

## Field Nocturnes CanTower 44

## The Fourth Stage of Meaning

Since this essay appears out of sequence it needs a preliminary identification. It is a part of a series of essays, *FNC 42 -117*, which aims at completing two previous series. The first series, monthly essays which began on Easter Monday, April 1<sup>st</sup> 2002, was intended to continue to December 1<sup>st</sup> 2011, and to contain 117 essays - a number equal to that of Ezra Pound's *Cantos* - was named *Cantowers*. It was interrupted in August 2005 at *Cantower 41* due to an opportunity to collaborate. That opportunity blossomed, in the following three years, into a collection of essays and two books. The final series of essays in that collection, running to 41 in number and to 300 pages in length, is titled *Field Nocturnes*. Its focus is on that single powerful paragraph of *Insight*, "Study of the organism begins ...."<sup>1</sup> The word *field* in the title is a direct reference to Lonergan's use of that word in *Phenomenology and Logic*: it may be taken elementarily as a colorful replacement of the word *being*.<sup>2</sup> *Nocturnes*, of course, is a reference to Chopin and John Field, but may be taken to point to dark searchings or searchers. The two series, *Field Nocturnes* and *Cantowers*, are made to converge after 41 essays in each case: so we arrive here at the third essay in the new series, with the general title given above.

The title is obviously a mesh of the two previous titles, but the mesh has a richer and explicitly optimistic meaning. The 41 initial *Cantowers*, and the works that followed, lifted my searchings towards the core of a solution to the problem of history, "the real

---

<sup>1</sup>My normal practice is to give references to both old and new *Insight*: so, here, *Insight* 464[489].

<sup>2</sup>See the index to *Phenomenology and Logic* under *Field*. This effort of Lonergan seems to me quite important. See my use of the shift and its mood in chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publications, 2007.

catch,"<sup>3</sup> in the emergence of a controlling regionalization called *The Tower of Able*.<sup>4</sup> The ongoing topologically-complex region is normatively a population of Field Nocturnes, people in functional collaboration within a genetically-shifting standard model of *Praxisweltanschauung*.<sup>5</sup> The optimism, regarding a potentially effective solution to the problem of cosmopolis,<sup>6</sup> is made quite explicit in the reading of the title as *Field Nocturnes Can Tower*. Previously I have mused over the character of the tower and the towering, but here I wish only to pause in a preliminary fashion over the origin and meaning of this essay's title.<sup>7</sup>

It emerged as an affirmative answer to the question raised by a paper by John Dadosky, "Is there a fourth stage of meaning?"<sup>8</sup> That paper pushed towards an

---

<sup>3</sup>"The problem of general history, which is the real catch" (Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 236).

<sup>4</sup>The final chapter of *Topics in Education* poses the problem complexly, but the manner in which Lonergan talks of regional history lends itself to envisaging the future sub-group of functional collaborators as constituting a peculiar complex topological region of the globe. The convenient image of the tower emerges from making the diagram on page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue* into a three dimensional structure in which the cycle of collaboration spirals upwards. It belongs to my list of Metagrams, Wi. See *Prehumous 2* for a presentation of the list.

<sup>5</sup>The enlarged view of functional collaboration is contained in two website books, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* and *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. The website is [www.philipmcshane.ca](http://www.philipmcshane.ca)

<sup>6</sup>The problem of cosmopolis is posed in the concluding section to chapter 7 of *Insight*. The realization of its characteristics in the strategy of functional specialization is spelled out in *Joistings 22*.

<sup>7</sup>The musing, of course, stretches back to my first essay of 1969 on the topic, "Metamusic and Self-Meaning", which is chapter 2 of the 1976 website book, *The Shaping of the Foundations*. It has been my central interest since Lonergan sketched the specialties for me in 1966.

