courses in economics. Depending on your background and interests, you might skim or skip this section and home in on the third section, which gets to the point in what I hope is plain doctrinal writing: what is to be done in the first weeks of an introductory course? My title and my first sentence indicate my initial reach. The first audience is obviously the most likely present readership of those who respect Lonergan's viewpoint. Through them I would hope to reach the teachers: friends, colleagues, whatever. Perhaps, indeed you have a daughter or a son suffering through grade 12? Then, with some degree of cunning, you might invade the teacher's mind.

Perhaps I can cater to the various audiences by putting my problem this way for you: "What might I do if took a month to introduce myself to Lonergan's economic perspective?". What is my problem, your problem? My problem is to persuade you to take that month; your problem is to take the month, or its equivalent, during the next year, or even decade.

First, let me assume that you respect Lonergan. The assumption would include that you respect what he says about economic democracy. However, that respect would be for most readers, at present, mainly a doctrinal respect. I am inviting you to a comprehending respect. Not an easy task, and to quote Lonergan on the topic, "Experto Crede."<sup>18</sup> In 1968 Lonergan invited my interest in his 1944 typescript: ten years later,

---

<sup>18</sup>I quote the end of the short chapter 7 of *For a New Political Economy*. I would note that, when I helped him prepare for his first presentation of what is now Part Three of that book, this was the only piece of his earlier writings that I encouraged him to include in his



after much mental gymnastics, I was sufficiently tuned in to present his view twice, in seminars in Boston College.<sup>19</sup> In the following spring he invited me to attend his first presentation of his view: mainly to have a friendly comprehending face in the audience. What did the audience make of the stuff? I would say, not a great deal. It was, and still is, altogether too strange, and there is the paradox, noted by Hefling in his comments on those years of Lonergan's economic lectures, that Lonergan tended to condense rather than expand.

There has not been much progress since in promoting Lonergan's economic views effectively: scholarly interest, yes, even theses, and some publications, my own among them. Recently I was external examiner of a Darlene O'Leary's thesis of Lonergan's economics and contemporary Christian perspectives. Gentle as she was, it was pretty evident that there was no serious economic theory backing up the various pseudo-theoretic or practical suggestions about economic justice that she considered. One of my questions to her was about the effectiveness of the thesis. At least I got a smile for it: neither of us have an answer to my question. The answer, indeed, requires at least the beginnings of functional specialization: the emergence of a sub-group sufficiently versed in Lonergan's approach to talk it and take it into local cultures. But that is an old issue of mine, to which I have so far got little response.

Have I at least stirred a new interest, or freshened an old one? Indeed, you might take an easy way out and, on the basis of the third [omitted] section here, nudge others, perhaps in the next generation, towards disturbing grade 12 classes in the manner

---

presentation.

<sup>19</sup>These were given in the summer of 1977, one during the workshop, the second for a special group after the workshop. This throws light on why the question-sessions to Lonergan that Summer were laced with questions on economic. During the rest of that year I was pore-occupied with hunting down relevant readings for his seminar of Spring 1978. Late in 1977 he greeted me one day with a relieved grin about his decision regarding how to handle that seminar: I am going to read it [the manuscript of 1944] at them twice!"

suggested below.<sup>20</sup>

### *Eldorede 3*      **Prayer, Spirituality**

#### **1. Basics**

Recently a young lady, out of the blue, thanked me for leading her to thinking of prayer as thinking. And that is, I suppose, as plain and simple a speaking as I might manage.

But the young lady knew what I meant by thinking and this may not be true of some of my readers. So we need a pause, and by *we* I do mean both of us. This notion of **my** need may seem peculiar to you, and it is worth a pause. Wow, are we departing from the plain speaking, or what?

Yes, this is tricky work: recall my view captured in the word (about)<sup>3</sup> : but don't follow it up for the moment, if ever.<sup>21</sup> Let us think, here, of my earlier expression of prayer as thinking: it was *Cantower XXI*, "Epilodge". It expressed my thinking early in 2004: my pragmatic thinking about pragmatic thinking.<sup>22</sup> But my thinking on the matter has expanded enormously in the three years since: a topic we just have to face in the next *Eldorede*, the topic of normative adult growth. That perspective is at the heart of hopefilled and positive spirituality. The plain point here is that my view changes

---

<sup>20</sup>The "below", omitted here, is available, on the website, in the original version of *Eldorede 2*.