<sup>8</sup>The paper was presented at the 35<sup>th</sup> annual Lonergan Workshop in Boston College. When it becomes more available I shall add references. Meantime I give references here to the pages of the paper made available at the conference, with the paper referred to simply as **Dadosky**.

affirmative answer which I shall consider presently. In that consideration I attempt to show how both our struggles come towards the issue from different directions. My own searchings had led me to envisage a refinement of the definition of generalized empirical method that required a balance of attention to subject and object to a definition that would focus on the subject in a radical care mediated by an advanced comprehension of the object.<sup>9</sup> Dadosky pushed my searchings towards a fuller context.

But let us take our merging contexts in helpful stages. First I consider Dadosky's question and answer. Then I turn to some of my own previous reflections. Thirdly, I pay some attention to the sequencing of stages of meaning. Fourthly, I pause over a parallel with the successful elementary science of physics, a paralleling that can aid us in coming to grips with future meanings. In the fifth place, I identify a central contemporary challenge.

### 1. Dadosky's Suggestion of a Fourth Stage of Meaning.

Dadosky leads us towards an affirmative answer to his question regarding the existence of such a stage with a winning quotation from Catherine of Siena's *Dialogue*, "O dearest daughter whom I so love, you who are my bride. Rise above your self and open your mind's eye."<sup>10</sup> Catherine of Siena was a lady I met and cherished in the early 1950 - Lonergan was less than a twinkle in my eye - but now the "rise and open" were read by me in a recently-freshened context of the luminous reading of a statement of Lonergan, "the pure desire to know is ineffable,"<sup>11</sup> coupled with a venturing into the

---

<sup>9</sup>I give Lonergan's own definition at note 22 below. In *Joistings 21*, "Research, Communications, Stages of Method", I give an account of the first three modes of generalized empirical method. The fourth mode is considered in *Joisting 22*, "Reviewing Mathews' *Lonergan's Quest*, and Ours".

<sup>10</sup>**Dadoski**, 1, quoted from *The Dialogue*.

<sup>11</sup>I am quoting from thesis 12 of the unpublished translation, due to Charles Hefling Jr., of *De Verbo Incarnato*, which is to appear as volume 8 of the *Collected Works* as *The Incarnate Word*.

reachings of the women mystics of the fourteenth century.<sup>12</sup> But Dadosky's reach was wider, into Lonergan's "Prolegomena to the Emerging Religious Consciousness of our Time,"<sup>13</sup> into Robley Whitson's *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*,<sup>14</sup> into Dadosky's own suggestions about a "genetic unfolding of *Insight's* Cosmopolis with its theological correlate the Reign of God on earth."<sup>15</sup>

In later sections he weaves a more complex web of correlations that are certainly of concern here, but I wish to maintain a simple focus on the core pointing, symbolized by Catherine's invitation to rise, to open. Loving knowledge of self is in some way to be knowledge of God, "just as the fish is in the sea and the sea in the fish."<sup>16</sup> Is there something here of an edging towards a cherishing of God as "not an object"?<sup>17</sup> Might such an edging edge a community towards a new vulnerable openness to "being at pains not to conceal his tracks,"<sup>18</sup> and a "new sacralization to be fostered?"<sup>19</sup> I venture no further into Dadosky's searchings but rather would have us pause over a single

---

<sup>12</sup>The series of essays titled *Prehumous* contains five essays, numbers 4 to 8, all titled *Foundational Prayer*. On fourteenth century mysticism, its place and transposition, see Prehumous 8, "Foundational Prayer V: Placing Mysticism".

<sup>13</sup>The fifth essay in *A Third Collection*.

<sup>14</sup>New York, Newman, 1971.

<sup>15</sup>John Dadoski, "Sacralization, Secularization, and Religious Fundamentalism", *Studies in Religious/Sciences Religieuses*, 2007, 513-529.

<sup>16</sup>Catherine of Siena, *Dialogue* 112.

<sup>17</sup>"On what I have called the primary and fundamental meaning of the name God, God is not an object" (Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 342).

<sup>18</sup>Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 193. Lonergan is making the point here about good historians. It is altogether more deeply true of the dialectic challenge built into the strategy of dialectic in the second half of page 250 of *Method*.

<sup>19</sup>Quoted in **Dadosky**, 18. It is from Lonergan on the top of page 265 of "Sacralization and Secularization" *Collected Works*, vol. 17 (University of Toronto Press, 2004).

quotation from Lonergan which Dadosky considers as central. "So it is - as we shall attempt to show in the next chapter - that humans can reach basic fulfilment, peace, joy only by moving beyond the realms of common sense, theory, interiority and into the realm in which God is known and loved."<sup>20</sup> Is there a pointing here towards an overcoming of the catch of history already mentioned, towards, in Dadosky's words, "an ecclesiology of friendship" but in a fullness of global towering and its mediations?

## 2. The Lift Given to My Own Previous Struggle.

My own struggle of more than five decades has led me to some appreciation of Lonergan's suggestion of two times of the temporal subject.<sup>21</sup> I came to consider these two times as separated by a long - perhaps more than five millennia long - axial period, identifiable mainly with the present shabby emergence of the second stage of meaning. In the third stage of meaning there is to emerge a luminous balanced turn to the subject. The turn is to be dominated by generalized empirical method in its second mode, specified by Lonergan thus: "generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject's operations without taking into account the corresponding objects."<sup>22</sup>

The past few years have pushed me towards envisaging a refinement of this second mode, given the obvious name of *GEM3*. The push came from a spread of efforts. There was a reach for a heuristics both of the *Eschaton* and of kataphatic prayer, and in that context there emerged the view both of paradise and prayer as **resting and**

---

<sup>20</sup>Quoted in **Dadosky**, 10: from *Method in Theology*, 84.

<sup>21</sup>Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, University of Toronto Press, 2007, 403.

<sup>22</sup>*A Third Collection*, 141.

**questing in the real.**<sup>23</sup> Pilgrim Tower-prayer would reach for a normative fullness that would mediate a proto-possessive community,<sup>24</sup> living towards luminous resonance with the Word as God's Explanation,<sup>25</sup> the Theory of the Speaker; Speaker, Spoke, Clasp, circumincessionally echoed in the cherishing and caring of the spiraling tower cycles of human's meaning - inwardly and in radiant symbol - history's chemical zeal.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>See *Prehumous 4*: "Foundational Prayer I", page 3, and *Prehumous 6*, "Foundational Prayer III, page 2.

<sup>24</sup>This is an enormously complex topic which I treated in an initial stumbling manner in Cantower 9, "Position, Poisition, Protopossession". In my struggles with the nature of foundational prayer, I moved to more light and precision on the matter of Proto-Possession, and usefully quote here note 8 of *Prehumous 5*, "Foundational Prayer: All Saints Reaching": "Ut homo studium deputet ad vacandum Deo et rebus divinis" (*Secunda Secundae*, q.24, a.8). Perhaps here is a good place to come to the heart of the matter, the topic that is to occupy us in the next several essays on foundational prayer. Thomas is dealing here with a high calling. But is not the global call of Faith seeking pragmatic understanding that high call globalized? And is not that the call of cosmopolis, identifiable now methodologically as functional specialization? "It would be unfair not to stress the chief characteristic of cosmopolis. It is not easy." (*Insight* 241[266]). So I would claim, bluntly, that foundational prayer is the core of the challenge of cosmopolis, the heart of that collaboration mentioned 29 times in the second-last section of chapter 20 of *Insight*. It is to be "not only a new and higher collaboration of intellects through faith in God, but also a mystery that is at once symbol of the uncomprehended and sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked together in charity, to a joyful, courageous, whole-hearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended." (*Insight*, 723[745]). Are we not close to the mood of the appeal in the verse quoted at the end of the previous footnote? "Please come home. Please come home into your own body, / Your own vessel, your own earth. / Please come home into each and every cell, / And fully into the space that surrounds you". And there are the further pointers of notes 18-25 of *Prehumous 5*.