<sup>21</sup>Footnotes, as you may also recall from the first *Eldorede*, are optional diversion, expansions. The meaning of (about)<sup>3</sup> can be sought by going to, say, in chapter 2 of *ChrISt in History*, "The General Solution to Present Ineffective Fragmentations", section 2.

<sup>22</sup>This is a complex issue of defining finite reachings adequately, but there is a quite pragmatic beginning in my view of economic reachings, expressed plainly in the previous *Eldorede* or at more length in *PastKeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Publishing, 1999.

exponentially<sup>23</sup> even as I struggle with this *Eldorede*, as I pragmatically think. There: that is a new word for me laced into a new emerging perspective that I cannot share - or rather that I can share doctrinally, which means that you may be able to climb to it over the decades.

But let us stay with what I call the basics. I am not promoting some strange view of, or practice of, prayer, that is novel: it is merely the stand of the lover that makes the beloved an object of interest and concern. In terms of the Christian tradition it has been around since the beginning, sloganized gradually as “faith seeking understanding”. Nor is it posed in opposition to that other type of prayer that is associated with a negative attitude, an attitude of accepting mystery, one that has a long tradition in Christianity, in Zen, in other cultures.<sup>24</sup> But this positive prayer is being pushed by me here and now as a desperate personal and cultural need. Simply put, I find the negative and also what I call the “dependent” attitude over-emphasized.

And also I have to claim that I find the positive attitude, when present at present, too weak, too narrow. Here I would draw attention to Bob Doran’s pointers in his paper “Ignatian Themes in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan”<sup>25</sup> and associate his efforts with one of the central pointers of *Insight*. “Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.”<sup>26</sup> Is reading

---

<sup>23</sup>See the quotation from Lonergan’s letter of 1954 and the discussion around it there: note 59, below, of *Eldorede* 4.

<sup>24</sup>The acceptance varies depending on the intellectual maturity of the group or the individual with the mystery-context of their own faith. On Rahner’s obscure acceptance as compared with Lonergan’s precisions through various inverse insights, see the beginning of Chapter 4, “Foundations,” of *ChrISt in History*.

<sup>25</sup>*Toronto Journal of Theology* 22(2006) 39-54. I have to hand only the typescript, kindly sent to me by Bob, as well as a version presented at the Boston Workshop of 2006. So my references will not be to specific pages.

<sup>26</sup>*Insight*, 417[442]. In the *Cantowers* I gave this important norm **The Tomega Principle** for obvious reasons.

*Insight* prayer? Oh yes. Indeed I would claim that reading physics is prayer. Is one not seeking to embrace the universe?

Further, I would note that the pragmathinking that I write of is at the heart of *Insight*, and should be the heart of the embrace, an embrace that gently groans to erect such a synthesis as oneself, “The Song of the Adorable,”<sup>27</sup> that longs with a molecularity of 13 billion years to be a synthetic whole.<sup>28</sup> *Insight*, of course, was written to make a simple point<sup>29</sup>: the embracing of Lonergan, with both objective and subjective genitives meant, was a hidden thing. And I would note, for your encouragement, that for me, the book of uncommon prayer since Lonergan sent it to me in 1964 has been the Systematic Treatise on the Trinity. There is still a hiddenness - Lonergan never broke forwards to the self- and Selves-revelation demanded by his challenge of linguistic feedback<sup>30</sup> - but Speak, Spoke and Clasp can be met there in a fresh subtle embrace that lifts the seeker, literally, into his or her own inner word of those Three, with fresh identification of Them and us.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>I have reflected on this perspective, in relation to the *Bhagavad Gita*, in chapter 5 of *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young Christian Minded*, a book available on the website.

<sup>28</sup>This longing has not been thematized sufficiently to carry us beyond Lonergan’s suggestions regarding **exigence** and **non-Noah’s Ark integrity** of finitude in his *Phenomenology and Logic* into a fuller perspective on the subject’s selection-reach in every decision of a different universe. The context here is the 18<sup>th</sup> place of the ninth section of chapter 19 of *Insight*.