<sup>25</sup>There are some very complex issues involved here, but it is important to advert to the simplest perspective, one that meshes with Lonergan's comments in "Mission and Spirit" (*A Third Collection*, 27) on Aristotle ideal - "too high for man" -and on *theoria* in the Greek Fathers. Clinging in theology to descriptions, however rich, is a blocking of the mission of the processive Word. A more complex reach is to ask, as Lonergan does implicitly in *Insight* chapter 10, how we are called to lift into the best human analogue our wonder at the Word's containing of "The Secondary Component in the Idea of Being" (title of section 7 of chapter 19 of *Insight*).

<sup>26</sup>I am pointing compactly here to the power of the second half of Lonergan's systematic treatment of the Trinity. "Speak, Spoke, Clasp" I find useful pastorally as a naming of the Trinity.

The practice of GEM2 would have at its neuroheart a focus on that echoing circumincession of the Circumcession.<sup>27</sup> The heartiness, a mustard seed, would be fostered by GEM3, a kataphatic cherishing of the loved subject. But would not this be a new stage of meaning, even though ecologically meshed with varieties of all other stages, thus shabbily sequential?

### 3. Sequencings of Stages of Meaning.

Sequencing, whether ontogenetic or phylogenetic, is a general problem. One may

---

The concluding paragraph of *Insight* 700[722] adds a magnificent context, especially taken in the context of the chemical zeal of 13.7 billion years. Indeed, the paragraph is worth quoting here, with “good will” thought of within the reality of the Clasp Joy of the Spirit, Godswell: “Finally, good will is joyful. For it is the love of God above all and in all, and love is joy. Its repentance and sorrow regard the past. Its present sacrifices look to the future. It is at one with the universe in being in love with God, and it shares its dynamic resilience and expectancy. As emergent probability, it ever rises above past achievement. As genetic process, it develops generic potentiality to its specific perfection. As dialectic, it overcomes evil both by meeting it with good and by using it to reinforce the good. But good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal”.

<sup>27</sup>We are here in the world of Thomas’ and Lonergan’s reflections. A text worth contemplating inward and onward is “For the glory of the Father is this, that just as he eternally speaks the Word in truth and through the Word breathes forth Love in holiness, so also in the fullness of time he sent his incarnate Son in truth so that by believing the Word we might speak and understand true inner words, and through the Word he sent the Spirit of the Word in holiness so that joined to the Spirit in love and made living members of the body of Christ we might cry out, Abba, Father.” (*The Triune God: Systematics*, 521). It is as well to mention in this context the searchings of the mystics for inner and outer words of the Trinitarian reality. Kataphatic contemplation is to lift that anaphatic effort into a new luminosity of minding. I have written previously of problems of the anaphatic reaching, and it seems useful to repeat a note given in that context (note 15 of *Prehumous* 8) which comments on a quotation “the birth of the divine Word in the soul”, from note 85, p. 423, of McGinn, *The Flowering of Mysticism*, Volume 3 of his *The Presence of God: A History of Western Mysticism*, Crossroads/Herder, New York, 1998. A fuller piece of McGinn’s note reads: “This mystical theme of the birth of the divine Word in the soul, found in a number of Cistercian authors, such as Gueric of Igny (see *Growth of Mysticism*, pp. 283-4), was richly developed by Meister Eckhart. For an overview, see Hugo Rahner, “Die Gottesgeburt: Die Lehre der Kirchenväter von der Geburt Christi aus dem Herzen der Kirche und der Gläubigen,” in *Symbole der Kirche* (Saltzburg: Otto Mueller, 1964), pp. 13-87. [excuse missing accents!]

ask what type of moral conversion, if any, can be expected to precede a certain type of religious reorientation. Here our interest is in sequencings of stages of meaning and of general types of generalized empirical method, each separately and also in their interweaving. Further, our interest here cannot be more than that of preliminary scientific description, and so we muddle along with crude genera.

It seems sufficiently accurate to claim that the four stages of meaning are roughly in the right order when we consider their emergence either in history or in the individual subject. But beyond the roughness we find exceptions. Both the Socrates of Plato and the Saint of Siena seem oddly close to what we name the fourth stage of meaning. The oddness invites us beyond the consideration of genera to an ecology of species and varieties. We must make do, in this short essay, with some few pointers. The question of the subject, or of “the subject as subject”<sup>28</sup> in Lonergan’s uncomfortable expression, emerges in elementary ways, differently in different cultures. There is the way of Confucius, the way of Dogen, the way of the twentieth century existentialists that interested Lonergan when he coined his phrase, *subject as subject*. Husserl obviously figures in that interest for Lonergan and us, and it gives the opportunity to mention the distant achievement of a developed fourth stage of meaning that would give an ecology of Husserl, both of his achievements in specifying stages of the Calculus of Variation and of his muddled persistence in misreading his own activities of is-ing.<sup>29</sup> That

---

<sup>28</sup>See *Phenomenology and Logic*, 314, and the index of the book under *Subject, as subject*. The word as is generally taken as abstractive, but Lonergan’s push is towards the subject in full concreteness, a concreteness that I would relate to the subject’s ineffable obediencity.

<sup>29</sup>In the next section I draw on a paralleling with Einstein’s searching in Spacetime’s understanding, but there is a large and fruitful paralleling to be had from Husserl’s work on the stages of development of the Calculus of Variation, a thesis written in the early 1880s under Weirstrass. I develop this parallel in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 4, “A Calculus of Variation”. That parallel brings out better the anticipated subtle remoteness of a developed science of calculated care, since the calculus of variation has a long history, starting from the Aeneas’s problem of maximizing an area and moving towards the complexity expressed by such a text as I.M.Gelfand, *Calculus of Variation*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1993. A parallel development in theology and in global inquiry is the object of our present fantasy, reaching into



ecology, and the ecologies of Confucius or Catherine, are to be patterned by what I call the Standard Model of the Tower Community, a relatively mature context named UV + GS, where both UV - a universal viewpoint - and GS - a geohistorical genetic systematics - have a richness of meaning rooted in a future century or so of cyclically cumulative progressive results.<sup>30</sup>

But all this is too much for our present effort, indeed, for our present generation. I wish only to make two broad descriptive points: that the sequencing and the related ecologies are massively flexible; that nonetheless that there is to be, as Lonergan would have it, a "normative pattern"<sup>31</sup> of cumulating results. The flexibility is illustrated by a sort-of premature presence of the fourth stage of meaning in the searchings of Socrates and the sighings of Catherine. The normativity is embedded in my claim that the Tower of Able is eventually to be a community alive in a mature fourth stage of meaning that is generalized empirical method in its third mode, mediated by the general and special categories of up-to-date global culture, within the dynamic spiral of GEM4.

So I return to the concluding quotation from Lonergan given at the end of section 2 above. Is there a normativity of some refined sequencing of the differentiations involved, which yet has a tolerant flexibility?

#### **4. Existential Assistance from Physics.**

It is important that we pause here over the parallel between GEM3 and the successful pursuit of a successful science, and the parallel I would make is one that

---

later centuries of this millennium.

<sup>30</sup>This is all too compact, expressing facets of the two books mentioned in note 5 above. The heuristic conceiving of genetic systematics seems especially difficult for the present generation, especially when it is taken in a spacetime fullness that would include geographic divergences, ecologies. John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria were in different genetic snakings, as were Dogen and Thomas in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. We need a heuristic and scientific complexification of Lonergan's various suggestions about ongoing, overlapping, etc contexts.