<sup>29</sup>Foolishness regarding the early and later Lonergan can be avoided by taking seriously just what Lonergan was doing in each of these books. On *Insight* he is quite explicit: “I was dealing in insight with the intellectual side - a study of human understanding - and got human intelligence in there, not just a sausage machine turning out abstract concepts” (“Interview with Bernard Lonergan”, edited by P. McShane, *A Second Collection*, 222) Regarding *Method in Theology*, I would say - recalling conversations with him in the late 1960s - that his effort there was one of a tired persuasiveness.

<sup>30</sup>See *Method in Theology*, 88, note 34.

<sup>31</sup>Lonergan *De Deo Trino Pars Systematica* is rich in suggestions. The volume is to appear shortly in English, which will give me the opportunity to give detailed references in

This may seem quite unrealistic, unrealizable for you now. It reminds me of a story of Stravinsky showing a violin part to a violinist, who remarked “This is quite beyond me!”. To which Stravinsky replied, “I did not write it for you”. But I am writing to you in the hope of you and I moving the human group forward slowly beyond its nominalist dependent<sup>32</sup> conversations with our Infinite Lovers. My plain speaking, then, is doctrinal towards the future, and the distant future: and is this not what doctrinal talk aims at?<sup>33</sup>

My plain speaking of necessity homes in on just a single aspect of our feeble journey in the making of our story and God’s history. In a later culture this pointing will not be necessary: the human group will have reached a new phase of the Clasp’s embrace.<sup>34</sup>

Still I would make a further remark before moving to the next section. Pragmathinking, pragmaprayer, has to do with us living in a reach for delicate

---

English. I add here just one instance from the conclusion of the lengthy *Quaestio XXXII*, which talks of the divine presence according to charity: there is the drive of finitude towards the speaking in us of our word of the Divine Word. This is just the beginning, quite beyond Augustine and Thomas, of a fuller luminous theology that is the cosmic call of sex and all. “The sexual extravagance of man, unparalleled in the animals, has its ultimate ground in St. Augustine’s *Fecisti nos ad te, Domine, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te*. The ignorance and frailty of fallen man tend to center an infinite craving on a finite object.” (Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection*, 49)

<sup>32</sup>This is a huge pastoral problem which can be sensed, for example, by contrasting the inner law of *Jeremiah* 31: 34 with the perspective of asking for and waiting for guidance that dominates contemporary hymns.

<sup>33</sup>There is the problem of distinguishing various levels of talk: so, for example doctrinal talk in the sixth specialty is remote and incomprehensible - when functional specialization and scientific theology matures - massively different from the doctrinal talk either of the eight specialty or of local communications.

<sup>34</sup>The context here is represented by the metagram that I name **W3**: see, for example, page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*, or page 130 of *Music That Is Soundless*. Both books are available from Axial Publishing.

alignment with “God’s concept and choice.”<sup>35</sup> Within our religiousness, our cosmic tie-in, there is that strange invitation to be Perfect as the Speaker.<sup>36</sup> But what might we mean, concretely, by this reach? In my own years of formal Jesuit religious living there was a tendency to home in on detail. I recall then, for you, a moment of doctrinal delight in the spring of 1978 when, in a casual aside of a lecture on economics, Lonergan remarked, “being perfect is trying to remove the major obstacle to your living”. You may recognize here the same attitude he expressed in his reflections on correcting our belief-system.<sup>37</sup> More on this in section 3 below.

## 2. Unusual Progress

What do I mean here by *unusual progress*? Since my speaking is primarily directed to a Lonergan community it is my hope that that directing would nudge some to aspire to becoming part of the strange Tower Community that I have been advocating especially in my *Cantower* years. There is to emerge, in a hundred years or so, a global minority whose pragmatic contemplative power will encourage, embarrass, frighten, world parliaments and banks and industrialists and lobbyists - think of the *Supersize Me* horror - towards sane progress.<sup>38</sup> Certainly, there is a range of types of unusual progress that can be related to such encouragement: I think immediately of that magnificent eccentric woman of the twentieth century, Theresa of Liseaux, opening us

---

<sup>35</sup>*Insight*, 726[748]. Note the peculiarity here of slipping in the notion of a divine concept, beyond the reachings of *Insight* chapter 19.

<sup>36</sup>Mathew 5: 48.

<sup>37</sup>*Insight*, chapter 20. Section 4.3.

<sup>38</sup>The context here is a heuristics of the full dynamics of theological system presented in chapters 6 of *Method in Theology and Botany*.

to a realism of attitude.<sup>39</sup> But here I have in mind that subgroup of contemplatives<sup>40</sup> who are to reach sustainedly, in a hundred years or so, for a larger fullness of the full explanatory conversion caught in Lonergan's shocking invitation: "So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extension and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies."<sup>41</sup> That community is to emerge, under global pressure within the Clasp, from all religious searchings. So, for example, the great Arab tradition that was prior to Aquinas will have its later fuller echo of history's heart. The contemplative Muslim will cherish freshly the invitation of the **The Recital**<sup>42</sup> and the Tower searchers in all traditions will converge on the mystery that is the single truth of history,

---

<sup>39</sup>The spirituality of Theresa of Liseaux is considered in chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* and in *Joistings 4*, "Personality Types", a useful reflection on such variations of attitude as are represented by those three "Theresas" : of Avila, of Liseaux, of India.

<sup>40</sup>There is the grounded fantasy expressed by Lonergan for an identity of contemplation and any theoretical pursuit. "Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view"(*Insight*, 417[442]) This should be related to the similar view lurking in *For a New Political Economy* 's perspective on leisure.

<sup>41</sup>*Insight*, 514[537].

<sup>42</sup>Translation of the Arabic *Qu'an*. I note here the translation that I use in the quotations to follow is that of N.J.Dawood, Penguin Books, 1999. "We have revealed the Koran in the Arabic tongue so that you may grow in understanding" (165) As with any scriptures, such as the Old Testament, there is the problem of full heed, repeated in this scripture throughout the section on The Moon : "We have made the Koran easy to remember, but will any take heed?" (374). What is that heed, that understanding? It is an element in the remote goal of the Towering minority of Muslim world, "that you may thereby proclaim good tidings to the upright" (219)? Within the distant truth there is a truth of the claim that Jesus is not God's son. But the Tower search has to grip "in its intellectual paws"(compare this reflection on comprehending Euclid [*Phenomenology and Logic*, 357]) with the problem of total comprehension. That grip requires the "come about" already quoted. Light on the struggle may be had from the effort in my *ChrISt in History* to lift the 4<sup>th</sup> century Christian struggle with the meaning of Mathew 16:16 into a pattern of metaphysical equivalence, a pattern foreign now as then to the followers of the Testament.

mediating mutual tolerance and collaboration in the making of that truth. But some further plain words on that are best left to the end of the next section.

### 3. Ignatian Spirituality

One of my favorite lines from Ignatius' *Exercises* has been, for the past fifty years, those lines where Ignatius justifies his divergence from scripture on the matter of Jesus appearing to his mother: "are you also without understanding?"<sup>43</sup>

Very obviously I am not about to venture into some compacted commentary on those **Exercises** of St. Ignatius: I wish only to give a few doctrinal pointers that mesh with the suggestions already given.<sup>44</sup> This is made easier for us in so far as you can get your hands on the essay of Robert Doran to which I referred already.

I refer especially of his reflections on the reading of *Insight* and on the task

---

<sup>43</sup>I am using the version of *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, of Vintage Books, Random House, 2000, translated by Louis Puhl S.J., prefaced by Avery Dulles S.J. It is referred to below simply as **Exercises**. I give page and section numbers. Here, **Exercises** p. 107, s. 299. I have to hand another translation which may help my reader to put in context what this entire essay is about: .David L.Fleming S.J., *Draw Me into Your Friendship. The Spiritual Exercise: A Literal Translation and A Contemporary Reading*, The Institute of Jesuit Sources, St. Louis, Missouri, 2002. The contemporary reading in Fleming's book goes page by page with the translation, and, from the point of view of my present suggestions, the work is of quite limited value. The contemporary reading that I envisage here is a vastly different business, a task of future functional specialization that would make ever-freshly available, to the local communities of the globe, the strategies of Ignatius' *Exercises* in a manner that is to be "something better than was the reality" (*Method in Theology*, 251).