<sup>31</sup>*Method in Theology*, 4.

lurks in many of Lonergan's suggestions. It is the parallel with the most elementary science, physics. The first lecture of Lonergan I heard, in 1961, gave a lead to my present pointing. He spoke of the lady who invited Einstein to tea. Midway through the tea she expressed her delight and went on "I am fascinated by your work and would live to understand your theory of relativity. I would live you to explain it to me, just in my own simple words: I am no good whatsoever with equations."<sup>32</sup>

He anticipates in this story the mood of his later comments on *haute vulgarization*,<sup>33</sup> a large topic to which I can only give footnote pointers, for here I wish us to focus in that mood, but sublationally, on Lonergan's meaning of stages, theoria, patterns, etc. General bias, molecularly possessive of all of us in this late stage of the longer cycle of decline, would have us shrink his meaning with gentle brutality. So it is useful to enlarge Lonergan's tale about Einstein into a definite paralleling of the two innovators.

Einstein was trying to envisage and initiate a lift in our understanding of space and time. There was the partial achievement, in 1904, of key elements expressed in his special theory of relativity. To that he added, eleven years later, in 1915, a decent shot at the general theory that eventually blossomed into a present incomplete gauge theory.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>I am recall the first of six lectures on Method and Science given during Easter, 1961. We were not great at recording in those days. The remaining lectures are available in the Toronto Archives, but I'm not sure whether we recorded the first lecture at all: I recalled points from it for those Archives.

<sup>33</sup>See *Collected Works*, volume 7: 121, 155. There are also relevant refection in *Topics in Education*, 145, and in Lonergan's musings, in *Phenomenology and Logic*, on decaying schools of thought. *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 3, "*Haute Vulgarization*", raises the question of the transposition of popular exposition to a positivity that would be an ex-plane-ing, from a present plane of the Tower to the plain plane of common sense.

<sup>34</sup>A relevant piece of an extended paralleling would be had from Lochlainn O'Raifeartaigh, *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1986, a brilliant critical work. There is need for a parallel work on the dawning of Lonergan's gauge theory, although we are as yet not close to sun-up: a work, then, for the end of this century.

The story of that blossoming cannot concern us here, although it is to be part of the Tower-stand against *haute vulgarization*. Let us simply leap descriptively and suggestively to Lonergan's efforts, exactly fifty years later.

Lonergan was trying to envisage and initiate a lift in our understanding of neuro-space and neuro-time. There was the partial achievement, in 1954, of key elements that bubbled out of his special effort of *Insight*.<sup>35</sup> He was onto the core of progress in theology that could be controlled by the sharing of that special effort. Hear his burst of confidence, however opaque it sits in your neurospacetime. "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>36</sup>

Eleven years later he broke through history's nudges to the core of the general character of the control of that sharing that is eventually to blossom into a global gauge of progress. He had solved, in principle, the larger problem lurking in the special theory, the problem of realistic efficiency.<sup>37</sup> And, in principle but not in expression, he

---

<sup>35</sup>I would note that *Insight* in ways is a light-weight book. Difficulties are described or passed over, even with such a comic turn as occurs at the beginning of the last paragraph of chapter 5: "The answer is easily reached". On the problem of a fuller axiomatics of "the position," (*Insight* 388[413]) including axioms of intentionality, of infinity, of incompleteness etc, see *Prehumous* 2. Then there is the problem that *Insight* was the first of two volumes envisaged by Lonergan, the second having some such title as, *Insight and Faith*. (This, from a letter to Eric O'Connor in 1952).

<sup>36</sup>I quote from a letter of Lonergan to Fr. Frederick Crowe in May 1954, which he kindly made available to me decades ago. I consider the letter, and the problem implicit there of accelerating adult growth (see *Eldorede* 4), in *Field Nocturnes* 4: "Lonergan's 1954 View of Theology in the New Context".

<sup>37</sup>I have all too often referred to the key text, line 16 of page 160 of *Topics in Education*, regarding the unity of a science to be found in its efficiency. Present global reflective concern, including present theology, is quite evidently "effete" (*Method in Theology*, 99). In the following *Field Nocturnes* CanTower 45, "Eau Canada" I shall attempt to illustrate this more concretely in relation to global care of water. The title of *FNC* 45 is the title of a recent book edited by Karen

had arrived at a general theory. GEM2 was to be weaved into a GEM4.