<sup>44</sup>I resist, too, the urge to extend the reflections on Ignatian spirituality to a clearly-implied transformation of the *Ratio Studiorum*, linking it up with the classroom transformations envisaged in section 2 of *Eldorede 1*. The solution cannot be just a matter of programs: it is the need for a new spirituality of teachers which can only be generated by a hierarchy of reformed recurrence-schemes of their formation. See further *Eldorede 12*.



Ignatius sets of "Thinking with the Church".<sup>45</sup> But think now of the unusual<sup>46</sup> climb towards a such a reading and thinking as is to be mediated by the "Standard Model" of which I wrote in *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, or more elementarily in *Method in Theology and Botany*. I should really have written there not "think now" but "fantasize strangely". It is a goal of a massively transformed theology. It would lift forward Pierre de Caussade's reach for every moment's sacrament<sup>47</sup> and ground a positive shift in the statistics of achievement of an *Inward Vision*<sup>48</sup> adequate to our times, giving the lie to Lonergan's gloom when he wrote, "Theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process."<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>**Exercises**, page 124, section 352, "Rules for Thinking with the Church".

<sup>46</sup>A clue to the climb and its oddness is **Cantower IX**, "Position, Poisition, Proto-Possession". I note here that the oddness of the climb has nothing to do with what I might call the oddness of mysticism, on which I comment briefly in the final note here. In the essay of Doran to which I refer (see note 25 above) he has enlightening suggestions for mediating an enlargement of perspective of the Exercises mediated by reading Lonergan. I would note in particular his pointings regarding patterns of elections (see **Exercises**, p. 57, s.175) that would push us back through Lonergan to the context of Aquinas reflections on consent and election in *Prima Secundae*, qq. 6-17.

<sup>47</sup>I am recalling a central pointing of that 18<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit in his work *Abandonment to Divine Providence*. His writings, of course, need a lifted out of various metaphysical mythology, but the primary point I would make about the perspective is that made in the final footnote here.

<sup>48</sup>I am recalling a book of that title, *The Inward Vision*, by H.J.Steuart, London, 1929. The problem of achievement is expressed in a piece that impressed me in my struggles of the early 1950s. It seems worthwhile to quote at length from *Music that is Soundless*, my late 1960s expression of what I am dealing with in this essay. "The discovery of the promised pearl and the emergence of growth of openness is the reader's personal challenge, a problem of savoring the gift of God and Who They Are that summons us endlessly yet gently. That silent summons is not easy to listen to: it seems a disturbance of our daily goings of good and evil. We are prejudiced in favour of the sounds we hear. 'History, heredity, personal experience, all combine to rivet my prejudice upon me. Under their influence, I gradually outdistance the disturbing echo of His words, spoken without reservation to me as to everyone else who should believe in Him, until at last it happens that I hear it no more'(Steuart, 113)"

<sup>49</sup>"Finality, Love, Marriage", *Collection*, University of Toronto Press, 1988, 47.

But one must fantasize about the effective operation of the tasks of functional specialization, especially the heart-cleansing tasks described on page 250 of *Method in Theology*, through which the word is made fresh and recycled in a “vertical finality to God himself .... obscure.... shrouded in mystery.”<sup>50</sup> How, THEN,<sup>51</sup> would one read those words of “The First Principle and Foundation”<sup>52</sup> or the pointers of “Contemplation to Attain Love of God”?<sup>53</sup>

So, what then of the rules for thinking with the church? Doran wisely advises us to shift from details to doctrines. I am merely placing his suggestion in a larger context, the one hinted at above when I was implicitly writing of the future foundationally-bent and -blessed Muslim thinking with and within the Mosque. And so, plainly speaking even if in fantasyland, one can envisage a fresh reading, character-forming, of either Ignatius’ *Exercises* or Dogen’s *Shobogenzo* lifting us forward to a coming convergence of global contemplation. The convergence is to be a slow-paced Hindu-braced cycling, a second sight of the Zulu *isisusa* dance,<sup>54</sup> clasped in a cosmo-

---

<sup>50</sup>Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 26.

<sup>51</sup>The capitalized THEN refers to the context of *Cantower IV*, “Metaphysics, THEN”

<sup>52</sup>*Exercises*, p.12, s. 23.

<sup>53</sup>*Exercises*, p. 79, s. 230. This topic of fresh reading is an enormous one and would require reflective reachings about - (about)<sup>3</sup> - levels of contemplative maturity in approaching any of the exercises, e.g. those related to the Christ Child (*Exercises*, p. 92 ff). I am thinking, then, of a fuller context that would sublate Lonergan’s musings on **Existenz** where he invites us (*The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 31) to make a “beginning from this particular time and place familiar to us through our senses and then proceeding by our imagination until we arrive at the Palestine, the Bethlehem, the Nazareth, and the Jerusalem of two thousand years ago”. The mature contemplative, going (about)<sup>3</sup> that journey, may be present and proceeding as a cosmic cuddler, amazed at the light from Jesus’ little eye - an invisible organ of a strange visionary organism - reaching out from Bethlehem to Betelgeuse and arriving there in the decade before the Council of Ephesus’s talk of his strangeness. And Betelgeuse of 431 B.C. spoke back to his new-born eyes on wings of primal energy.

<sup>54</sup>I am recalling the first book written in Zulu, Mageme M.Fuze, translated by H.C.Lugg as *The Black People And Whence They Came*, University of Natal Press, 1979, where there

genetic heuristic embrace of the hidden Hebrew harvest.<sup>55</sup>

#### **Eldorede 4      Meaning-Growing**

I am not optimistic about plain speaking here. There are various ways that I

---

occurs the proverb, “the *isisusa* wedding dance is always appreciated by being repeated”. I recall too my earliest reference to this work ( note 10 of the Prologue to *Lack in the Beingstalk*) and the continuity of my concluding reflections there: “The story of that great suffering continent may yet illuminate us on what is meant by *Axial*. Lonergan, in the context of Whitson’s *Coming Convergence of World Religions*, sensed African hopes, “underground until such times as the black man could worship God in his way”(A *Third Collection*, 69). I am not entirely frivolous when I quip that Lonergan might have learned more by focusing on the Hottentots “whose god was an insect with many knees” (Fuze, 5) instead of Husserl, seeking to inset one kneed axioms. And does not Kimbanguism point towards a meso-Christianity of many knees (analogous to its budding meso-economic structures) remote from the Axial centrism of Rome?”

<sup>55</sup>A central point should be held in mind regarding all this. It is that my view of contemplation is a matter of the natural dynamic of curiosity captured in the phrase “faith seeking understanding” with that phrase placed in the meaning-context pointed to in note 46 above. Technically, there is nothing mystical about its dynamics. I do not think that Doran would disagree with me on this, though in the paper to which I refer he uses the title “Trinitarian Mysticism” for the title of section 2.2. But there is a tendency in some authors, e.g. William Johnson, to point to a relevance of mysticism, in his case of the Zen type, that I find unacceptable. Certainly Ignatius’ Trinitarian visioning (see *Music That Is Soundless*, p.79), if mystical, is motivational within the dynamics of his life and indeed of others: but it is not articulately so. These comments are random, anticipating the later context that would sublate Lonergan’s suggestions regarding the dialectics and the foundations of contemplation (see *Method in Theology*, 266, 290). The sublation itself, of course, would interweave in the consciousness and character of the contemplative in a manner that would make microautonomic the dynamics of functional system and specialized systematics sketched in chapter 6 of *Method in*

*Theology and Botany*. The full operation of that system should eventually lead to a sublation both of the confused Jesuit tradition on mysticism and of the aspirations of the Renaissance humanism, identifying luminously the axial place of nominalism’s alliance with descriptiveness in its frustration of faith’s invitation to understand. But that is a task for future centuries. A survey and referencing context is chapter 7 of John W.O’Malley, *The First Jesuits*. The fuller methodological context is my *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, (on the website), with its relocation of *Cantower XXIII’s* rejection of descriptivism.

might go about shifting the slim statistics of existential communication. We are, for one thing, dealing with a huge axial problem, where I mean axial in a sense quite beyond Jaspers, something I have pretty clear on for more than twenty years; but that topic needs plain speaking also, since my previous writing and speaking on the topic has generated little interest.<sup>56</sup>

I must first note that I am talking principally about full and fulsome growth in meaning, of the type then that Lonergan mentions in what for me is a key statement of the book *Insight*, quoted already in these *Eldorede*, "Theoretical understanding seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view."<sup>57</sup> I am writing, then, of norms in the new luminous culture of meaning that is to emerge in some future century.