## 5. The Existential Challenge

The existential assistance that is touched on in the previous section is, alas, of real significance and of real assent, ascent, only if it assisted by patient involvement in the effort to climb a little in scientific understanding. This is an old thesis of mine, but it can be well documented from Lonergan's writings.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps, in this brief essay, the challenge might be intimated by focusing on the word *patterned* as I wrote it above and you read it there and here.<sup>39</sup> How did you read it? More broadly, how do you read the word *pattern* in *Insight* and *Method in Theology*? Einstein and his followers in gauge theory think and write of the patterns of planets and particles. Lonergan has written of a normative gauge of thinking of persons and patterns of consciousness. If the first

---

Bakker, University of British Columbia Press, 2007. The title is an obvious pun, but it leads me to lift the reflection into another musical context, that of C.Hubert Parry's 1916 melody *Jerusalem*, with modern words "O world of God so vast and strange, profound and wonderful and strange, beyond the utmost reach of thought but not beyond our Maker's care". The issue of modern theology and care is, nonetheless, to push for that utmost reach, rise out of its shallowness, stop being "a titanothore, a beast with a three-ton-body with a ten-ounce brain .... It must glory in its deepening, in the pure deepening that adds to aggregate leisure, to liberate many entirely and all increasingly to the field of cultural activities ..... It must lift its eyes more and ever more to the more general and the more difficult fields of speculation, for it is from them that it has to derive the delicate compound of unity and freedom in which alone progress can be born, struggle, and win through" (*For A New Political Economy*, 20).

<sup>38</sup>See Part three, chapter 1, of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, a work in progress, to appear in English, French, and other languages. In that chapter I focus attention on Lonergan's ingestion of the perspective of Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*.

<sup>39</sup>The word occurs in the sentence following that marked by note 29. It refers to patterning by the Standard Model. It is useful to note the two lengthy commentaries on components of this patterning that the series *Field Nocturnes* focuses on: the pattern of serious science described in the paragraph "study of the organism", talked about in that 300 pages, and the pattern of serious dialectic collaboration described on page 250 of *Method*, commented on previously in the 200 pages of the two series, SOFAWARDS and *Quodlibets*. One does not come to grips with the pattern of scientific inquiry from outside science, or by reading *Scientific American*.

group's reachings are incomprehensible to common sense, the second groups reachings are to be much more so.

But is this latter stand yours?

The series of 41 essays titled *Field Nocturnes* was a 300-page invitation to exercises on the single paragraph "Study of the organism". One might thus come to the stand in question by savouring the distressing fact that patterns of human experience are not forms, but flexible circles of ranges of recurrence-schemes realized by acts of forms, those actual and active forms being forms of flexible aggregates of vastly complex neurochemical acts; and so on down to those particles which intrigue the practitioners of the elementary gauge theory of physics. The achievement of the stand removes one existentially from metaphysical myth-making,<sup>40</sup> from simplistic and distorted phenomenology, but above all from the *haute vulgarization*, mate of general bias, that haunts present Lonergan studies. The effective long-term remedy to that sickness is, of course, the slow global implementation of the Towering Enterprise of GEM4. But that circles us back to the million-word project of the 117 Cantowers, not something to be put in simple words without equations.

---

<sup>40</sup>*Insight* 505[528] speaks of "the substitution of a pseudometaphysical myth-making for scientific inquiry". *The Triune God: Systematics* puts the point in uncompromising terms: "Only in the intermediate scientific stage are relations divided into predicamental and transcendental and even in that state such a division is not very suitable"(725). Add to that the comment on page 199 of *Understanding and Being*: "We arrive at Aristotle's categories most simply by going into the woods, meeting animals, and asking, What kind of an animal is this? How big is it? What is its color? What relations does it have? And so on. They are categories of descriptive knowledge, and descriptive knowledge is science in a preliminary stage".