Still, there are analogies to which I have appealed over decades that can help, and I should repeat them as simply as possible here. But first, a plain statement of a normative formula for growth, to which I add the warning that the present ethos, in most areas of culture, is firmly against anything like it.

Please do not take fright at my formula: indeed, I simplify it shortly for communicative purposes. So, here we go. Let the state of growth of an individual be generally given by  $e^x$ .<sup>58</sup> Then one gets a glimpse of the reality and of the problem of

---

<sup>56</sup>A plain note may help. Instead of Jaspers' Axial Period of 600 B.C. - 200 B.C. I propose a longer Axial Period, let's say roughly 6000 years, around the Incarnation. The axial period separates the two times of temporal subjectivity mentioned in Lonergan's *Systematics of the Trinity* and also the first from the third stage of meaning discussed in *Method in Theology*. 3000 A.D. may be too optimistic for the beginning of that new control of meaning: the date depends on you.

<sup>57</sup>*Insight*, 417[442], the **Tomega Principle**. I note here that I still continue to give the reference to the old *Insight* in these *Eldorede*. Yet I assume that almost all my readers are using the new version. But: not much point in changing my old habits in these final river-re-runs!.

<sup>58</sup> For those unfamiliar with this odd use of the letter **e**, I draw attention to the fact that it is not at all mysterious. It is not some general function, some vague mathematical thing. It is a definite number between 2 and 3. Of course, raising it to a power which is "loose" in its meaning

growth by considering the rate of change of that function. It is equal to itself, or in symbols,  $d/dx (e^x) = e^x$ .

Might I take some of the possible, probable, fright out of the last sentence by going back to elementary calculus: and at the same time illustrating here and now - there and then to one of us now! - the challenge of growth? I can rename  $e^x$  by using a longer name given by an equation. For those with sufficient mathematical sophistication, of course, there is more than a renaming involved. Here you have it:

$$e^x = 1 + x + x^2/2 + x^3/(2.3) + x^4/(2.3.4) + \dots + x^n/(2.3.4\dots n) + \dots$$

Even with only a technical knowledge of the rules for differentiation you figure out, by using the rule  $d/dx (x^n) = nx^{n-1}$ , that  $d/dx (e^x) = e^x$ . O.K? In popular terms the rate of change of this thing is equal to its size.

Now before I go on - since this sort of thinking is not only discouraging but perhaps discouraged, disliked, even disdained, by philosophers and theologians - it seems a useful strategy to appeal to Lonergan's use of something similar. How similar? The knowing will smile at the result of getting the value of  $[1 + 1/n]^n$  as  $n$  approaches infinity, to which Lonergan appeals. But the point is that he, like I, is searching for a way to convey a genetic result; where his problem is phylogenetic, mine is ontogenetic. And do not the problems mesh? The meshing lurks in the knowledge of the result I mentioned.

Here, at any rate, is his view at the age of 50:

"The Method in Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating  $[1 + 1/n]^n$  as  $n$  approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God."<sup>59</sup>

I ended the previous *Eldorede* with some compact reflections on such manifolds

---

is a tricky thing, but at least you can think of something definite like "the square of".

<sup>59</sup>I quote, with Fr.Crowe's permission, from a letter of Lonergan to him of May 1954.

of developing unities in a manner that coaxes towards phylogenetic openness.<sup>60</sup> Here the topic is the norm of growth of the individual.

Further, when I ended the last *Eldorede* a little while ago, I paused and puzzled at my failure to hold to simplicity. Perhaps I should have held to the statement that there is an important type of prayer that is simply hard thinking and leave it at that!

But the pause makes me wiser in my revision of this *Eldorede*. I should have a shot at ending it in four clear pages!

So, let me add a simpler image of growth. Suppose your mind is like a balloon and suppose, further, that the normative rate is a unit of radius (a centimeter, say) per unit of time (a day, a month: it does not matter). Now you don't need even to work out the geometry to make sense of the claim that the larger the balloon the more air it takes in through a one centimeter expansion.

This raises huge questions about human communication, including the communication and progress suggested by Lonergan. But let us keep to one point regarding **telling** or **sharing**.

Start with me or with you. If, this past week, I make significant progress (which, of course, is part of my contemplative norm) then I could not tell **me** of last week the content of that progress. Certainly I can help the climb of the likes of me: AND that helping is related to historic progress.

Let me go back now to my favorite analogy for all this: teaching mathematical physics, as I did one year, both to a first year group and to a graduate class. The first year group grew in the relevant meaning through struggling with texts and exercises, week by week. The growing was accelerating: this is a quite accepted fact. In second year they would grow at a faster pace: like the balloon image illustrates. The graduates grew at a much higher pace. And so on: where that "and so on" is, I expect, problematic

---

<sup>60</sup>With that coaxing I have regularly associated the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter of Joyce's *Ulysses*, entitled "Oxen of the Sun". See "Features of Generalized Empirical Method" in *Creativity and Method*, M.Lamb (ed), Minnesota Press, Milwaukee, 1982.

for you: does the  $n^{\text{th}}$  year of thinking in an area really pace up from the  $(n - 1)^{\text{th}}$  year?!<sup>61</sup>

Dealing with that problem helps us further along : where dealing in the present situation is me talking briefly and you taking a lot more time. This is a difficulty of present cultures of telling and teaching, but let us not complexify what so far seems pretty successful plain, if incomprehensible speaking. Incomprehensible? Well, the words are plain, but I am proposing a strange theorem of incompleteness and openness. And here we are, heading plainly into page four, with a tunnel at the end of this light.

Can you tunnel your way round and through the following parallel? If you don't like it , skip to the last paragraph!

Fermat made a simple statement which he claimed to be true and which can make sense to you as you now read it:

$x^n + y^n = z^n$  is not true for integral values of  $x, y, z$ , when  $n$  is greater than 2

The Proposal is called *Fermat's Last Theorem*: whether he "had" it or not is a debated issue. But there you "have" it: a nice suggestive pattern of words:  **$x^n + y^n = z^n$  is not true for integral values of  $x, y, z$ , when  $n$  is greater than 2**. The pattern kept Andrew Wiley busy for 10 years, and talking it out "clearly" took three lectures (June 21-23, 1993, in Cambridge University, England) and 100 pages, both for a very well-up audience.<sup>62</sup>

In the later post-axial culture that I envisage, both Wiley and the audience will be in, within, constituted by, a quite larger world of meaning, generated by a Tower commitment to the **Tomega Principle**. And part of that larger world will be a luminous recognition of Lonergan's claim about any particular progress in insight and concept.

<sup>61</sup>What then of, say, the 40<sup>th</sup> year? A perspective on this is presented in my contribution to Mike Vertin's "Retirement *Festschrift*": "The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*", *The Importance of Insight. Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*, University of Toronto Press, 2007, pp. 339-376.

<sup>62</sup>The basic paper is Andrew Wiles, "Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat's Last Theorem," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 142, 1995, 443-551.

“The conceptualization of understanding is, when fully developed, a system .... the concept emerges from understanding, not an isolated atom but precisely as part of a context, loaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts.”<sup>63</sup> We are struggling here with an enlargement of this view, especially within the third definition of generalized empirical method, loneliness, “an infinite craving,”<sup>64</sup> tuned to its source. Then a shift in one zone’s insight-system is a ballooning of meaning throughout the dominant inner word and world: one becomes a stranger to oneself of yesterday.

### ***Eldorede 5: Lonergan’s Ethics of Self-Transcendence: Education***

Is there not some benefit in taking the same “riverrun past Eve and Adam” again?

What is it to repeat?<sup>65</sup> Is it a repetition, or is one not elder, wiser, a stranger to the previous self with the so-much smaller inner word, world? But to answer this in some small way, one needs the riverrun to and past *Eldorede 4*.

---

<sup>63</sup>*Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, U. of T. Press, 1997, 238. See also *Joistings 21*.

<sup>64</sup>B.Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection*, U. of Toronto Press, 1988, 49. The third definition of generalized empirical method is discussed in *Joistings 21*.

<sup>65</sup>Here we are in the larger world of the questions raised in *Eldorede 0*, note 7 and *Eldorede 8*, note 12: a good place to end.